School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A

School Year:	**2025 - 2026**
School Name:	**High School**
Principal Name:	**T. J. Perry**
Date Submitted:	**6/3/2026**
Revision Date(s):	**5/1/25; 5/21/25**

APPROVED

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	South Cobb High School
Team Lead	T.J. Perry Principal
Position	Principal
Email	Tommy.Perry@cobbk12.org
Phone	

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

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

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders).
References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]

School Response: In developing this plan, the school actively sought input from students, staff, and parents through surveys. Additionally, community stakeholder feedback was gathered through the Principal Advisory Council, which includes representatives from various sectors of the community. Teachers contributed their perspectives both through surveys and their respective professional learning communities. Instructional support personnel played a central role in the process by participating in planning meetings, guiding collaboration, and leading the disaggregation of data from the comprehensive needs assessment to inform the development of school goals.

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:	October, 7th 2024, April 1st, 2025	May 5th, 2025	May 7th, 2025

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Academic Coach/Parent	Staci Morris	Staci Morris
Academic Coach	Ricardo Pacheco	Ricardo Pacheco
Assistant Principal	Sean W. Strode	
Assistant Principal	WILGAN JOSEPH	WJ
Assistant Principal	Angela Hurley	Angela Hurley
Assistant Principal	Sonya Cook	Sonya Cook
Assistant Principal	Ormond Moore	
Principal	T.J. Perry	
Assistant Principal	Bryan Rathke	
Assistant Principal	Robin Dowdy	
Parent Facilitator	Adriana Breceda	Adriana Breceda
Parent	Israel Sanchez	
Parent/Teacher	Iesha Etheridge	Iesha Etheridge
Pastor-Community Member	Reginald Fields	

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).

<table>
<tr><td>Previous Year's Goal #1</td><td>By May 2025, increase the percentage of students in Biology scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 3% (approximately 245 students out of 588 students tested), as measured by the EOC assessments.

By May 2025, increase the percentage of students in American Literature scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 3% (approximately 241 students out of 450 tested), as measured by the EOC assessments.

By May 2025, increase the percentage of students in U.S. History scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 3% (approximately 291 students out of 450 tested) as measured by the EOC assessments.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Was the goal met? ☒ YES for American Literature & US History ☐ NO ☐ Partially ☒ NO for Biology</td></tr>
<tr><td>What data supports the outcome of the goal?</td><td>Biology did NOT meet the Goal: Increase Proficient + Distinguished (Levels 3 & 4) by 3% from 2023 to 2024.

To meet the goal of a 3% increase in the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished (Levels 3 & 4), we needed to reach 49.31% in 2023–2024, but we achieved 40.14%, which is a 6.17% decrease from the previous year and 9.17 percentage points below the target.

Biology
<table><tr><th>Achievement Level</th><th>2023-2024</th><th>2022-2023</th><th>Change</th></tr><tr><td>Level 1 - Beginning</td><td>29.49%</td><td>30.26%</td><td>↓ 0.77%</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2 - Developing</td><td>30.37%</td><td>23.43%</td><td>↑ 7.94%</td></tr><tr><td>Level 3 - Proficient</td><td>32.98%</td><td>37.64%</td><td>↓ 4.66%</td></tr><tr><td>Level 4 - Distinguished</td><td>7.16%</td><td>8.67%</td><td>↓ 1.51%</td></tr><tr><td>Level 3 & 4</td><td>40.14%</td><td>46.31%</td><td>↓ 6.17%</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

American Literature DID Meet the Goal: Increase *Proficient + Distinguished* (Levels 3 & 4) by **3%** from 2023 to 2024. The 3% increase of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished (Levels 3 & 4), we scored 39**%** in 2023–2024, but we achieved **34% in 2022-2023** which is an **8% increase** from the previous year.

American Literature

Achievement Level	2023-2024	2022-2023	Change
Level 1 - Beginning	25%	29%	↓ 4%
Level 2 - Developing	36%	39%	↓3%
Level 3 - Proficient	35%	28%	↑7%
Level 4 - Distinguished	4%	3%	↑1%
Level 3 & 4	**39%**	**31%**	**↑8%**

US History DID Meet the Goal: Increase *Proficient + Distinguished* (Levels 3 & 4) by **3%** from 2023 to 2024. The 3% increase of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished (Levels 3 & 4), we scored **50%** in 2023–2024, but we achieved 40**% in 2022-2023** which is an 1**8% increase** from the previous year.

US History

Achievement Level	2023-2024	2022-2023	Change
Level 1 - Beginning	18%	27%	↓ 9%
Level 2 - Developing	31%	41%	↓10%
Level 3 - Proficient	42%	28%	↑14%
Level 4 - Distinguished	8%	4%	↑4%
Level 3 & 4	**50%**	**32%**	**↑18%**

Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	**Biology:** Although we did not meet our goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the Biology EOC , teachers have implemented the 3D Science Instructional Framework, aligning phenomena guiding questions tasks to the standards at Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Levels 3 and 4. To build on this progress, our focus for the upcoming year will be on helping students develop the following skills: **Asking Questions**: Teach students to generate and refine testable scientific questions. **Planning Investigations**: Guide students in designing and carrying out structured experiments. **Analyzing Data**: Strengthen skills in identifying patterns and drawing evidence-based conclusions. **Constructing Explanations**: Support clear, logical explanations backed by data. **Engaging in Argument from Evidence**: Encourage structured discussions using data to support claims.
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?	**American Literature:** American Literature did meet our goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished on the American Literature EOC. Teachers have implemented instructional strategies that are more rigorous, but also ensuring the instructional strategies matched the DOK level of the standards. Writing was a main component in those instructional strategies and teachers used Socratic Seminar, synthesis writing, and literary analysis essays embedded in units within the curriculum. We believe the teachers collaboratively planning with the end goal in mind, helped to increase several domains on the American Literature EOC, specifically the argumentative writing and narrative responses built upon the argumentative essay. Students were able to engage in academic discourse and debate while analyzing texts and literary devices while participating in the Socratic Seminar. Students were able cite textual evidence while synthesizing multiple texts to write arguments. **US History:** US History did meet our goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC. Teachers have implemented instructional strategies that are more rigorous, but also ensuring the instructional strategies matched the DOK level of the standards. Writing was also an instructional strategy used in US History to support students mastering the standards. Teachers implemented CRQ's (Constructed Response Questions) and DBQs. These analyzed political cartoons, speeches, maps, letters, and charts which helped students to critically think and not just recall content. These forms of writing help students to infer, contextualize, and corroborate evidence. Embedded Tier II vocabulary into the lessons with word walls and concept maps also contributed to the US History teachers and students meeting the goal.

Previous Year's Goal #2	By May 2025, increase the percentage of students in Algebra scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 5% (approximately 199 students out of 511 students), as measured by the EOC assessments.

Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially

What data supports the outcome of the goal?

Algebra EOC

Achievement Level	2023-2024	Winter 2024	Spring 2025	2024-2025	2024-2025
	Students Tested - 544	Students Tested - 196	Students Tested - 328	Students Tested - 524	Increase/Decrease
Level 1 - Beginning	39%	33%	36%	35%	4% points decrease
Level 2 - Developing	31%	31%	40%	37%	6% points increase
Level 3 - Proficient	21%	25%	19%	21%	0% point
Level 4 - Distinguished	9%	11%	5%	7%	2% points decrease
Level 3 & 4	**30%**	**36%**	**24%**	**28%**	**2% points decrease**

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?

Based on the raw scores of Spring 2025, the goal was not met.
Our focus for the past two years was ensuring that our assessment and instruction align with the new math standards which will sometimes involve raising the DOK levels. Collaborative planning days were funded for this purpose.
Our next steps in the third year will involve continued support in the areas of more scaffolds, interventions, particularly for our EL and SWD students, and professional learning on mathematical discourse to deepen students' understanding, foster collaboration, and promote problem-solving.

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?

Previous Year's Goal #3	By May 2025, attain a 3% increase in the percentage of students in grades 9th-12th reading at-or-above grade level (approximately 940 students out of 1639 tested) based on the iReady baseline data given August 2024 through May 2025.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	During the implementation phase of the new Lexile growth measure, we learned that iReady does not provide growth data for 9th and 10th grade students. We also learned that not all students would be tested at the end of the semester, which in the past was used to indicate Lexile growth.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	We will pivot and create a goal that will assess reading level using EOC data.
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?	

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

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATES				
Graduation Rate Longitudinal Data	**FY22**	**FY23**	**FY24**	**FY25**
	4-Year 78.65% 5-Year 80.20%	4-Year 80.42% 5-Year 79.74%	4-Year 78.35% 5-Year 83.16%	

OVERALL CONTENT AREA DATA				
EOC Longitudinal Data	**FY22** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY23** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
American Literature & Comprehension	36%	31%	39%	35%
Algebra	32%	27%	36%	28% (raw scores)
Biology	37.52%	46.31%	40.14%	
U.S. History	54%	40%	48%	55%

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION DATA– By Year								
EOC Longitudinal Data	**FY22**		**FY23**		**FY24**		**FY25**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	2% (6)	1% (2)	5% (14)	1% (3)	5% (14)	3% (7)	22% (62)	27% (53)
Level 3	35% (101)	37% (74)	31% (86)	25% (67)	37% (102)	33% (80)	42% (119)	41% (80)
Level 2	34% (98)	39% (78)	35% (98)	44% (111)	36% (99)	37% (90)	33% (95)	28% (55)
Level 1	29% (84)	24% (48)	29% (81)	29%(73)	23% (63)	27% (66)	4% (11)	4% (7)

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION (READING STATUS) – By Year								
Percentage of Students	**FY22**		**FY23**		**FY24**		**FY25**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Grade Level and Above	63% (182)	70% (140)	63% (176)	63% (159)	72% (199)	64% (156)	74% (204)	64%(125)
Below Grade Level	37% (107)	30% (60)	37% (103)	37% (93)	28 (77)	36% (87)	26% (72)	36% (70)

AMERICAN LITERATURE (READING) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (FY25)						
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	**Reading & Vocabulary**		**Key Ideas & Details**		**Craft & Structure/Integration of Knowledge & Ideas**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	28% (80)	19% (38)	33% (94)	21% (41)	20% (56)	22% (43)
Level 2 Monitor Learning	23% (67)	21% (41)	26% (73)	29% (57)	32% (91)	22% (43)
Level 1 Remediate Learning	49% (139)	59% (116)	42% (119)	50% (97)	49% (139)	56% (109)

