

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	High School
Principal Name:	Dr. Andrea Jenkins-Mann
Date Submitted:	May 21, 2026
Revision Date(s):	June 9, 2026 & August 7, 2026

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Cobb Horizon High School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Semeka Samuels
<i>Position</i>	Academic Coach
<i>Email</i>	Semeka.samuels@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	678-594-8240
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
X	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). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>
School Response: The plan was developed after conversation with building leadership teams for COLA & Horizon, Student Focus group, and Parent Advisory Council. Meetings were held from March through April to finalize the plan.

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 <i>[Signature]</i>	Parent Facilitators <i>Shanti Ventura</i>
Content or Grade Level Teachers <i>Rania G. [Signature]</i>	Media Specialists <i>Matthew [Signature]</i>
Local School Academic Coaches <i>Shemekah Samuels</i>	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee) <i>Paula Bradley-Mack</i>	Social Workers
Student (Required for High Schools) <i>Lukio Gladner</i>	Community Leaders <i>[Signature]</i>
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists <i>Lynn [Signature]</i>
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:	5/12/26	5/13/26	
----------------	---------	---------	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Teacher	William Bellus	William Bellus
Teacher	Ryan Baker	Ryan Baker
Teacher	Gini Morgan	Gini Morgan
Teacher	Brittany Dock	Brittany Dock
Teacher	Chandra Gue	Chandra Gue
Teacher	Jeffrey Clancy	Jeffrey Clancy
Teacher	Deanna Cobb-Walls	Deanna Cobb-Walls
Teacher	JASON D RICHIE	JASON D RICHIE
Teacher	Angie Kim	Angie Kim
Teacher	Connie Erb	Connie Erb
Teacher	Blake Wright	Blake Wright
Teacher	Michelle Ihvig	Michelle Ihvig
Teacher/Plath Dept Chair	Dorrell Buckman	Dorrell Buckman

Teacher
Teacher

Miles Price
Melvie Hibbler

Miles Price
Melvie Hibbler

Cobb Horizon High School

FY27 Title I School Improvement Plan

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:	5/12/26	5/13/26	
----------------	---------	---------	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Counselor	Mandy Mooney	Mandy Mooney
Math Teacher	Tammy MacLean	Tammy MacLean
ESOL Teacher	Jennifer Pritt	Jennifer Pritt
Admin	Jeff Hixon	Jeff Hixon
SS Teacher	Jeff Jones	Jeff Jones
Math Teacher	Laura Carmichael	Laura Carmichael
Science Teacher	Lauren Ruehman	Lauren Ruehman
ELA Teacher	Larisa Foster	Larisa Foster
Admin	Amanda Pittman Burks	Amanda Pittman Burks
Health, PE, Math Teacher	Connie Bailey	Connie Bailey
CTAE Educator	Nicole Champion	Nicole Champion
Math Teacher	Shauna DeFreitas	S. DeFreitas
Special Ed	Carrie Newman	Carrie Newman

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	The percentage of students scoring at the developing, proficient and distinguished levels (2, 3, 4) on the Algebra 1 EOC will increase from 60% (84 students) to 80% (112 students) for the 26SY
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	As of Spring EOC administration, only 52% (50 of 97) of the students scored levels 2, 3, 4 on the Algebra 1 EOC. Horizon students who take Algebra are 1-3 years behind academically. Most have failed Algebra at least once in the past.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Teachers received vocabulary professional learning in general practices in one session during 25-26 school year. 100% of students completed vocabulary on Algebra 1 assessments. Students averaged 82% mastery on those assessments. We need to continue our focus on academic vocabulary to increase course completion in all math courses. Teachers need professional development on additional vocabulary instructional strategies in Marzano's Six Step Model: Frayer Model, Word Maps, Morphologic instruction aligned with a flexible learning environment. Horizon will implement direct instruction in math courses for struggling students in place of the current instructional model where students work independently at their own pace through scripted computer-based curriculum.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

Previous Year's Goal #2	The percentage of students scoring developing, proficient and distinguished (Levels 2, 3, and 4) on the Literature 2 EOC on Writing Domain will increase from 33% (107 students) to 45% (145) of 322 students for the 2026 School Year
Was the goal met? ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Because the ELA EOC is new for 26 SY, results have to be normed before release to public. No ELA EOC data available until December '26 or January '27. Teachers collaboratively scored student essays with common rubric in Lit 2 classes. For Horizon, 63% of students scored level 2 (0), level 3 (3), and level 4 (7).
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	• Common writing prompts were developed and implemented in all ELA courses • Common scoring rubric that aligns to GA DOE rubric was developed • Collaborative scoring & calibration • Graphic organizers are provided as needed. • Pre-reading of sources • Individualized writing instruction, pre-writing and during editing • Writing conferences and individual feedback