AMERICAN LITERATURE (READING) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (FY25)						
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	**Vocabulary & Acquisition & Use**		**Reading Literary Text**		**Reading Informational Text**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	21% (59)	16% (31)	24% (69)	17% (34)	26% (73)	16% (32)
Level 2 Monitor Learning	32% (91)	27% (52)	36% (102)	33% (64)	24% (68)	31% (61)
Level 1 Remediate Learning	48% (136)	57% (112)	40% (115)	50% (97)	51% (145)	53% (102)

AMERICAN LITERATURE (Writing) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (FY25)

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Writing & Language		Writing		Language	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	29%(82)	28% (54)	43% (122)	27% (53)	20%(56)	19% (35)
Level 2 Monitor Learning	23% (66)	23% (44)	32% (92)	23% (45)	35% (99)	29% (57)
Level 1 Remediate Learning	48% (138)	50% (97)	44% (126)	50% (97)	46% (131)	53% (103)

AMERICAN LITERATURE (Writing) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (FY25)								
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Argumentative Writing		Argumentative Writing - Narrative		Informational Writing		Informational Writing - Narrative	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4			36% (57)	29% (28)			36% (46)	25% (25)
Level 3	48% (76)	31% (29)	30% (47)	43% (41)	47% (61)	39% (39)	39% (50)	43% (43)
Level 2	33%(52)	43% (41)	22% (35)	12% (11)	39% (50)	40% (40)	15% (19)	20% (20)
Level 1	19%(30)	26% (25)	12% (19)	16% (15)	14% (18)	21% (21)	10% (14)	12% (12)

ELA DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

	Strengths	Weaknesses

AMERICAN LITERATURE & COMPOSITION (3-year trend)
 	
• **What trends exist for all students in the:**
  ○ **Percentage of students reading on grade level or below grade level?**
  ○ **Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no 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?**
	Students reading on grade level has been a strength and reading levels increased between SY22-SY24.
	
	<u>Reading Levels</u>
	
	• FY22 – FY24 trend is 63% - 74% (11% increase) – Above Level
	• FY25 reading level indicates that 69% above level which shows a slight decrease from FY24.
	
	Based upon the trend data below for FY22-FY24 (1,012 students) of the American Literature EOC there has been a 3% increase of (46 students) scoring Level 4 and a 1% decrease of (213 students) scoring Level 1.
	
	<u>EOC Levels</u>
	
	• FY22 – FY24 trend is 2% - 5% (3% increase) – Level 4
	• FY22 – FY24 trend is 37% - 37% (0% increase) – Level 2
	• FY22 – FY24 trend is 23% - 21% (2% decrease) – Level 1
	
	There are no noticeable strengths in reading domains of the last 3 years as well as FY25.
		Based upon the trend data below for FY22-FY24 (1,012 students) of the American Literature EOC there has been a 2% decrease of (374 students) scoring Level 4.
		
		<u>EOC Levels</u>
		
		• FY22 – FY24 trend is 39% - 37% (2% decrease) – Level 3
		• FY25 data indicates a 4% decrease – Level 3
		• FY25 data indicates a 6% increase – Level 2
		
		The data for the reading domain of **Reading and Vocabulary** indicated 6% decrease (152) students in the "Accelerate" level.
		
		<u>Reading Domain</u>
		
		• FY22 – FY24 – *Reading and Vocabulary* – 9% - 15% (6% decrease) - Accelerate Level
		• FY25 – *Reading and Vocabulary* indicates 54% - Below Target
		• FY25 – *Reading Informational Text* – 52% - Below target
		
		Based upon the trend data below students showed a weakness in the following skills that are incorporated in the **Reading and Vocabulary and Reading Informational Text** domains.
		
		<u>Reading Domain Skills- RL1/RI1, RL2,RI2/RL4/RI4, L5</u>
		
		• Citing textual evidence with analysis. -*RL1, RI1*
		• Determining central ideas of a text. - *RL2, RI2*
		• Determining figurative and connotative meanings of words. – *RL4, RI4*
		• Analysis if nuances in word meanings. - *L5*

	The writing domain data below indicates an increase of (486) students in Level 3 of **Argumentative Writing,** and (364) students increased in Level 3 of **Narrative Writing** based upon the American Literature EOC data below. **<u>Writing Domains</u>** • FY22 – FY24 – *Argumentative Writing* - 19% - 48% (29% Increase) – Level 3 • FY22 – FY24 – *Narrative Writing* – 12% - 36% (24% increase) – Level 3 • FY25 – Narrative Writing indicates 43% - Level 3 (7% increase) from FY24. Based upon the writing domains trend data below students showed a strength in skills pertaining to argumentative writing and narrative writing. **<u>Writing Domain Skills – W1, W1.b W3.b</u>** • Writing arguments to support claims in analysis. – *W1* • Developing claims and counterclaims. – *W1.b* • Developing narrative techniques such as dialogue, pacing, events and characters. – *W3.b* SWD students in FY22-FY24 – 29% - 25% (4% decrease) showed a 4% decrease in the above writing domains.	Based upon the trend data below (71) students showed a weakness in the following skills that are incorporated in the **Writing and Language** domain with (142) students demonstrating a need of remediation in Informational writing. **<u>Writing Domains</u>** • FY22 – FY24 - *Writing and Language* – 4% - 7% (3% Decrease) – Level 3 • FY22 – FY24 – *Informational Writing* – 9% - 14% (5% increase) – Level 1 • FY25 – *Writing and Language* – 49% - Level 1 • FY25 – *Argumentative Writing* indicates 39% Level 3 (9% decrease) from FY24. • FY25 – Informational Writing indicates 14% in Level 1 (Stagnant) from FY24. Based upon the trend data below students showed a weakness in the following skills that are incorporated in the writing domain of informational writing. **<u>Writing Domain Skills – W2b, W2c, W2.e</u>** • Developing topics usings relevant facts and concrete details. - *W2b* • Using precise language appropriate transitions. - *W2c* • Maintaining an objective tone in informational writing. - *W2.e* EL students in FY22 – FY24 – 43% - 56% (13% increase) showed a 13% in Level 1 for the reading and writing domains above.

<table>
<tr><th>COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year

• What trends exist for all students in the:
  ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to reading domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness

  ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to writing domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness

• How do the trends differ for EL students?

• How do the trends differ for SWD students?</th><th>Strengths</th><th>Weaknesses</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Based upon the American Literature common assessments, (

<u>Skill Domains – RL3/RI3, RL4/RI4</u>
• RL3, RI3- Analysis of the impact of author’s choices. – 56% proficiency
• RL4. RI4 - Determine the figurative and connotative meanings of words. – 82% proficiency

<u>Skill Domains – W1, W1b</u>

• W1 – Writing arguments using sufficient evidence and valid reasoning. – 63% proficiency
• W1b - Developing claims and counterclaims. – 63% proficiency
<u>EL</u>
15% - 20% lower than on-level students on the above standards</td><td><u>Skill Domains – RI9, RL2/RI2, RL6</u>
• RI9 - Analysis of historical documents, i.e. Constitution. – 21% proficiency
• RL2, RI2 - Determining one or more themes throughout the text. – 31% proficiency
• RL6 - Analyzing texts that use satire, sarcasm and irony. – 27% proficiency

<u>Skill Domains – W2b, W2c, W2e</u>
• W2b - Developing topics usings relevant facts and concrete details.- 47% proficiency
• W2c - Using precise language appropriate transitions. – 47% proficiency
• W2e - Maintaining an objective tone in informational writing. – 47% proficiency

<u>SWD</u>
• 30% - 40% lower than our on-level students on the above standards.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

☒ Coherent Instruction
☒ Professional Capacity
☐ Effective Leadership
☐ Supportive Learning Environment</td><td colspan="2">Root Cause Explanation: Coherent Instruction

• Most significant weaknesses are reading informational texts and writing informational texts.
• Students were exposed to more argumentative and narrative texts within the curriculum. There was a heavy emphasis on argumentative and narrative writing throughout the year, which is why an area of weakness is analyzing historical documents.
• Figurative and connotative meanings of words manifested as a weakness because of the lack of emphasis on informational texts.
• Common Assessments may need to incorporate more informational texts and writing within the curriculum</td></tr>
</table>

	**The 2025-2026 standards for ELA have changed, name of the ELA courses, literature content of those courses, and the grade level of the EOC. The new standards are not like previous standards, so teachers will need additional guidance on implementation of new standards, developing new summative assessments, ensuring DOK levels match the new standards and instruction.*	
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**
	Out of the 42 instructional walks, 81% of teachers displayed learning targets that matched the standards.	Out of the 42 instructional walks, in the category of "Level of Engagement", 65% of the students were well-managed or compliant while only 24% were highly engaged in authentic and relevant content and discussions.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation: Coherent Instruction** • The root cause of the level of engagement being more complaint than highly engaged is that teachers spend more time covering the standards instead of creating lessons that have meaning such as using essential questions, engaging activities such as podcasts and debates. • Students quietly and passively completing assignments do not create an environment where students can engage in higher-order thinking. **The 2025-2026 standards for ELA have changed, name of the ELA courses, literature content of those courses, and the grade level of the EOC. The new standards are not like previous standards so teachers will need additional guidance on implementation of new standards, developing new summative assessments, ensuring DOK levels match the new standards and instruction.*	
Survey Summary Data ☐ **Teacher Survey** ☐ **Parent Survey**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**

☐ **Professional Learning Survey** ☐ **_____**		
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 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:**	

LITERACY - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: Literacy	**By May 2026, 60% of students taking the 10th grade EOC English II will read on or above grade level.**
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	The most significant weaknesses are reading informational texts and writing informational texts. Students were exposed to more argumentative and narrative texts within the curriculum. There was a heavy emphasis on argumentative and narrative writing throughout the year, which is why an area of weakness is analyzing historical documents. Figurative and connotative meanings of words manifested as a weakness because of the lack of emphasis on informational texts.
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 – 10th Grade
☒ EL
☒ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
 	
1. Provide professional learning on the implementation of strategies that will support interpreting and constructing literary and informational texts.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of the teachers will implement strategies that will support interpreting and constructing literary and informational texts.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• **Preplanning**:
	  • Strategies will be chosen to support interpreting and constructing literary and informational texts.
	  • Teachers will analyze the GaDOE SuitCASE that outlines the domains, standards, and expectations.
	  • Teachers will unpack standards and expectations prior to creating their first unit framework and pacing guide.
	
	• **August-September**:
	  • ELA Academic Coach will work with CCCs to support the implementation of the strategies.
	  • 10th grade teachers will implement strategies that will support the Winter the 10th grade EOC, specifically in interpreting texts (Techniques/Periods & Movements, Context/Structures Style) and constructing texts
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		"50% of 10th grade students will show growth on summative assessments that integrate reading and writing standards, supporting overall reading development.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• 10th Grade EOC
		• Common Summative Assessment
		• Walkthrough observation rubric
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☐ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☒ Winter & Spring Semesters
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
			Progress Learning
			
			CommonLit 360
			
			NoRedInk
			
			ELA PL's
			
			District Academic Coaches

	(Techniques/Research & Analysis, Grammar/Vocabulary) • Teachers will implement a common summative assessment connecting the domain, standard and expectations. • **October-Decembe**r: • ELA Academic Coach will work with CCCs to support the implementation of the strategies. • ELA Academic Coach will begin instructional walks to confirm strategies that will support the Winter 10th Grade EOC specifically in interpreting texts (Techniques/Periods & Movements, Context/Structures Style) and constructing texts (Techniques/Research & Analysis, Grammar/Vocabulary) • Teachers will continue analyzing common assessment data to track standard/expectations mastery. • **January-February**: • ELA Academic Coach will analyze the Winter 10th Grade EOC data, specifically looking at the reading levels, and the domains of Reading and Writing - (Techniques/Periods & Movements, Context/Structures Style) and constructing texts (Techniques/Research & Analysis, Grammar/Vocabulary) • ELA Academic Coach and teachers will implement the same plans documented for August – September. • **March-Apri**l: • ELA Academic Coach and teachers will implement the same plans documented for October – December. • **May**: • ELA Academic Coach will analyze the Spring 10th Grade EOC data, specifically looking at the reading levels, and the domains of Reading and	• Teachers will review common assessment data specifically analyzing interpreting texts and constructing texts domains. • Teachers will review Winter and Spring 10th grade EOC data. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

	Writing - (Techniques/Periods & Movements, Context/Structures Style) and constructing texts (Techniques/Research & Analysis, Grammar/Vocabulary) • ELA Academic Coach will determine instructional priorities next year based upon the 10th grade EOC data. **Artifacts to be Collected:** Lesson Plans PL Agendas Common Summative Unit Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Lesson Plans with each unit. Attend CCC meetings at least twice a month Review CCC documentation weekly Begin classroom walking twice a month beginning in September and ending in November.		

ALGEBRA DATA– By Year								
EOC Longitudinal Data	**FY22**		**FY23**		**FY24**		**FY25**	
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	7%	0%	11%	0%	16%	5%	11%	5%
Level 3	32%	13%	26%	14%	25%	20%	25%	19%
Level 2	28%	40%	31%	42%	23%	34%	31%	40%
Level 1	33%	47%	32%	44%	36%	41%	33%	36%

ALGEBRA – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (FY25)								
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	**Exponential Expressions & Equations**		**Exponential Functions**		**Quadratic Functions**		**Quadratic Equations & Equations**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	26%	12%	18%	16%	28%	23%	27%	20%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	15%	22%	27%	26%	21%	27%	26%	29%
Level 1 Remediate Learning	59%	66%	55%	58%	51%	50%	48%	51%

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)?	<u>FY22 – FY25 trends:</u> • **Growth in Level 4 (Distinguished Learners)** from 4% in 2022 to a peak of 10% in 2024. • **Level 2 (Developing Learners)** declined from 40% in 2022 to 30% in 2024, then increased to 37% in 2025.	<u>FY22 – FY25 trends:</u> • **Level 1 (Beginning Learners)** increased overall from 28% in 2022 to 35% in 2025 – about 1 in 3 students remain in the lowest performance band. • **Level 3 (Proficient Learners)** declined from 29% (2022) to 21% (2025), indicating fewer students are meeting the standards. • **Drop in Level 4 (Distinguished Learners)** from 10% (2024) to 7% (2025).

○ Algebra EOC domain increases or decreases?	• Also, in spring 2025, 57 students (18%) in Level 2 were close to Level 3. • In 2021/22, the **Expressions domain** was the strongest with the highest proficiency level (accelerate and monitor learning) of 45% and the lowest beginning (remediate learning) level of 55%. • In the following year, 2022/23, the **Expressions domain** was the strongest with the highest proficiency level (accelerate and monitor learning) of 521% and the lowest beginning (remediate learning) level of 53%. • In 2023/24, **Numerical Reasoning – Rational & Irrational Numbers** was the strongest domain with the highest percentage of 42% in the 'Met Target' category. • In 2024/25, **Numerical Reasoning** – **Rational & Irrational Numbers** was the strongest domain with highest percentage of students (32%) in the 'Met Target' category.	• In 2021/22, the **Algebra Connections to Statistics and Probability** was the weakest domain with 74% of students requiring remediation. • In 2022/23, **Equations** was the weakest domain with 64% of students requiring remediation. • In 2023/24, **Functional and Graphical Reasoning – Quadratic and Exponential Functions**, was the weakest domain with 63% of students below target. • In 2024/25, **Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning – Exponential Expressions & Equations**, **Functional & Graphical Reasoning – Exponential Functions, and Data & Statistical Reasoning – One-Variable & Two-Variable Statistics** domains are the major weaknesses. ○ **Exponential Expressions & Equations:** 17% - Met Target and 63% - Below Target. ○ **Exponential Functions:** 17% - Met Target and 57% - Below Target. ○ **Statistics:** 12% - Met Target and 56% - Below Target.

• **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	• EL students have shown a consistent upward trend in Level 3 scores, increasing from 18.5% in 2022 to 26.2%. • The percentage of Distinguished Learners (Level 4) also rose from 3.7% in 2022 to 7.5% in 2024. • Additionally, there was a decrease in the percentage of students scoring at Level 1, from 47.4% to 43% in 2024. • SWD students showed significant growth in Level 3 scores, increasing from 8.3% in 2023 to 15.9% in 2024. • Also, there was a notable reduction in the percentage of SWD students scoring at Level 1, which decreased from 70.2% in 2023 to 55.7% in 2024.	• The percentage of EL students in Level 1 remained high, increasing from 44.4% in 2022 to 47.4% in 2023, then slightly decreasing to 43% in 2024. • There was a decreasing trend in Level 2 (Developing Learners), with percentages dropping from 33.3% in 2022 to 28.2% in 2023 and further to 23.4% in 2024. • The percentage of SWD students scoring at Level 1 remained consistently high, increasing from 54.8% in 2022 to 70.2% in 2023, then decreasing to 55.7% in 2024. • The percentage of SWD students scoring at Level 4 was very low, dropping from 1.19% in 2022 to 0% in 2023, and slightly rising to 1.14% in 2024.
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year (FY25) • **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to math domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness • **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	**Foundations of Algebra (FOA):** • 41% of all students in FOA have mastered standard **A.FGR.9 – Functional & Graphical Reasoning - Exponential Functions** **Algebra:** • 48% of all students in Algebra have mastered standard **A.PAR.4 – Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning - Linear Inequalities.** • 41% of all students in Algebra have mastered standard **A.PAR.6 – Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning - Quadratic Expressions and Equations** according to teacher common assessments. **FOA:** • FOA EL and SWD student performance is consistently lower than non-EL and non-SWD students on each assessment. The gap is slightly narrower than the EL group. The EL students performed best on the standard related to **Functional & Graphical Reasoning with a grade average of 61% on A.FGR.7 – Quadratic Functions summative.** **Algebra:** • Both EL and SWD students showed their strongest performance in the standard	**FOA:** • 72% of all FOA students have not mastered **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (specifically standards A.PAR.6 - Quadratic Expressions & Equations, and A.PAR.8 – Exponential Expressions & Equations)**. • 78% of all FOA students have not mastered **Functional & Graphical Reasoning (specifically standard A.FGR.7 – Quadratic Functions).** **Algebra:** • 82% of all Algebra students have not mastered **Geometric & Spatial Reasoning.** • 71% of all Algebra students have not mastered **Functional & Graphical Reasoning (specifically standard A.FGR.2 – Linear Functions)**

	related to **Functional & Graphical Reasoning – A.FGR.2 – Linear Functions** with a grade average of 88% for SWD students and 72% for EL students. This high performance reflects highly effective academic supports and strong content retention. • SWD students were also strong in **Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning – Linear Inequalities** with a grade average of 83%.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • The ongoing performance gaps in domains like quadratic and exponential functions, and Geometric & Spatial Reasoning may be a lack of consistent strength in planning and refining instruction. • However, Geometric & Spatial domain had the lowest percentage (31%) of students in the 'Below Target' category in the Spring 2025 EOC. • Instructional planning often doesn't meet the cognitive rigor of new math standards, especially for English Learners (EL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD). **ROOT CAUSE:** Teachers require support to plan and refine instruction with targeted scaffolds and interventions to meet rigorous standards, particularly for EL and SWD students.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – MATH (FY25) • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during MATH walks?**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	• The walkthrough data in 2nd semester, highlights strong student engagement, effective questioning techniques, and real-world applications. • Slight increase of 9% from 1st (3/15) to 2nd (5/17) semester, of teachers utilized	• By 2nd semester, 71% (12/17) of teachers utilized questions and tasks up to a DOK-2 level. Key areas for growth include the following: • fostering student independence in problem-solving, • encouraging structured mathematical discussions, and

• **What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during MATH walks?**	questions and tasks up to DOK-3 level during instruction.	deepening conceptual understanding through collaborative learning.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • While some classrooms demonstrate student engagement and real-world application, instructional delivery often stops short of allowing students to independently apply skills, engage deeply with conceptual learning, and participate in structured peer discussions. • Monitoring of student understanding during lessons is not always systematic or responsive, limiting opportunities to adjust instruction in real-time to meet student needs. **ROOT CAUSE:** Teachers need support in implementing strategies that deepen student conceptual understanding, foster structured mathematical discussion, and promote independent problem-solving.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	**By May 2026, increase the percentage of students in Algebra scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 5% (approximately 190 students out of 541 students), as measured by the EOC assessments.**
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	1. Teachers require support to plan and refine instruction with targeted scaffolds and interventions to meet rigorous standards, particularly for EL and SWD students.
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)
 	
1. Algebra and FOA teachers will implement standard analysis intervention plans for EL and SWD students.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of Algebra and FOA teachers will submit and implement intervention plans for at least 2 priority standards per unit with scaffolded supports for EL and SWD students.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• Preplanning: N/A
	
	• August-September: Algebra/FOA teachers, ESOL, & Sped. teachers will:
	  ○ Use common assessments data to identify low performing standards.
	  ○ Collaboratively design interventions based on the Milestones Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs) for each unit with embedded language and learning scaffolds.
	  ○ Initial implementation during reteaching and small groups. (Ongoing)
	  ○ Algebra/FOA teachers will reassess EL and SWD students after every unit assessment.
	