Previous Year's Goal #3	We will increase the graduation rate for the 2026 cohort from 58.14 (159 students) to 65% (178 students) Actual '25 cohort grad rate was 55.14 (226 students)
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Grad 26 Cohort results will not be available until August 2026. As of May, 109 of the 243 students in the Horizon 26 cohort have completed graduation requirements.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	There were 44 students who graduated earlier than scheduled. 4 students in 27 cohort graduated a year early. 39 students were withdrawn for lack of attendance. A graduation cohort committee was formed that included teachers to mentor students. Mentors conference with mentees once every two weeks. The committee meets twice monthly to evaluate the progress of the four-year cohort students. We have added a 4th session on Wednesday evening so that students can earn a .5 or 1.0 credit. 32 of 35 students passed an additional class because of the 4th session in Q3. There were 26 Cohort students failing 2 or more classes are assigned staff mentors. We will offer 2 summer school sessions in June to allow additional students to graduate with their cohort.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

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

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATES			
Graduation Rate Longitudinal Data	FY24	FY25	FY26
	58.14 HRZ 50	55.14 HRZ 48.51	Available October 26

OVERALL CONTENT AREA DATA			
EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
American Literature & Comprehension	24.01%	N/A	N/A
Algebra	34.3%	23.3%	13.1%
Biology	34.1%	24.2%	22.6
U.S. History	20.3%	15.6%	12.0

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION – By Year						
EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	0%	0%	0%	3.5%	n/a	n/a
Level 3	18%	13%	15.3%	23.8%%		
Level 2	36%	30%	32.8%	28.7%		
Level 1	45%	57%	52.9%	44.1%		

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION (READING STATUS) – By Year						
Percentage of Students	FY24		FY25		FY26	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Grade Level and Above	43%	47.67%	33.5%	41.8%		n/a
Below Grade Level	57%	52.33%	66.5%	58.2%		

AMERICAN LITERATURE (READING) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year						
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Reading and Vocabulary		Key Ideas & Details		Vocabulary Acquisition & Use	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	11%	19%	13%	17%	11%	18%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	11%	15%	17%	21%	22%	21%

Level 1 Remediate Learning	78%	66%	70%	62%	62%	61%
----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

AMERICAN LITERATURE (Writing) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year						
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Craft & Structure		Writing and Language		Writing	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	10%	17%	6%	17%	7%	16%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	12%	14%	12%	16%	20%	19%
Level 1 Remediate Learning	78%	68%	82%	73%	73%	65%

ELA DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS		
AMERICAN LITERATURE & COMPOSITION (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses
What trends exist for all students in the: - Percentage of students reading on grade level or below grade level? - Percentage of students scoring Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?	FY25 American Lit scores overall, the number of level 1 decreased by 4.4% and level 2 decreased by 1.7%. At or above grade level reading was 47.44%. Our EL students scored an overall 7.69%, that is an increase of 1.3% from FY24 Our SWD students scored an overall 43.75% , that is an increase of 3.75% from FY24	- Percentage of students reading on grade level decreased from FY24 (51.9%) to FY25 (47.1%). - Percentage of Beginning (Level 1) and Developing (Level 2) increased from FY24 (75.5%) to FY25 (79.6%) on ELA EOC - Majority (66%) of students are reading at a remediate learning level - Percentage of students scoring at Level 3 in writing and language increased from 6% Winter to 17% Spring - Majority of students (73%) are scoring at the Remediate level in Writing in the Spring - There are 92.4 % of our EL students reading below grade level.

○ 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?		• There are 56.25 of our SWD students reading below grade level.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Cobb Horizon High School is experiencing persistent reading underperformance due to an increase in students entering below grade level, coupled with a growing population of English Language Learners (ELL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD). Cobb Horizon does not have access to a reading diagnostic for all students. Reading diagnostics will be instituted and used as a reading screener. Students enrolled in the literacy support course at Cobb Horizon High School continue to demonstrate gaps in writing and reading proficiency due to inconsistent implementation of targeted, research-based literacy strategies and limited opportunities for student engagement with grade-level texts. Cobb Horizon High School is experiencing an increase in Writing domain scores due to high levels of individualized support, consistent offline writing prompts with models, and writing instruction is more consistent during the Spring semester due to the implementation of new school-wide initiatives.	
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year	Strengths	Weaknesses

• 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?	• Horizon students' proficiency levels in upper courses Lit Comp 3 and Lit Comp 4 compared to Lit 2 Proficient and Distinguished learners. HRZ Lit 2 Proficient (19%) & Distinguished (44%) HRZ Lit 3 Proficient (42%) & Distinguished (22%) HRZ Lit 4 Proficient (36%) & Distinguished (42%) • Students have a basic command of grammar and conventions. Across all datasets, students tend to cluster in level 2 • A school-wide instructional strategy of collaborative scoring was implemented. Common writing prompts and scoring rubrics were implemented school-wide as well. • Local school writing data was not disaggregated by subgroups of ELL & SWD	• Because Cobb Horizon uses a scripted program (Edmentum) there are no common assessments available, other than the writing assessment data. • Students in Lit Comp 2 are entering with significant skill gaps, and foundational writing skills are not yet solidified • Based on teachers' evaluation of writing rubric scores Evidence and Elaboration are persistent weaknesses. Students struggle to move beyond basic evidence and offer limited explanation or analysis in writing. Students demonstrate difficulty with textual support, depth of reasoning, and analytical writing. • Purpose and Organization show moderate growth, but students struggle with strong thesis clarity, logical progression of ideas, and cohesion at an advanced level • Local school writing data was not disaggregated by subgroups of ELL & SWD
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Across all writing domains, students demonstrate gradual improvement from Beginning to Proficient Learners; however, persistent gaps remain in Evidence and Elaboration and higher-level organization skills due to underdeveloped foundational writing skills, inconsistent exposure to rigorous, standards-aligned writing instruction, and limited engagement with analytical writing tasks.	