	• October-December:
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		At least 70% of EL and SWD students will demonstrate a 10% or greater improvement on priority standards identified through unit assessments.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• Unit assessment data disaggregated by subgroup
		• Walkthrough observation forms
		• Teacher reflection and CCC minutes
		• Student work analysis rubric
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		AC and admin will conduct monthly data reviews:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☒ Monthly – subgroup mastery trends
		☒ Every other month – reflection on instructional effectiveness and scaffolding quality
		☐ 3 times per year
		☐ _____
		Data Analysis Plan:
		FOA/Algebra teachers (Sped. & ESOL) will:
			CTLS
			
			Ellevation Strategies
			
			AVID Strategies
			
			Academic Coach
			
			District PLS's

	○ Use a data tracking template to monitor students' progress on ALDs and revise lesson plans as needed. • January-February: ○ Review 1st semester's data to determine instructional shifts for the new semester. ○ Repeat implementation cycle from August – December. • March-April: ○ Regroup students for EOC Bootcamp accordingly. • May: ○ Review both semesters' data to determine instructional shifts for next school year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Completed intervention plans aligned to standards • Lesson plans with evidence of scaffolds for EL and SWD students • Walkthrough and observation notes reflecting scaffolded instruction • Subgroup performance data from unit and formative assessments **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ Academic Coach **Frequency of Monitoring:**	• Disaggregate assessment data by subgroup (EL, SWD) and standard. • Calculate growth from common formative to common summative assessment for each student. • Identify patterns of strength and need across students and standards. • Identify students that need additional support and share findings during CCC meetings. • Document instructional changes and intervention adjustments based on findings. **Instructional Strategies Implementation Plan:** FOA/Algebra teachers (Sped. & ESOL) will: • Identify and select scaffolds appropriate for language and learning needs (e.g. visual supports, sentence frames, graphic organizers). • Align strategies with standard complexity and task demands. • Plan for differentiation during core instruction. • Provide supports during guided practice and independent work. • Monitor implementation through lesson plan reviews and walkthrough observations. • Adjust strategies based on formative data and student feedback. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal	

	• Bi-weekly CCC reviews of intervention plans and student work • Monthly check-ins and walkthroughs	☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads ☒ Algebra & FOA Gen. Ed. & Sped. teachers	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	2. Teachers need support in implementing strategies that deepen student conceptual understanding, foster structured mathematical discourse, and promote independent problem-solving.		
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. Algebra/FOA Teachers will engage in targeted professional learning on strategies that build conceptual understanding, support math discourse, and encourage independent problem-solving.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100 % of teachers will participate in two professional learning sessions aligned to best practices in mathematical discourse facilitation.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• Preplanning: N/A
	
	• August-September:
	  ○ AC in collaboration with Department head will conduct a needs assessment survey.
	  ○ District Math Supervisor will provide initial professional learning on facilitating math discourse in the classroom to Algebra/FOA teachers.
	  ○ AC will support and monitor implementation of Ellevation strategies targeted to deepen conceptual understanding.
	
	• October-December:
	  ○ AC will continue to support and monitor implementation of strategies that promote facilitation of mathematical discourse and deepen conceptual understanding.
	  ○ Teachers will document final self-reflections of strategy implementation.
	
	• January-February:
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		By December, 80% of teachers will demonstrate consistent use of at least two strategies that promote student discourse, as evidenced by lesson plans and walkthrough observations.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• Walkthrough observation rubric
		• Teacher data self-reflection
		• CCC minutes
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Academic Coach/Department Chair will conduct walkthroughs focused on strategy implementation:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☒ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☐ _____
		Results will be analyzed and shared in December to determine progress and future PD.
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		• FOA/Algebra teachers (Gen. Ed. & Sped.) will analyze student work monthly for evidence of conceptual understanding and problem-solving skills.
			CTLS
			
			Ellevation Strategies
			
			AVID Strategies
			
			Academic Coach
			
			District PLS's

	○ Review 1st semester's data to determine instructional shifts for the new semester. ○ Repeat professional learning for facilitating math discourse in the classroom to Algebra/FOA teachers. • March-April: ○ Repeat implementation cycle from August – December. • May: ○ Review both semesters' data to determine instructional shifts for next school year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • PD attendance records • Teacher reflections on strategy implementation • Lesson plans showing use of strategies • CCC notes **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ Academic Coach/Department Chair **Frequency of Monitoring:** • Monthly reviews of teacher lesson plans and reflections. • Bi-monthly CCC walk-throughs.	• Trends in strategy usage and impact will be tracked through walkthrough forms and teacher reflections documentation. • AC in collaboration with department chair will use teacher survey data to inform instructional shifts and follow-up support. **Instructional Strategies Implementation Plan:** • FOA/Algebra teachers will learn and apply mathematical discourse strategies. • Each strategy will be modeled during the professional learning session and practiced during CCC meetings and collaborative days. • FOA/Algebra teachers will include Ellevation, and or AVID strategies, and or strategies learned from PL in their weekly lesson plans. • FOA/Algebra teachers will implement strategies at least bi-weekly and reflect during CCC meetings. • Coaching support will be available for modeling and co-teaching as needed. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads/Department Chair ☒ Algebra & FOA Gen. Ed. & Sped. teachers	

BIOLOGY DATA – By Year								
EOC Longitudinal Data	**FY22**		**FY23**		**FY24**	**FY25**		
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	4%	8%	5% (11)	11% (36)	4% (13)	9% (30)	2% (4)	9% (25)
Level 3	33%	28%	30% (72)	39% (130)	26% (80)	33% (109)	28% (58)	26% (70)
Level 2	30%	32%	25% (61)	21% (71)	28% (85)	29% (97)	31% (64)	29% (79)
Level 1	32%	32%	40% (96)	29% (96)	41% (124)	29% (97)	39% (82)	35% (95)

BIOLOGY – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (FY25)					
Domain Mastery Levels **(Enter domain that is most significant)**	**Cells Domain**	**Cellular Genetics & Heredity**	**Classification & Phylogeny**	**Ecology**	**Theory of Evolution**
	Winter Spring	**Winter Spring**	**Winter Spring**	**Winter Spring**	**Winter Spring**
Level 3: Met Target	23.69% (113)	26.00% (124)	26.83% (128)	22.85% (109)	27.88% (133)
Level 2: Approaching T.	27.04% (129)	22.64% (108)	19.92% (95)	24.95% (119)	28.72% (137)
Level 1: Below Target	49.27% (235)	51.36% (245)	53.04% (253)	52.20% (249)	43.40% (207)

BIOLOGY EOC (3-year trends) • **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	Developing Learner (Level 2) • SY22–23: 23.4% (n=132) → SY23–24: 30.4% (n=182) → SY24–25: 30.1% (n=143) • There was a 7-point increase from SY22–23 to SY23–24, with 50 more students moving into Level 2. • Performance remained stable in SY24–25, holding those gains. **Please Note:** Higher scores in spring (e.g., 9.3% Distinguished) reflect the addition of magnet students who only test in the spring window. SY24–25 performance percentages are predicted using past trends in "raw" vs. final CCRPI scores. On average, official scores differ from raw by 0.5–5.6 percentage points.	**Beginning Learner (Level 1)** • SY22–23: 30.3% (n=192) → SY23–24: 29.5% (n=221) → SY24–25: 35.8% (n=177) • Although the total number of students in Level 1 declined, the percentage increased in SY24–25. • This means a larger proportion of students are still performing at the lowest level — a clear area of concern**.** **Proficient Learner (Level 3)** • SY22–23: 37.6% (n=202) → SY23–24: 33.0% (n=189) → SY24–25: 30.1% (n=128) • Fewer students are reaching proficiency — downward trend in both % and actual counts. **Distinguished Learner (Level 4)** • SY22–23: 8.7% (n=47) → SY23–24: 7.2% (n=43) → SY24–25: 6.6% (n=29)

	SWD : **Developing Learner %:** • SY22–23: 19.5% → SY23–24: 30.6% → SY24–25: 19.1% — Moderate improvement in SY23–24 suggests movement out of Level 1 before regression **Combined Mastery (Proficient + Distinguished):** • SY22–23: 19.51% + 2.44% = 21.95% (highest of three years) **EL:** **Beginning Learner %:** • SY22–23: 60% → SY23–24: 36.6% → SY24–25: 40.2% — sharp drop, slight increase in final year **Developing Learner %:** • SY22–23: 10% → SY23–24: 31.7% → SY24–25: 32.4% — consistent improvement **Note:** *Domain scores are only available for SY23–24 and SY24–25 due to changes in how EOC domains are reported (see GaDOE Interpretation Guide).* In **Theory of Evolution**, 27.88% of students (n=133) met the target in SY24–25, up from 21.42% — a 6.46% gain. Students showed stronger understanding of evolutionary patterns and were better at forming scientific explanations and asking analytical questions. With a 17% EOC	• Gradual decline in highest-performing group across all years. **Combined Mastery Levels (Level 3 + 4)** • SY22–23: 46.3% (n=249) → SY23–24: 40.2% (n=232) → SY24–25: 36.7% (n=157) • Less than half of students are meeting or exceeding proficiency. **SWD:** • **Beginning Learner:** SY22–23: 58.54% → SY23–24: 52.39% → SY24–25: 69.94% Significant increase in SY24–25 — 7 out of 10 SWD students are Level 1 • **Proficient Learner:** SY22–23: 19.51% → SY23–24: 18.06% → SY24–25: 9.23%. Dropped from 19.51% to 9.23% over three years — cut by more than half. • **Distinguished Learner:** SY22–23: 2.44% → SY23–24: 0% → SY24–25: 1.79% Overall mastery is declining — equity gap is widening **EL:** **Distinguished Learner %** remains low: • SY22–23: 0.0% → SY23–24: 2.4% → SY24–25: 4.8% **Proficient %** declined: • SY22–23: 30.0% → SY23–24: 29.3% → SY24–25: 22.6%

○ Biology EOC domain increases or decreases?	weight, this improvement has a meaningful impact. **Classification and Phylogeny** rose from 17.95% to 26.83% (n=128), the largest gain across domains. Students improved in identifying patterns, organizing organisms, and supporting conclusions through observation and structured investigations. This domain represents 15% of the EOC. In **Cellular Genetics and Heredity**, 26.00% (n=124) met the target, up from 22.99%. Students demonstrated better understanding of inheritance and meiosis, with growth in using models, explaining biological processes, and citing evidence. This domain makes up 23% of the EOC. In **Genetics and Heredity**, 23.12% of EL students (n = 40) met the target. Students demonstrated understanding of heredity and used models effectively to explain genetic processes. This domain accounts for 23% of the EOC. In **Classification and Phylogeny**, 23.12% (n = 40) also met the target. These students succeeded in comparing organisms and applying classification systems. This domain represents 15% of the EOC. In **Theory of Evolution**, 22.54% (n = 39) met the target. Students showed growing ability to explain biological change over time and support ideas with evidence. This domain carries 17% of the EOC.	**Cells** remained flat, with 23.69% (n=113) meeting the target, down slightly from 24.09%. Students struggled with organelle functions and molecular processes, and showed difficulty designing investigations and explaining cellular functions. This domain carries 20% of the EOC. In **Ecology**, scores dropped from 25.20% to 22.85% (n=109), despite its 25% EOC weight. Students had trouble analyzing data, explaining ecological relationships, and using evidence to evaluate human impact. The decline makes this a top priority for instructional support.

• **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	In **Classification and Phylogeny**, 15.38% of SWD students (n = 8) met the target in SY24–25. Students showed emerging ability to group organisms based on traits and interpret classification visuals. This domain represents 15% of the EOC. In **Theory of Evolution**, 11.54% of SWD students (n = 6) met the target. These students showed some growth in understanding patterns of change over time and constructing explanations from evidence. This domain accounts for 17% of the EOC.	**In Classification and Phylogeny**, 56.65% (n = 98) of EL students scored Below Target. Despite strengths in a portion of students, the majority struggled to apply classification reasoning consistently. In **Genetics and Heredity**, 52.60% (n = 91) scored Below Target. Many students found it difficult to connect models with explanations and to interpret inheritance data. In **Cells**, 51.45% (n = 89) scored Below Target. Students had difficulty explaining organelle function and molecular processes in context. This domain makes up 20% of the EOC. In **Ecology**, only 5.77% of students (n = 3) met the target, while 80.77% (n = 42) scored Below Target. Students struggled to analyze ecosystem interactions and apply data-based reasoning. Ecology is the most heavily weighted domain at 25%. In **Cells**, 7.69% (n = 4) met the target, and 59.62% (n = 31) scored Below. Students showed difficulty understanding cell structures, functions, and molecular processes. This domain carries 20% of the EOC.

		In **Genetics and Heredity**, 9.62% (n = 5) met the target, while 63.46% (n = 33) scored Below. Students had limited success modeling inheritance or applying reasoning to genetic outcomes. This domain makes up 23% of the EOC.
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year (FY25)	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
• **What trends exist for all students in the:** o Percentages mastering standards aligned to Biology domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness • **How do the trends differ for EL students?**	***this analysis focuses only on the district-created interims. These assessments were selected because they were given consistently to all students, aligned to specific standards, and structured for reliable comparison across semesters and teachers.*** **Classification Standard:** 76% of student assessments (n=314) were proficient in comparing viruses and organisms, showing strength in interpreting visuals and organizing biological categories. **Skill Focus:** Recognizing patterns and using classification systems to compare organisms. **Photosynthesis and Respiration Standard:** 74% of student assessments (n=872) were proficient in modeling photosynthesis and respiration, reflecting strong conceptual understanding of how energy flows through biological systems. Modeling energy transfer and explaining biological processes. **Classification Standard:** 73% of EL student assessments were proficient in comparing viruses and organisms. This suggests strong performance in recognizing biological categories and visual interpretation.	**Biodiversity Investigations Standard:** 57% of student assessments (n=436) were proficient in exploring biodiversity, indicating limited skill in conducting investigations and generating scientific questions. **Skill Focus:** Designing and interpreting scientific inquiries in ecological contexts. **Cell Structures and Energy Standard:** 61% of student assessments (n=872) were proficient in modeling cellular structures and energy flow, showing ongoing difficulty with abstract visualization and functional understanding. Modeling organelle function and explaining processes in the cell. **Biodiversity Investigations Standard:** 54% of EL student assessments showed proficiency in investigations related to biodiversity. This highlights a need for better support in designing ecological experiments. *Skill Focus: Asking scientific questions and interpreting ecological data.*

	Skill Focus: Interpreting visuals and organizing classification systems. **Genetics Standard (Mendel's Laws):** 70% of EL student assessments demonstrated proficiency in applying Mendel's laws of inheritance. This reflects a strong grasp of simple genetic patterns. *Skill Focus: Applying probability and understanding predictable inheritance models* . **Cladograms and Relationships Standard:** 75% of EL student assessments were proficient in interpreting cladograms and relationships. Students showed strength in analyzing evolutionary connections. *Skill Focus: Reading diagrams and making logical inferences based on traits.*	**Cell Transport Standard:** 58% of EL students were proficient in understanding cell transport and homeostasis. The lower performance reflects difficulty grasping cellular equilibrium processes. *Skill Focus: Modeling membrane processes and feedback systems.* **Natural Selection and Resistance Standard:** 64% of EL students were proficient, but this is low for a foundational standard. It suggests students struggle to apply evolutionary reasoning to real-world scenarios like antibiotic resistance. *Skill Focus: Applying cause-effect reasoning and interpreting population-level changes.*
• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	**Macromolecule Structure and Function Standard:** 64% of SWD assessments showed proficiency in understanding macromolecule roles. Students performed well in identifying biomolecule types and their purposes. *Matching structure to function in biological systems.* **Photosynthesis and Respiration Modeling Standard:** 66% of SWD students were proficient in modeling energy flow. This shows progress in understanding the role of photosynthesis and respiration. *Explaining energy transformation in cells.*	**Analyzing and Interpreting Evolutionary Data Standard:** Only 41% of SWD students were proficient in this standard. They struggled to analyze comparative data in evolutionary contexts. *Interpreting visual data and drawing logical conclusions.* **Asking Questions about Evolutionary Phenomena Standard:** 48% proficiency suggests SWD students struggled to develop scientific questions around evolutionary change. *Generating testable questions based on observed phenomena.* **Biodiversity Investigations Standard:** 57% proficiency indicates limited success in planning and executing investigations around biodiversity. *Designing investigations and identifying ecological patterns.*

	Genetic Variation through Meiosis Standard: 68% of SWD student assessments showed proficiency. Students were able to connect meiosis to variation, a cognitively demanding concept. *Linking cellular processes to inheritance outcomes.*	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** (Coherent Instruction – Delivering Quality Instruction): **Students underperform tasks requiring higher-order science thinking** — including interpreting biodiversity data, constructing scientific arguments, and analyzing models. These standards were the lowest performing in both the district-created common assessments and the Biology EOC. **Performance was stronger on standards involving structured tasks,** such as modeling photosynthesis and classifying organisms — indicating students are more successful when tasks are guided, familiar, or based on recall**.** **Root cause is:** Instructional planning and delivery do not consistently provide students — particularly English Learners and Students with Disabilities — with scaffolded opportunities to develop higher-order science and engineering practices. As a result, students lack the experience and confidence needed to perform rigorous, standards-aligned assessments that require critical thinking and scientific reasoning.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – BIOLOGY (SY25) • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during BIOLOGY walks?**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	100% of Biology teachers implemented phenomena-based instruction during the first semester. In the second semester, 70% of teachers incorporated student-centered practices such as phenomena discussions and guiding question boards. Instructional shifts occurred following coaching, showing responsiveness and professional reflection.	In the first semester, 80% of lessons were teacher-directed, limiting opportunities for student inquiry and reasoning. By the second semester, though student-centered structures increased, 90% of observed students were still not using inquiry skills such as analyzing, evaluating, or generating explanations. Teachers lacked structured systems for teaching, modeling, or correcting inquiry-based thinking.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** (Coherent Instruction – Delivering Quality Instruction) During SY25 instructional walks, all Biology teachers implemented phenomena-based instruction in the first semester, and 70% incorporated student-centered strategies like guiding questions and discussions in the second semester. These shifts reflect professional responsiveness and a willingness to adjust to practice following coaching. However, 80% of lessons in the first semester were teacher-directed, and by the second semester, 90% of observed students were still not actively using inquiry skills such as analyzing, evaluating, or explaining scientific phenomena. In many classrooms, students copied information without demonstrating understanding, and few lessons included explicit modeling or correction of reasoning processes. The root cause is a lack of coherence in instructional planning that supports scientific inquiry. While engagement strategies are present, most students—particularly ELs and SWDs—do not receive the structured support needed to develop higher-order thinking. Without intentional scaffolding of inquiry practices, students struggle to meet the cognitive demands of Biology assessments.	

BIOLOGY - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3a: BIOLOGY	**By May 2026, increase the percentage of students in Biology scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 3% (approximately 245 students out of 588 students tested), as measured by the EOC assessments.**
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Lack of coherence in instructional planning to support student-centered scientific inquiry Misalignment of Common Assessments to the EOC rigor
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)* 1. CCCs will plan instruction around learning target progression and success criteria, to support student-centered scientific inquiry and create greater alignment between Common Assessments and EOC rigor	**Implementation Performance Target:** By the end of Semester 1, 100% of teachers will demonstrate implementation of student support aligned to the Science and Engineering Practices (e.g., evaluating information sources, modeling scientific explanations, or scaffolding argument from evidence) as documented through walkthroughs. **Implementation Plan:** • **Pre-Planning July:** Teachers will participate in professional development focused on supporting evidence-based inquiry through the lens of the Science and Engineering Practices (SEPs). • **August–September:** Teachers will participate in PL for Teacher Clarity (*Learning Target Ladder Progression: Planning Instruction*). Walkthroughs will evaluate the implementation of the PL focus.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** At least 50% of students will score at Proficient or Above on common assessments At least 80% of students will show 10% growth from formative to summative assessment **Evaluation Tool(s):** • CTLS Common Assessment Reports – Used to measure student proficiency and growth across units, especially on CER and constructed response items. • Student Work Samples – Lab reports, CER writing tasks, and inquiry-based assignments will be reviewed to assess student use of research, evidence, and reasoning. • Walkthrough Forms – Used to document the presence of instructional supports (e.g., sentence starters, source evaluation strategies, citation scaffolds) during classroom visits. **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed:	