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
	Horizon teachers were observed during instructional walkthroughs. The following elements were observed. - Pacing Guides posted - Conferencing with students 1 on 1 support - Offline assignments - Focus on writing instruction	Horizon based instructional walkthroughs, the following elements were noted. - Lack of small group instruction - Alternative approach for the use of AI in writing
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - There was a lack of structure in place that would allow for 1on1 and small group instruction - Lack of knowledge and experience with vetted resources.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☒ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- Clear expectations (4.26 on 5 pt scale) - Students are treated with respect (4.22) - Teachers grade and evaluate fairly (4.22)	- Limited opportunities for family involvement (3.76 on 5 pt scale) - Lack of emphasis on post-secondary planning (3.81 on 5-point scale)
Root Cause Explanation:		

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	The analysis of parent-perception data indicates that while Cobb Horizon High School has established a welcoming environment and maintains general communication with families, there is a lack of consistent, clear, and academically focused communication about student learning, progress, and available supports. This gap limits parents' ability to actively engage in their child's education and support learning at home.	
Additional Data Analysis (If relevant) Select all that apply: ☐ i-Ready 9 th & 10 th grade ☒ WIDA ACCESS Other(s): ☐ ☐	Strengths 1. Listening and speaking are the strongest domains - Grade 10: 60% of students score at levels 4-6 in Listening - Grade 11: 71% scored at levels 4-6 in Listening - Grade 12: 60% scored at levels 4-6 in Listening 2. Reading Skills are moderate to strong for many students. Reading performance exceeded Speaking and Writing in most grade bands. - Grade 11 had 47% of students at Levels 5-6 in Reading - Grade 12 had 22% of students at Levels 5-6 in Reading - Grade 10 has 20% at Levels 5-6 in Reading 3. Students Writing Primarily at Level 3 (Developing) - Grade 10 Writing: 75% at Level 3 - Grade 11 Writing: 82% at Level 3 - Grade 12 Writing: 74% at Level 3	Weaknesses 1. Speaking is the weakest domain across the school - Grade 12: 74% of students scored at Levels 1-2 Speaking - Grade 11: 89% scored at Levels 1-3 in Speaking - Grade 10: 60% scored at Levels 1-2 Speaking 2. Writing performance remains low across all grade levels - Grade 12: 91% scored at Levels 2-3 in Writing - Grade 11: 100% scored at Levels 2-3 in Writing - Grade 10: 90% scored at Levels 2-3 Writing 3. Overall scores remain concentrated in developing levels - Grade 12: 95% scored at Levels 2-3 overall - Grade 11: 94% scored at Levels 2-3 overall - Grade 10: 85% scored at Levels 2-3 overall
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: 1. Limited opportunities for structured academic discourse. 2. Insufficient explicit language instruction across content areas 3. Gaps in foundational literacy skills 4. Online learning environment has led to less language production	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	The percentage of students scoring developing, proficient, and distinguished (Level 2, 3, &4) on the ELA End of Course test writing domain 07 will increase from 33% (107) to 45% (145) for the 2027 school year (goal % based on 2025 SY data because 2026 data will not be released until 2027)		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Across all writing domains, students demonstrate gradual improvement from Beginning to Proficient Learners; however, persistent gaps remain in Evidence and Elaboration and higher-level organization skills due to underdeveloped foundational writing skills, inconsistent exposure to rigorous, standards-aligned writing instruction, and limited engagement with analytical writing tasks.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will create and implement common writing prompts	Evaluation Performance Target: 50% of students will score proficient on the writing rubric	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Teachers modify common writing prompts for all grade levels; CCC leads & Academic Coach create writing assessment schedule. Academic Coach and teacher leaders will identify and share best practices for student conferencing. - August-September: Teachers administer common writing prompts focused on building student capacity in evidence and elaboration. The teacher collaboratively scores writing. Complete initial conferencing. - October-December: Identify common writing trends, select strategies to build student writing capacity, and adjust writing instruction. Administer another writing prompt, complete student conferencing, and collaboratively score. - January-February: Analyze 2026 EOC writing performance and adjust writing instruction to address weaknesses. Teachers administer common writing prompts. Teachers collaboratively score writing.	Evaluation Tool(s): Common Writing Rubric	
☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ <u>Quarterly</u>	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: Teachers will meet in CCC to: - Analyze student writing using the common rubric - Identify trends in student strengths and gaps - Compare performance across classes and subgroups - Determine instructional next steps	
1. Teachers will engage in student writing conferencing each quarter/semester to improve student writing performance.			