	Teacher CCCs will compare the rigor of Common Assessments against the EOC, and rewrite test items using the DOK descriptors. • **October–December:** Teacher CCCs will review recorded training provided for 9-12 Biology Readiness High School Science Training Series Coach will plan and use a protocol to connect content from the training with teacher practice and assessments. Teachers will walk away with an action step that will be monitored. Walkthroughs and student work will be used to monitor progress. • **January–February:** Teacher CCCs will plan how to facilitate student discussions aligned to the unit, model argumentation strategies, and create a process to provide feedback aligned to Science and Engineering Practices. To monitor progress, the Academic Coach will conduct walkthroughs and guide team discussion about student work. • **March–April:** Teachers will plan scaffolding tasks for higher-level reasoning and scientific argumentation. Coach will conduct walkthroughs to observe teacher practice and monitor student application of these practices. • **May:** Teacher CCCs will review assessments, student work and performance data, and make suggestions for instructional moves. **Artifacts to be Collected:** CCC meeting minutes	☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** End of Each Unit: Common assessment data and student work samples (CERs, labs) will be analyzed to monitor proficiency, identify misconceptions, and adjust instruction. CCCs will review performance by standard and discuss which research and reasoning supports were most effective. End of Each Semester: Teachers and coaches will review trends in student growth, focusing on improvements in explanation, use of evidence, and research skills. Walk-through data and artifacts will also be reviewed to assess implementation progress. Post-EOC: Biology EOC results will be analyzed by domain, achievement level, and student subgroups. Focus will be placed on performance in Genetics, Ecology, and constructed response trends to inform planning for the next school year. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

	Walkthrough forms Assessment Audit notes Feedback notes on instructional trends **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Lesson Plans • Weekly and Monthly		

U.S. HISTORY DATA – By Year								
EOC Longitudinal Data	**FY22**		**FY23**		**FY24**		**FY25**	
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	5% (6)	5% (10)	3% (8)	6% (13)	8% (18)	9% (20)	12% (32)	13% (39)
Level 3	26% (30)	36% (69)	29% (76)	26% (105)	46% (56)	39% (87)	44% (121)	39% (81)
Level 2	34% (39)	34% (66)	44% (116)	38% (82)	29% (66)	32% (71)	27% (75)	29% (60)
Level 1	34% (39)	26% (50)	24% (63)	30% (65)	17% (39)	20% (44)	17% (46)	19% (37)

U.S. HISTORY – By Domain of Focus – Current Year										
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	**Colonization Through the Constitution**		**New Republic Through Reconstruction**		**Industrialization, Reform & Imperialism**		**Establishment as a World Power**	**Post-World War II to the Present**		
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	20% (43)	30% (63)	38% (82)	41% (85)	35% (76)	30% (63)	47% (102)	49% (101)	32% (70)	39% (81)
Level 2 Monitor Learning	34% (74)	38% (79)	36% (78)	23% (48)	25% (54)	19% (40)	25% (55)	23% (47)	32% (70)	26% (53)
Level 1 Remediate Learning	46% (101)	31% (65)	27% (58)	36% (74)	40% (88)	50% (104)	28% (61)	29% (59)	36% (70)	35% (73)

U.S. HISTORY DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

US History EOC (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses

• **What trends exist for all students in the:**
  ○ Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?
  ○ US History EOC domain increases or decreases?
• **How do the trends differ for EL students?**
• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**
	Based upon the trend data below for FY22-FY25 (1,729 students) of the US History EOC there has been increase in level 3 (968) students and a decrease in Level 1 (311) students.
	
	EOC Levels
	• FY22-FY25 trend is 44%-56% (12% increase) – Level 3
	• FY22-FY25 trend is 19%-18% (1% decrease) – Level 1
	
	The data below indicates strengths of the trend EOC domains. Students scoring in the "below level" in **Colonization Through the Constitution** decreased 19%, maintained at the "met level" in **Establishment as a World Power**, and increased the students in the "met level" by 13% for the **Post World War II to the Present** domain.
	
	EOC Domains
	• FY23-FY25 trend is 46% - 27% (Decreased 19% – Below Level) – (467 students) - *Colonization Through the Constitution*
	• FY23-FY25 trend is 42% - 42% (Maintained – Met Level) – (726 students) - *Establishment as a World Power*
		Based upon the trend data for FY22 – FY25 (1,729 students) of the US History EOC, the data below indicates an increase in Level 2 (484) students and a decrease in Level 4 (225) students.
		
		EOC Levels
		• FY22 – FY25 trend is 20% - 13% (7% decrease) – Level 4
		• FY22-FY25 trend is 27% - 28% (1% increase) – Level 2
		
		The data below indicates weaknesses of the trend EOC domains. Students scoring "below level" in **Industrialization, Reform and Imperialism** increased 10%.
		
		EOC Domains
		• FY23-FY25 trend is 42% - 52% (Increased 10%– Below Level) – (899 Students) *Industrialization, Reform and Imperialism*
		
		Below is the trend data of content skills for the domains**:** **Colonization Through the Constitution** and **Industrialization, Reform & Imperialism.**
		
		EOC Domain/ Content Skills:
		• FY23- FY25 trend standards – *USH1,3,4* –Colonization Through the Constitution - **Skills:** *Compare/Contrast, Investigate, Explain the impact*

	• FY23-FY25 trend is 33% - 46% (Increased 13% – Met Level) – (795 students) *Post-World War II to the Present* Below is the trend data of content skills for the domains**, New Republic and Reconstruction** and **Establishment as a World Power.** **<u>EOC Domain/ Content Skills:</u>** • FY23- FY25 trend standards – *USH6– USH8* - New Republic and Reconstruction - **Skills:** *Compare/Contrast, Analyze the causes and impact, Explain the impact* • FY23-FY25 trend standards – *USH15 – US17* – Establishment as a World Power - Skills**:** *Analyze the impact, Describe and Synthesis, Evaluate* SWD students scoring in Level 1 in the domain **Post-World War to the Present** has decreased since FY22-FY25 – 25%-22% (3% decrease)	• FY23-FY25 trend standards - *USH11 – US14* – Industrialization, Reform & Imperialism **Skills:**, *Investigate, Analyze the impact, Explain the Causes* EL students scoring Level 2 in the domain **Colonization Through the Constitution** based upon the FY22-FY25 - 27% - 56% (29% increase) data.
	Strengths	**Weaknesses**

<table>
<tr>
<td>COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year

• What trends exist for all students in the:
o Percentages mastering standards aligned to math domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness

• How do the trends differ for EL students?

• How do the trends differ for SWD students?</td>
<td>Based upon the US History common assessments, (464 students) have mastered the domains below.

<u>Content/Skill Domains</u>

Domain - New Republic through Reconstruction and Establishment as a World Power.

• Connect the court case of Plessy v. Ferguson to laws – Skills: Compare, contrast and synthesize. – 96% - Levels 3 & 4

• Describe modern forms of cultural expression, ie. Jazz and the Harlem Renaissance. – Skills: Analysis of culture – 95% - Levels 3 & 4

• Describe the impact of American Cultural and significant events ie. Civil Rights, Vietnam, Moon landing – Skills: Synthesize historical events and connections - 95% - Levels 3 & 4

Based upon the common assessment data SWD students scored 12% lower than on-level students on the above domains/standards.</td>
<td>Based upon the US History common assessments, (145 students) have shown weaknesses the domains below.

<u>Content/Skill Domains</u>

Domain – Colonization Through the Constitution, Industrialization, Reform & Imperialism and Post-World War to the Present

• Anti-Federalists debate vs. Federalist Papers and connection to presidents. – Skills: Synthesize historical events and analyze the impact on later government decisions. – 28% - Levels 1 & 2

• Presidential Reconstruction and Congressional Reconstruction – Skills: Compare and contrast the significance of the event and connect to the presidents. 26% - Levels 1 & 2

• Social and political outcomes of major events such as Dr. King’s assassination and the Tet Offensive – Skills: Analyze the implications historical events toward changes in society. – 27% - Levels 1 & 2
• Policies that result from the Cold War and Vietnam War. Skills:– Analyze and synthesize how policies impact historical events and their outcomes. – 24% - Levels 1 & 2

Based upon the common assessment data, EL students scored 32% lower than on-level students on the above standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

☒ Coherent Instruction
☒ Professional Capacity
☐ Effective Leadership</td>
<td colspan="2">Root Cause Explanation:

• The most significant weaknesses based upon the EOC and Common assessment data is the ability for students to analyze and synthesize US History content, specifically in the domains Colonization Through the Constitution and Industrialization, Reform & Imperialism.</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>☐ Supportive Learning Environment</td><td colspan="2">The areas identified that may contribute to the weaknesses is that many classes focused on memorizing terms and information through repetition instead of analysis or conceptual mastery of the standards.
The impact of inconsistently utilizing DBQ’s and CRQ’s with US History is demonstrated through the weakest domains because students are not getting enough practice synthesizing information. Synthesizing information through DBQ’s helps students to perform tasks that are a DOK 3 and 4 instead of recalling at a DOK 1.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">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?</td><td>Strengths</td><td>Weaknesses</td></tr>
<tr><td>Out of the 27 instructional walks, 78% of teachers displayed learning targets that matched the standards.
50% of the classes implemented cooperative learning, consistently using flexible grouping and project-based assignments. The instruction and rigor increased because of the strategies.</td><td>Out of the 27 instructional walks, in the category of “Level of Engagement”, 55% of the students were well-managed or compliant while only 45% were highly engaged in authentic and relevant content and discussions.
30% of the classes spent over 50% of the time lecturing or some type of direct instruction, without releasing the students to small groups or even independent practice.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:
☒ Coherent Instruction
☒ Professional Capacity
☐ Effective Leadership
☐ Supportive Learning Environment</td><td colspan="2">Root Cause Explanation:
The most significant weakness based upon walk-through data is the ability for students to analyze and synthesize US History content. The instruction was more teacher-led than student-led.</td></tr>
</table>

	• **The areas identified that may contribute to the weaknesses is that many classes focused on memorizing terms and information through repetition instead of analysis or conceptual mastery of the standards.** • **The impact of inconsistently utilizing instructional practices that are DOK 3 and DOK 4 is demonstrated in the assessment data. US History is demonstrated through the weakest domains.** • **Teachers will need additional guidance in implementing active learning strategies, student-led activities, and a higher rigor that includes consistent writing.** • **Teachers also need professional learning in implementing literacy standards, which include writing standards for Social Studies.**	
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:**	