	• March-April: Identify common writing trends, select strategies to build student writing capacity, and adjust writing instruction. Administer another writing prompt & collaboratively score. • May: Teachers analyze school-year data on writing performance outcomes to identify next steps. Artifacts to be Collected: Writing Rubrics Common writing prompts Collaborative scoring protocols Collaborative scoring schedule Student conferencing documents Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Quarterly	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students enrolled in the literacy support course at Cobb Horizon High School continue to demonstrate gaps in writing and reading proficiency due to inconsistent implementation of targeted, research-based literacy strategies and limited opportunities for student engagement with grade-level texts.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of the Reading Support Teachers will implement target research-based literacy strategies. Implementation Plan: • Preplanning:	Evaluation Performance Target: 100% of participating students will complete individualized learning plans in iReady. Evaluation Tool(s): • Skills assessments in iReady • Common Writing Rubric	
Target Student Group			

☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD	Evaluate the enrolling students to determine who will be enrolled in the course. Determine the number of students for each class. • August-September: Teachers will participate in iReady training Teachers will administer diagnostic assessment for Reading and Language Arts. Based on diagnostic results students will work on an individualized learning plan through iReady. Teachers will focus on strengthening areas of weaknesses through individualized instruction. Student progress data will be collected and interventions will be conducted based on data.	• Pre & Post Diagnostic Assessment	
Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)			
2. Reading/Writing Support Teachers will implement targeted literacy interventions through the Reading/Writing Lit Support Courses	• October-December: Teachers will administer post assessment for Reading and Language Arts. Based on results students will work on an individualized learning plan through iReady. Teachers will focus on strengthening areas of weaknesses through individualized instruction. Student progress data will be collected and interventions will be conducted based on data. • January-February: Teachers will administer diagnostic assessment for Reading and Language Arts. Based on diagnostic results students will work on an individualized learning plan through iReady. Teachers will focus on strengthening areas of weaknesses through individualized instruction. Student progress data will be collected and interventions will be conducted based on data • March-May Teachers will administer post assessment for Reading and Language Arts. Based on results students will work on an individualized learning plan through iReady. Teachers will focus on strengthening areas of weaknesses through individualized instruction. Student progress data will be collected and interventions will be conducted based on data Artifacts to be Collected:	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ <u>Quarterly</u> Data Analysis Plan: Diagnostic Assessment Report for student growth. Growth of students from pre- and post-diagnostic Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	

	Individualized Learning Plans Conference Form- Denoting Date and Topic/Intervention Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Quarterly		
--	--	--	--

ALGEBRA – By Year						
EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
Administrations	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	11%	4.32%	7%	5.5%	4.1%	7%
Level 3	44%	15.11%	17.8%	13.6%	5.5%%	10.3%
Level 2	19%	28.78%	25.6%	32.8%	42.5%	31%
Level 1	26%	51.80%	50%	48.1%	47.9%	55.1%

ALGEBRA – By Domain of Focus – Current Year								
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	06-Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning-Exponential Expressions & Equations		07-Functional & Graphical Reasoning		03- Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning		08- Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning- Sequence & Linear Functions	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	10%	7%	10%	10%	12%	17%	4%	3%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	7%	24%	7%	10%	5%	7%	17%	24%
Level 1 Remediate Learning	83%	68%	83%	79%	83%	76%	79%	72%

MATH DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

ALGEBRA I EOC (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses
• What trends exist for all students in the: ○ Percentage of students scoring at Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)? ○ Algebra EOC domain increases or decreases? • How do the trends differ for EL students? • How do the trends differ for SWD students?	• Horizon demonstrated an increase in levels 2, 3, and 4 from 15% in 2025 to 44.8% in 2026. • 9.37% increase in total students scoring from level 2 to level 4 • Horizon demonstrated a decrease in % of students scoring at level 1 from 2025 (85%) to 2026 (55.2). Essentially, it is volatile and changes from year to year. Compared to SWD, our EL group seems unstable, which is due to small subgroup size (6 tested in 2025, 11 tested in 2026), student turnover, English proficiency levels, and transiency/attendance. • 2 SWD students scored level 3 & 4 in 2026 versus 0 in 2025	• Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning-Exponential Expression & Equations Level 3 decreased for Winter to Spring by 3%. • After drilling down, there was evidence of skills deficits in solving 2 step equations and academic vocabulary. • SWD performance subgroup size is also very small (17 tested in 2025, 27 tested in 2026) • SWD demonstrated an increase in level 1 scores from 2025 (53%) to 2026 (85%) • For ELL students, academic vocabulary tends to be a barrier to mastery of standards.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction	Root Cause Explanation:	

☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Students demonstrate gaps in foundational skills specifically in solving two-step equations, number sense, and mastering academic vocabulary. Students also have difficulties with spatial reasoning, which causes challenges/problems in interpreting and analyzing graphs.	
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year • What trends exist for all students in the: ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to math domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness • How do the trends differ for EL students? • How do the trends differ for SWD students? The trends are stable with other subgroups across the three content areas.	Strengths • Unit 1 CFA average score of 76%, with 71% meeting or exceeding the standard • Unit 2 CFA average score of 75%, with 69% of students meeting or exceeding the standard • Unit 3 CFA average score of 65%, with 61% of students meeting or exceeding the standard • Unit 4 Assessment average score 65%, with 46% of students meeting or exceeding the standard • Unit 5/6 Assessment average score of 72%, with 58% meeting or exceeding the standard. For the most part, EL students are scoring the same as other students in Algebra and Advanced Algebra. There are some fluctuations in Geometry scores. This can be due to emphasis on vocabulary, theorems, postulates, and word problems. Limited English proficiency can interfere with math performance.	Weaknesses • 29% of students did not meet the standards on Unit 1 CFA • 31% of students did not meet the standards on Unit 2 CFA • 38% of students did not meet the standards on Unit 3 CFA • 54% of students did not meet the standards on the Unit 4 Assessment • 42% of students did not meet the standards on Unit 5/6 Assessment

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: After reflecting on common assessments across Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Algebra, teachers noticed that some summative assessments are ineffective and do not accurately reflect student learning. Creating mixed assessments with multiple-choice, open-ended/constructed responses and error analysis will allow students to demonstrate “how” and explain “why.” Assessments should be created with achievement-level descriptors that target student mastery and command of knowledge and skills at each level to increase rigor (especially for Algebra).	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - MATH • What instructional practices/processes are consistently observed during MATH walks? • What instructional practices/processes are consistently missing or ineffective during MATH walks?	Strengths Based on TKES formative observations and weekly CCC meetings: • COLA educators consistently implement research-based active engagement strategies specifically designed for a virtual learning environment. • Faculty demonstrate proficiency in utilizing instructional technologies, including document camera and standards-aligned digital resources. • The math team consistently applies instruction models to provide clear, systematic teaching approaches in a virtual learning environment.	Weaknesses Based on TKES formative observations and weekly CCC meetings: • Teachers ability to monitor student engagement and understanding is limited by virtual instructional environment.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Students have gaps in their prior knowledge and academic vocabulary (e.g., number sense). Students also demonstrate gaps in interpreting and analyzing word problems, as well as in solving equations. Some students experience difficulties with spatial reasoning, graph interpretation, and analysis.	

Survey Summary Data	Strengths	Weaknesses
☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____ Cognia Survey	• Our school is focused on student success (4.79 on 5 pt scale) • Shared values and beliefs guide decision making (4.63 on 5 pt scale) • School provides a variety of resources to support student learning (4.6 on 5 pt scale)	• School personnel regularly engage families in their children’s learning progress (3.93 on 5 pt scale) • Teachers in our school regularly use strategies that require collaboration and self-regulation (4.16 on a 5 pt scale) • Our teachers use multiple types of assessments to modify instruction and revise the curriculum (4.21 on a 5 pt scale)
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:	Root Cause Explanation:	
☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	While Cobb Horizon High School & COLA demonstrates strong leadership, a positive professional culture, and access to resources, it has an inconsistent implementation of high-quality assessment practices.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	The percentage of students passing the three core math classes (Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Algebra) will increase from 74% (58 students) to 80% (63 students) in Algebra; 78% (164 students) to 85% (180 students) in Geometry; 92% (358 students) to 95% (370 students) in Advanced Algebra.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers consistently notice gaps in foundational math skills, specifically in number sense and mastering academic vocabulary, which is compounded by ineffective summative assessment practices.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will deliver at least three lessons on math content vocabulary. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Algebra teachers will reevaluate and revise the vocabulary terms that will be taught. Geometry and Advanced Algebra teachers will determine targeted academic vocabulary for units. Teachers will create related common formative assessments on the district's CTLS Assess platform	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will perform at least at the developing level or higher on three school-created academic vocabulary common formative assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): School-created academic vocabulary assessments located in CTLS Assess for easy data monitoring.	
Target Student Group	- August-September: Teachers will administer at least one content vocabulary targeted assessment related to the current lesson/unit. - October-December: Teachers will administer at least two content vocabulary targeted assessments related to the current unit. - January-February: Analyze the effectiveness of the content vocabulary lessons. Teachers will administer at least one content-vocabulary-targeted assessment related to the current unit/lesson.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Collaborative teams will review data collected in CTLS Assess to determine the percentage of students performing at the beginner, developing, proficient, and distinguished levels. Students at the beginning levels will receive remediation and be reassessed for growth.	
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
1. Math teachers will deliver content vocabulary lessons in Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Algebra courses; assessment data will be collected every month.			