US HISTORY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3b: US HISTORY	**By May 2026, increase the percentage of students in U.S. History scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 3% (approximately 180 students out of 420 tested) as measured by the EOC assessments.**
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	1. Professional learning and implementation of student discussion, analysis, conceptual mastery and synthesis of US History content. 2. Teachers need additional guidance in implementing active learning strategies, student-led activities, and a higher rigor of DOK3 & DOK 4 instructional strategies that include consistent writing.
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 teachers will implement rigorous instructional literacy strategies at a DOK 3 and DOK 4 level during each US History unit. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning**: • Teachers will analyze the US History standards, specifically for the first EOC domain Colonization Through the Constitution and choose a rigorous instructional strategy the CCC will implement in Unit 1. • **August-September**:	**Evaluation Performance Target:** 65% of US History students will demonstrate growth on summative assessments that incorporate balanced DOK question levels and writing. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Common Summative Data • US History EOC **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks	District Academic Coaches SS PL's DBQ's/CRQ's

US History teachers will implement instructional literacy strategies, specifically argumentative and informative writing, that will increase the instructional and assessment rigor to DOK 3 & DOK 4	• SS Academic Coach will work with CCCs to support implementing a rigorous instructional strategy. • US History teachers will integrate argumentative and informative writing with common rubrics weekly into their instructional units. • Teachers will create a common summative assessment for the beginning units that have balanced DOK levels and CRQs. • **October-December:** • SS Academic coach will begin instructional walks to confirm the implementation of the instructional strategies at a DOK 3 & DOK 4 level. • SS Academic coach will review common assessments to review for balanced DOK levels as well as argumentative and informative writing with rubrics. • Teachers will continue analyzing common assessment data to track US History standards to assess remediation and/or enrichment plans. • SS Academic Coach will analyze Winter US History EOC data, specifically looking at the domains. • **January-February**: • SS Academic Coach will work with CCCs to support implementing a rigorous instructional strategy. • US History teachers will integrate analysis of writing with common rubrics weekly into their instructional units. • Teachers will create a common summative assessment for the beginning units that have balanced DOK levels and analysis of writing. • **March-April**: • SS Academic Coach will implement the same plans documented for October – December. • **May**: • SS Academic Coach will analyze Spring EOC US History data, specifically looking at the domains.	☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Following each US History Unit. ☒ Winter and Spring Semester **Data Analysis Plan:** • Teachers will review common assessment data through item analysis. • Teachers will review Winter and Spring US History EOC data. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads/ Department Chair	

	• SS Academic Coach will synthesize strengths and weaknesses based upon the Winter and Spring EOC data. **Artifacts to be Collected:** Lesson Plans PL Agendas Common Summative Unit Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Lesson Plans with each unit. Attend CCC meetings at least twice a month. Review CCC documentation weekly. Begin classroom walking twice a month beginning in September and ending in November.		

GRADUATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #4: GRADUATION	**To increase the graduation rate by 3% from the 2024-2025 school year to the end of the 2025-2026 school year.**		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Regular absence (missing 10%+ of school days) leads to course failure. • Failing core classes (especially Algebra I and English I) early on puts students **off-track for graduation**. • Students often enter high school with **reading and math deficits** from elementary or middle school.		
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**	**Implementation Performance Target:** By October 2025, 100% of students identified as having chronic absences or with a history of academic	**Evaluation Performance Target:** At least 50% of students identified at risk for chronic absenteeism and academic failure will	**District MTSS Support Specialist**

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)* 1. Reduce chronic absenteeism by 20% and improve course pass rates in Core Academic Classes by providing targeted academic and engagement support to at-risk 9th and 10th grade students.	failure will receive academic intervention/ support from teachers and support staff. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning**: Identification of students who have chronic absences or failing core classes. • Identification of **RTI Team** • PD Training for RTI Team • **August-September** (i) Assign students to interventions block focused on Core Academic classes conducted by certified teachers and Paras. • PD for Staff on RTI *Increase Tiered Intervention Support* • *Tier I*: Initiate Community and Wide Campaign focused on School Attendance. • *Tier II*: Initiate personalized outreach by school staff (Phone calls, parent meetings, home visits). • *Tier III*: Launch case management for chronically absent Student through RTI, Social work, Community in Schools and mentorship, connect to clubs, student leadership roles or groups to build belonging. • **September- October** *Provide Remediation Opportunities* • Initiate opportunities for grade repair and tutoring after school and during Saturdays (SOAR Saturday) using Edmentum. • Provide Opportunity for At-Risk ELL and SWD students to take advantage of additional after school and weekend opportunities for remediation. • Tier III: Case management for chronically absent students through MTSS, Social work, Community in Schools mentorship.	be passing 3 out of 4 academic classes by the end of each semester. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Student Grade Reports in OnTrack/ Synergy • Student Attendance Reports in Synergy **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** MTSS and Attendance Team will review data on grades and attendance of targeted at-risk students. Monthly. Recommendations will be made to various school personnel to make changes to the interventions based on the review of student data. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists/ Counselors/Parent Facilitator/Sources of Strength Leader ☒ CCC Leads	**Positive School Support Specialist** **School's RTI Team** **Community in Schools**

	• **October-December** • Host Academic and Attendance and Grades Night for targeted students. • Launch Trusted Adult Sources of Strength Campaign/PD for Staff • **December-January**: Celebration for students who met attendance and Academic goals. • Initiate Credit Recovery for targeted groups of students. • Re-Launch Attendance Campaign for 2nd Semester • **March-April**: • Host Academic and Attendance and Grades Night for targeted students. • Targets tutoring for identified student groups ELL/SWD. • **May:** • Final Attendance and Academic Push (Tier I-III) • Celebrate improvements with recognition events. • Plan Summer Bridge for 8th grade • Initiate Credit Recovery **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Synergy Grade Reports/Attendance Reports • PD Sign-in Sheet • Video from PDs • Minutes from MTSS Meetings • Edmentum Attendance and grades roster • Parent Contact Logs **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals		

	☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monitoring of the overall process will occur monthly.		

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 16th, 2025) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	September 16th, 2025		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1st- November 3rd 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.	October 1st- November 3rd 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline (March 26th, 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.	March 26th, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required Building Capacity for Involvement (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) Teacher 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	July 1 – September 26 January 5 – February 16		☐ 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:** Incoming 9th Graders Parent Meeting- April 23, 2026/ 6:00 PM (In Person) Rising 9th Grade families are introduced to expectations and learning opportunities offered in high school. Transition to Adulthood - Rising 12th Grade Parent Meeting- April 15, 2026, 6:00 PM (Virtually) Microsoft Teams Rising 12th grade families will be introduced to the expectations and learning opportunities available in post-secondary education and the world of work.	April 23rd, 2026 Apri 15th, 2026		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/program meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d*	***List documents translated for parents:*** School Policy and Compact		☐ 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**
Math and Social Studies Curriculum Night – October 2, 2025/ 6 – 8 PM (In person) Join the Math and Social Studies departments for an engaging session where teachers will guide you through what your student will be learning this year. They'll provide a brief sample lesson along with helpful tips and resources for families to support learning at home.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Math Teachers/ Social Studies Teachers. Academic Coaches Parent Facilitator	Title I and Local funds	October 2nd, 2025	The Parent facilitator will keep parent sign in logs and copies of the presentations to parents.	**Academic Coaches**
English and Science Curriculum Night – October 6, 2025/ 6 – 8 PM (In person) Join the English and Science departments for an engaging session where teachers will guide you through what your student will be learning this year. They'll provide a brief sample lesson along with helpful tips and resources for families to support learning at home.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	English and Science Teachers. Academic Coaches Parent Facilitator	Title I and Local funds	October 6th, 2025	The Parent facilitator will keep parent sign in logs and copies of the presentations to parents.	**Academic Coaches**
Smart Fun: How Families Can Use AI to Make Learning Exciting Again. - February 12th, 2026, 6:00PM (in person) Join us for an engaging session filled with practical tips, hands-on tools, and AI resources designed to support fun, safe, and effective learning at home. Enjoy food, treats, and snacks for the whole family!	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	Academic Coaches Parent Facilitator	Title I and Local funds	February 12th, 2026	The Parent facilitator will keep parent sign in logs and copies of the presentations to parents.	**Academic Coaches**

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's input. (#14 in list of "shalls" and "mays")

School Improvement Plan Required Questions
Schoolwide Plan Development – *Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)*
1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages.** *SWP Checklist 5(a)*
2. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement for fall and spring input meetings**. *Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)*
3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page.** *SWP Checklist 5(c)*
4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages.** *SWP Checklist 5(d)*
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. *SWP Checklist 5(e)* **Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)** **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: South Cobb High School will strategically integrate **state and local funds** with **community partnerships** to support the academic, social, and emotional needs of its students. • **Title II funds** will support professional development and training opportunities for instructional staff, with an emphasis on improving instructional quality and student outcomes. • **Title III funds** will be utilized to enhance language proficiency programs for English Language Learners (ELLs), ensuring they receive targeted language acquisition support.

- **Twenty Day Funds** will be allocated to provide **tutoring services** for students struggling to meet Georgia's academic standards, particularly in core content areas.

In addition, **mentoring services** will be offered through a collaboration with **Communities in Schools (CIS) of Marietta**, supporting students identified as at-risk due to attendance, behavior, or academic performance.

South Cobb High School has also established strong community partnerships with organizations including:

- **Revive Church of Austell, GA**
- **LGE Community Credit Union**
- **Austell Community Collaborative**
- **South Cobb Rotary Club**
- **Sherri Sells Atlanta (Sherry Mitchell)**
- **EF2 Reality**
- **Zaxby's of Smyrna (Sheila Ramsey)**
- **Mexico Lindo Restaurant**
- **Perfectly Different Design**
- **Dionne's Dream Homes**
- **Sandy Johnson and Associates, LLC**
- **Smoothie King, Mableton (Jonathan Terrell)**
- **Nothing Bundt Cakes Smyrna**

These partners contribute essential services such as volunteers, mental health and grief counseling, vision and hearing screenings, and support for athletic and enrichment programs. Furthermore, in collaboration with the Family and Community Engagement (FACE) Coordinator, South Cobb provides parent workshops on topics such as financial literacy, understanding student Lexiles, and navigating academic support. These efforts are aligned with needs identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and parent/community surveys, ensuring that both students and families receive holistic support.

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: The school evaluates the Student Improvement Plan on a bi/weekly basis. The administrative team collaborates with academic coaches on a monthly basis to review data points. Teachers meet with administration and academic coaches during their CCC's, to determine if goals are being met and adjustments will be made accordingly. Administrators and academic coaches will monitor interim assessments/ CTLS Assess to determine if goals towards the plans are being met. A Mid-Year Review and End of the Year Process with the Title I district Supervisor to assess the goals.

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: South Cobb High School evaluates the effectiveness of its School Improvement Plan on an ongoing basis using a multi-tiered approach:

- **Biweekly evaluations** are conducted by the school leadership team to assess progress toward targeted goals.
- The **administrative team meets monthly** with academic coaches to review key data points, including attendance, course performance, and formative assessments.
- Teachers collaborate with administrators and academic coaches during **Collaborative Content Communities (CCCs)** to analyze student performance data, evaluate instructional strategies, and determine whether established goals are being met. Instructional adjustments are made as needed.
- **Interim assessments**, including **CTLS Assess** and other benchmark tools, are reviewed regularly by administrators and academic coaches to measure progress toward academic goals.
- A formal **Mid-Year Review** and **End-of-Year Review** are conducted in partnership with the **Title I District Supervisor** to evaluate progress and make system-wide recommendations.

Based on the data, the school will make appropriate adjustments, which may include:

- Targeted **professional development** for teachers in areas of identified instructional need
- **Additional academic interventions** for students requiring more intensive support

This continuous cycle of reflection and adjustment ensures that the School Improvement Plan remains responsive, data-driven, and aligned with the needs of all learners.

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: South Cobb High School will assess the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan through a comprehensive analysis of multiple data sources. The leadership team will review data from **CTLS Assessments, End-of-Course (EOC) exams, i-Ready diagnostics, Beacon assessments, student attendance records, course grades, and discipline data housed in Synergy**.

These data points will be monitored on a **weekly basis** to identify trends, measure progress toward established goals, and determine the impact of instructional strategies and interventions.

Based continuous needs analysis, the school will make informed adjustments, which may include:

- Refining **instructional practices**
- Delivering targeted **professional development** for teachers
- Implementing or modifying **student intervention strategies**

This continuous improvement cycle ensures that the school responds promptly to student needs and remains aligned with academic achievement targets and the priorities outlined in the School Improvement Plan.

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: South Cobb High School implements a **schoolwide tiered model of support** that integrates **Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)** and a **Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)** to proactively address student behavior and provide early intervening services aligned with the **Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**.

Tier I – Universal Supports

All students receive Tier I supports, including:

- Clearly defined behavioral expectations taught and reinforced across all school settings
- Schoolwide PBIS strategies focused on prevention, consistency, and positive reinforcement
- Regular communication with families about behavior and school culture
- Social-emotional learning (SEL) lessons embedded into the advisory curriculum

These proactive measures aim to create a positive and inclusive school climate that reduces the need for disciplinary interventions.

Tier II – Targeted Group Interventions

Students who require additional behavioral support are identified through behavior data (e.g., office discipline referrals, teacher input, and attendance patterns) and receive Tier II interventions such as:

- Small group counseling (e.g., anger management, conflict resolution)
- Check-In/Check-Out systems with a designated mentor
- Behavior contracts and goal tracking
- Referral to Community in Schools (CIS) mentoring or anti-bullying programs

These services are coordinated through the school's **counseling department and MTSS team and** closely monitored for effectiveness.

Tier III – Intensive Individualized Support

Students demonstrating persistent or severe behavioral challenges receive Tier III support, which may include:

- Functional Behavior Assessments (FBA) and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP)
- Individual counseling and wraparound services
- Referral to special education services through IDEA, where appropriate
- Collaboration with school psychologists, social workers, and external service providers

South Cobb High School ensures that all Tier III supports are **coordinated with IDEA requirements**, including early identification of students with potential disabilities, appropriate referral processes, and delivery of services consistent with students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

Collaboration and Coordination

The MTSS and PBIS frameworks are designed to **work in tandem with IDEA services**, promoting a unified approach to early intervention. School teams regularly analyze data from multiple sources—including discipline records, academic performance, and teacher referrals—to:

- Identify at-risk students early
- Deliver timely and appropriate supports
- Avoid over-identification of students with disabilities
- Ensure culturally responsive practices

A **District MTSS Specialist** is also supporting South Cobb in refining Tier II and Tier III interventions, with a long-term goal of integrating behavior and academic support into one comprehensive model by the **2025–2026 school year**. In February 2025, the Guiding Coalition met with the districts MTSS team to initiate guided support for South Cobb High School.

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: South Cobb High School is committed to ensuring the successful transition and development of all newly hired educators through a comprehensive and supportive **New Teacher Induction Program**. In addition to participating in the **Cobb County School District's district-level induction**, new teachers at South Cobb engage in a **site-based induction program** tailored to the specific culture, expectations, and instructional practices of the school.

Key components of the South Cobb New Teacher Induction Program include:

- **Orientation and Integration:** New teachers are introduced to department heads, administrative staff, academic coaches, and key personnel who will support their success at the school.

- **Mentoring:** Each new teacher is assigned a **mentor teacher** by their department chair. Mentors provide consistent support with lesson planning, behavior management, school procedures, and classroom observations.
- **Weekly Professional Development (PD):** New teachers attend weekly PD sessions aligned with schoolwide goals and personalized learning needs. They also participate in **Collaborative Content Communities (CCCs)** for ongoing content-specific support.
- **Monthly Support Meetings:** The administrative team and academic coaches host monthly sessions (as needed) to address questions, offer tailored PD, and foster a sense of professional community among new staff.
- **Instructional Coaching:** Academic coaches work directly with new teachers to plan, deliver, and reflect on instruction using evidence-based strategies. Feedback is immediate and actionable.
- **Teacher Voice and Ownership:** A survey was conducted to gather input from staff on topics of interest for future professional learning. South Cobb will use this data to drive teacher-led PD offerings that directly impact student learning outcomes.
- **Professional Learning YouTube Channel:** To support sustained access to PD resources, South Cobb launched a **Professional Learning YouTube Channel** where recorded sessions are archived for on-demand viewing. This ensures new teachers can revisit key training at their convenience.
- **Instructional Walkthroughs and Peer Feedback:** Supplemental funding will support substitute coverage so that department chairs can conduct **instructional walks** with new teachers. This provides opportunities for observation, reflection, and coaching.
- **Conference Participation:** New teachers are encouraged to attend **local and national education conferences** to deepen their professional learning and build capacity in areas aligned with school priorities.

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: South Cobb High School prepares students for postsecondary education and workforce readiness through a comprehensive approach that includes counseling, career pathways, dual enrollment opportunities, and specialized programs such as AVID and the Magnet Academy of Research and Medical Sciences.

In alignment with Georgia's BRIDGE Act, the Counseling Department provides structured advisement and career counseling for all students. Counselors implement the use of **Naviance**, an online platform that guides students through career exploration and postsecondary planning by offering assessments like the career matchmaker and ability profiler. Through Naviance, students also set education, career, and financial goals. South Cobb hosts events such as

“Apply to College Day”, **postsecondary check-in sessions**, and **FAFSA workshops**. The College and Career Center, staffed daily during lunch periods, serves as a central hub for students to receive information about college applications, scholarships, and financial aid.

The school actively promotes **Dual Enrollment**, **Dual Achievement Option B**, and **Advanced Placement (AP)** coursework to expand students' access to earning college credit while still in high school. Counselors provide direct support to students and families interested in these programs through information sessions and one-on-one advisement.

South Cobb offers 13 **Career, Technical, and Agricultural Education (CTAE)** pathways, including programs in fields such as Healthcare, Law and Justice, Graphic Design, Game Design, Education, and JROTC. These programs equip students with technical skills and hands-on experience to prepare them for immediate entry into the workforce or further specialized study.

In addition, the school offers **AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination)**, a nationally recognized program that supports students in building the skills needed for success in college-level work. The AVID program supports students with writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading strategies (WICOR) while also coordinating college visits and mentorship opportunities through partnerships with Communities In Schools.

The **Academy of Research and Medical Sciences**, South Cobb’s Magnet Program, provides a rigorous four-year track focused on science and medicine. Students' complete internships, participate in research projects, and are required to complete 360 hours of community service, all while engaging in leadership opportunities across the school.

South Cobb High School also provides **Work-Based Learning (WBL)** opportunities, where students gain real-world job experience in career fields aligned with their interests. Each year, the school hosts a **Career Fair** in which local employers meet with students and offer direct employment opportunities to juniors and seniors.

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?**
Classroom Teacher(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	• **Improving Student Achievement**: Implementing differentiated instruction and data-driven strategies to address gaps in learning, especially for at-risk students. • **Increasing Engagement**: Designing relevant, interactive lessons that connect historical content to real-world issues, fostering student investment and attendance.
Academic Coach(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	• **Data Analysis and Instructional Adjustments**: Academic coaches will analyze student performance data to identify learning gaps and work with teachers to adjust instructional strategies, ensuring targeted support for at-risk students. • **Professional Development**: Coaches will provide ongoing professional development, helping math and science teachers implement effective teaching methods, differentiated strategies, and best practices to improve student outcomes. • **Targeted Intervention Support**: Coaches will collaborate with teachers to develop and implement intervention plans for struggling students, including small-group instruction and differentiated assignments to close achievement gaps. • **Monitoring and Continuous Improvement**: Academic coaches will monitor student progress, gather feedback, and adjust instructional strategies to ensure continuous improvement and alignment with the goals of the School Improvement Plan.
Parent Facilitator(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	• **Family Engagement and Communication**: The Parent Facilitator will establish strong communication channels with families, ensuring they are informed about school goals, programs, and student progress, which fosters a collaborative school-home partnership. • **Workshops and Support for Parents**: The facilitator will organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies

			to support their children's academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. • **Increased Parental Involvement**: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. • **Connecting Families with Resources**: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	

School Improvement Goals *Include goals on the parent compacts and policy*	
Goal #1	**Literacy**: By May 2026, 60% of students taking the 10th grade English EOC will read on or above grade level.
Goal #2	**Math:** May 2026, increase the percentage of students in Algebra scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 5% (approximately 190 students out of 541 students), as measured by the EOC assessments.
Goal #3	A) **Biology**: By May 2026, increase the percentage of students in Biology scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 3% (approximately 245 students out of 588 students tested), as measured by the EOC assessments. B) **US History**: By May 2026, increase the percentage of students in U.S. History scoring Proficient and Distinguished by 3% (approximately 180 students out of 420 tested) as measured by the EOC assessments.
Goal #4	**Graduation:** To increase the graduation rate by 3% from the 2024-2025 school year to the end of the 2025-2026 school year.