	• March-April: Teachers will administer at least two content vocabulary targeted assessments related to the current lesson/unit. • May/Post planning- Review all lessons and related assessments for effectiveness and adjust as necessary Artifacts to be Collected: Assessment plan Assessment Results Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Semester (assessment plan) Quarterly (Assessment results)	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	After reflecting on common assessments across Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Algebra, teachers noticed that some summative assessments are ineffective and do not accurately reflect student learning. Creating mixed assessments with multiple-choice, open-ended/constructed responses and error analysis will allow students to demonstrate “how” and explain “why.” Assessments should be created with achievement-level descriptors that target student mastery and command of knowledge and skills at each level to increase rigor (especially for Algebra).		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will administer collaboratively created common unit (summative) assessments aligned to the standard.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will perform at least at the developing level on summative assessments.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Teachers will create/modify unit assessments in Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Algebra. - August-September: Teachers will align standards to learning targets, success criteria, and Units 1 and 2 summative assessments. Teachers will administer and analyze unit assessments within the CCC. - October-December: Teachers will align standards to learning targets, success criteria, and Units 3 & 4 summative assessments. Teachers will administer and analyze unit assessments within the CCC. - January-February: Teachers will analyze and modify units 1 & 2 assessments in Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Algebra. - March-April: Teachers will administer and analyze Units 3 & 4 assessments within the CCC.	Evaluation Tool(s): Teacher-created assessment located in CTLS, Formative, and Edmentum for easy data monitoring.	
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: Collaborative teams will review data collected in CTLS Assess, Formative, and Edmentum to determine the percentage of students performing at the beginner, developing, proficient, and distinguished levels. Students who perform at the beginning levels will be offered remediation and reassessment for growth.	
2. Math teachers will create and revise standards-aligned unit assessments connected to learning targets and success criteria; summative assessment data will be collected monthly.		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
	Artifacts to be Collected:		

	Week at a Glance Formative Assessment Plan Assessment Plan Summative Data Analysis Pacing Guide Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: COLA Week at a Glance (two weeks) COLA Formative Assessment Plan (Semester) Horizon Quarterly Assessment Plan		
--	---	--	--

BIOLOGY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
Administrations	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	8%	2.92%	4%	7.69%	4%	2%
Level 3	29%	19.30%	24%	27.22%	21%	7%
Level 2	23%	30.99%	22%	28.40%	28%	15%
Level 1	41%	46.78%	51%	36.69%	47%	76%

BIOLOGY – By Domain of Focus – Current Year								
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	Cells		Genetics & Heredity		Classification		Evolution	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	14	7	24	2	18	7	20	7
Level 2 Monitor Learning	32	15	20	17	22	32	24	22
Level 1 Remediate Learning	54	71	56	80	61	61	56	71

BIOLOGY DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS (if applicable)		
BIOLOGY EOC (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses
What trends exist for all students in the: - Percentage of students scoring Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)? - Biology EOC domain increases or decreases? How do the trends differ for EL students?	- The percentage of students scoring level 1 was lower in the Winter (47%) than Spring (76%) - The percentage of students scoring at level 3 in all domain areas was consistently higher in the winter than the spring. 9% of students scored at level 3 or 4 on the Biology EOC in 2026. 11.9% of students scored at a level or 4 on the assessment.	- Horizon students demonstrated a decline in percent of students scoring levels 2, 3, and 4 from 2025 (38.2%) to 2026 (26.2%) - Horizon students demonstrated an increase in percent of students scoring at level 1 from 2025 (61.8%) to 2026 (73.8%) - EL students demonstrated an increase in level 1 performance from 2025 (63%) to 2026 (71%) - Students with SWD make 15% of students tested in Biology. 97% (5 students) of those students scored level 1.

How do the trends differ for SWD students?	EL students on CTLS interim assessments outperformed non-EL peers in most units (86%, 81%, 94%, and 83%), indicating strong engagement with biology content. Of the 15% of SWD tested, 45% of them were 2 or 3 questions away from scoring at level 2.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	Students demonstrate a lack of background knowledge and academic vocabulary.	
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year - What trends exist for all students in the: - Percentages mastering standards aligned to science domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness - How do the trends differ for EL students? - How do the trends differ for SWD students?	Strengths	Weaknesses
	87.5% (70 of 80 students) passed Biology. - The average grade of students who took Biology was 73.5 (80 students) - General education students had a course pass rate of 86.5% 100% of SWD (8 students) passed the biology course. - ELL students had a course passage rate of 88.2% (15 of 17 students). - The average grade in Biology for SWD students was 77.9.	- Still building common CTLS assessments for Biology after Edmentum course upheaval at the start of SY25 - Edmentum assessments are not truly common because assessment questions are randomized from a question bank; tests and quizzes cannot be edited in Edmentum - ELL/SWD appears to be the highest-risk group. The combined ELL/SWD group averages only 66.0, about 7.5 points below the overall average. However, there are only 3 records, so this should be treated as a signal for further investigation rather than a definitive group conclusion.

	ELL performance is close to the overall average. ELL averages 72.1, about 1.4 points below the overall 73.5 average. The bigger issue is variation: the scores range from 17 to 90.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Teacher pacing was an issue. There was an imbalance of time, with teachers spending the bulk of the time on one unit, leaving little time for other priority standards to be taught. Students experienced disjointed instruction when the A and B portions of the course was taken out of sequence.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – BIOLOGY What instructional practices/processes are consistently observed during BIOLOGY walks? What instructional practices/processes are consistently missing or ineffective during BIOLOGY walks?	Strengths	Weaknesses
	Vocabulary Instruction Differentiation	Dependency on technology format makes it difficult to demand critical thinking skills, such as analysis, as well as to establish relevance. Feedback connected to the language of the standards

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:
	The Edmentum course underwent a major revision over the summer of 2025, and teachers had to relearn the structure and rework all assessments.

U.S. HISTORY – By Year						
EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
Administrations	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	2%	6.75%	1%	5.3%	1%	1%

Level 3	20%	21.3%	15%	19.7%	9%	10%
Level 2	34%	41.27%	36%	35.23%	24%	16%
Level 1	44%	30.95%	49%	39.77%	67%	73%

U.S. HISTORY – By Domain of Focus – Current Year								
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter the domain that is most significant)	Domain 04- Establishment as World Power		Domain 02- New Republic Through Reconstruction		Domain 01- Colonization through the Constitution		Domain 03- Industrialization, Reform & Imperialism	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	8	7	9	10	12	7	11	6
Level 2 Monitor Learning	32	8	22	19	28	14	26	14
Level 1 Remediate Learning	60	85	69	71	60	79	63	79

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

US History EOC (3-year trends)

- **What trends exist for all students in the:**

- Percentage of students scoring Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?
- Percentages mastering standards aligned to social studies domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness
- Level 2 declining from FY24 (41.27%) to FY26 Winter (24%).
- Level 1 significantly increased from FY 24 Spring (30.95%) to FY26 Winter (67%).
- US History EOC domain increases or decreases?

- **How do the trends differ for EL students?**

- **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**

- Domain 2 (New Republic Through Reconstruction) had the smallest gap; the highest compared to the district alignment.
- Level 3 increased in Domain 4 (Establishment as World Power)
- Level 3 increased in Domain 3 (Industrialization Reform & Imperialism)
- Students scored the highest average in Domain 1 Colonization (1.5) and Domain 2 New Republic (1.5)
- Very little change was noted in percentage at levels of performance from 2025 to 2026:

Level	2025	2026
1	50%	51%
2	35%	35%
3	14%	12%
4	1%	2%

Students showed a high level of mastery of the tested standards. SWDs & ELL performed at proficient levels.

- Percentage of students scoring level 1 increased in the FY 26 school year to 67% in the Winter and 52% in the Spring
- Percentage of students scoring Level 4 significantly decreased from FY 24 (6.75%) to FY 26 Winter (1%)
- Percentage of students scoring Level 1 significantly increased from FY 24 Spring (30.95%) to FY 26 Winter (67%)
- In Domain 4 (Establishment as World Power), level 2 decreased and level 1 increased.
- In Domain 2 (New Republic through Reconstruction, level 2 decreased and level 1 increased
- In Domain 1 (Colonization through Constitution), level 2 decreased and level 1 increased.
- In Domain 3 (Industrialization Reform & Imperialism), level 2 decreased and level 1 increased.
- Percentage of students scoring level 3 decreased in Domain 1 (Colonization through Constitution) and Domain 3 (Industrialization Reform & Imperialism)
- 90% of ELL Students scored level 1 on the Winter administration of the EOC
- 80% of SWD Students scored level 1 on the Winter administration of the EOC
- Level 1 performance of ELL students increased from 2025 (80%) to 2026 (92%)
- Level 1 performance SWD students increased from 2025 (47%) to 2026 (67%)

Overall, SWDs and ELL students underperform on assessments compared to on-level and honors students.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	- The EOC was viewed as low value because the assessment is worth 10% and does not determine whether the student passes or fails the course. - Horizon and COLA have experienced dramatic changes in populations, shifting from 55% ED in 2025 to 100% in 2026. The percentage of homeless students is significantly higher than in traditional schools. Many of these students have experienced gaps in their education as they struggled in traditional environments.	
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year What trends exist for all students in the: How do the trends differ for EL students? How do the trends differ for SWD students?	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- Average score of US History U1 (Colonialism) was 79%. 71% of students scored distinguished on the U1 Colonialism assessment. - Average score of US History U2 (The American Revolution) was 80% - Average score of US History U3 (The New Republic) was 86%. - Average score of US History U4A Sectionalism & Civil War was 88%. - Average score of US History 4B Sectionalism 7 Civil War was 81%. - Average score of US History U5 (Expansion & Reform) was 82%.	The percentage of level 2, 3 and level 4 decreased from 2024 (50%) to 2025 (41.8%) to 2026 (27.3%)

	• Average score of US History U6 (WWI & the 1920s) was 89%. • Average score of US History U7A (The Great Depression, WWII) was 82%. • Average score of US History U7B (The Great Depression, WWII) was 81%. • Average score of US History U8 (The Cold War & Civil Rights) was 84%. • Average score of US History U9 (Modern US History) was 82%.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Academic vocabulary acquisition is an area of growth for students in US History courses. Students who struggle with vocabulary will also have difficulties with historical comprehension.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – US HISTORY • What instructional practices/processes are consistently observed during US HISTORY walks?	Strengths	Weaknesses
	• Use of offline review activities to prep students for summative. • Pacing guides are helpful for student accountability and forward progress within the course.	• Students struggle with document-based analysis. • Some students cannot independently read and analyze sources. • Some students have a weak vocabulary foundation.

• What instructional practices/processes are consistently missing or ineffective during US HISTORY walks?	• Guided notes help the students master the course material	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Analysis of student performance data in US History indicated that many students struggle to demonstrate proficiency on benchmark and summative assessments due to limited academic vocabulary knowledge. Students often have difficulty comprehending complex informational texts, primary and secondary sources, and assessment questions that require vocabulary knowledge.	

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA / OTHER DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: Graduation rate	The percentage of students in cohort 2027 enrolled at Horizon/COLA in August 2026 will improve from 45% (77 students) projected to graduate on time to 57% (97 students) who have graduated or graduated early as of July 2027.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	55% of students are not on track to graduate with their cohort.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of the Graduation Cohort committee will work to identify students at risk of not graduating with the cohort 2027 Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Establish a committee, assign roles, set expectations for monitoring check-ins, and individual learning plans. - August-September: Identify target off-track students. Students are assigned an additional graduation mentor. Have an initial check-in with targeted students	Evaluation Performance Target: 100% of students will be on track in AOC courses Evaluation Tool(s): Failure Reports Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Graduation Cohort Committee will monitor targeted off-track students through mentoring check-ins and individualized learning plans; student progress data will be collected monthly.	- October-December: Graduation mentors continue to monitor targeted students. The committee meets to determine if additional intervention strategies need to be implemented. - January-February: Preplanning at the start of the second semester will include a review of strategies from the fall, as well as any additional strategies identified by the committee in December - March-April: Graduation mentors continue to monitor targeted students. - May: The Graduation Cohort Committee will meet to determine strengths and areas of improvement, and prepare for pre-planning the following year Artifacts to be Collected: Graduation Cohort Conference Form End of Quarter Failure Report Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Data Analysis Plan: The cohort committee will analyze data from Edmentum, course passage data, and the failure report to identify off-track students and assign a mentor. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads ☒ Graduation Cohort Committee	
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% Students will successfully pass Fourth Session courses. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Scheduling teams and counselors will determine the courses offered during the fourth session 1st quarter. Select staff for the fourth course. - August-September:	Evaluation Performance Target: 100% of 4th session students will pass the course. Evaluation Tool(s): Course completion report Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly	
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			

Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. Counselors and Scheduling Teams will provide additional opportunities for students to obtain credits through Fourth Session and Summer School. Course completion data will be collected quarterly and at the end of summer school.	In the fourth session, the staff will monitor student progress. Course completion data will be collected at the end of the 1st Quarter. - October-December: The scheduling team and counselors will determine which courses will be offered during the fourth session of the 2nd quarter. In the fourth session, the staff will monitor student progress. Course completion data will be collected at the end of the 2nd Quarter. Course completion data will be collected. - January-February: The scheduling team and counselors will determine which courses will be offered during the fourth session of the 3rd quarter. In the fourth session, the staff will monitor student progress. Course completion data will be collected at the end of the 3rd Quarter. Course completion data will be collected. - March-April: The scheduling team and counselors will determine which courses will be offered during the fourth session of the 4th quarter. In the fourth session, the staff will monitor student progress. Course completion data will be collected at the end of the 4th quarter. Course completion data will be collected. The summer school team works together to develop the course schedule for the two Summer School sessions. Registration for summer school begins. - May: The scheduling team and counselors will analyze course completion data and reflect on the initiative's success. Summer school schedules and staff are finalized. - Summer School session one during the first two weeks in June. - Second Summer School session begins the last two weeks of June.	☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ <u>Quarterly</u> Data Analysis Plan: The scheduling team and counselors will analyze the 4th session and the Summer School course completion. The team will identify strengths and areas for improvement in the session. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	

	Artifacts to be Collected: Fourth session course completion report. Summer school course completion report Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Quarterly End of Summer School		
--	--	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<i>*Must be listed in the school policy</i>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required: * Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, a description of the curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, the professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement, including use of the family resource center.	9/2/26		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026) Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	9/9/26-9/30/26		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participating in discussions about the family engagement funds.	3/16/2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of parents' contributions, including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between parents and the school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	8/17/2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5
	3/1/2027		☒ 3 ☐ 6
5. Required: * Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visiting the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. Briefly describe the transition activities here: During the enrollment meetings, students and parents will learn tips on how to be successful at both COLA and Cobb Horizon High School.	May 27 July 22 July 27 July 30 Aug 11 Aug 18 Sept 29 Oct 6 Oct 20 Dec 15 Jan 4 Jan 12 Jan 19 Mar 2 Mar 9 Mar 23		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

6. Required: <u>Provide translated information</u> related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> Fall Input Survey Annual Title I Meeting Spring Input Survey	<table> <tr> <td>☐ 1</td> <td>☐ 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☐ 2</td> <td>☒ 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>☐ 3</td> <td>☐ 6</td> </tr> </table>	☐ 1	☐ 4	☐ 2	☒ 5	☐ 3	☐ 6
☐ 1	☐ 4							
☐ 2	☒ 5							
☐ 3	☐ 6							

Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)

Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SW/P Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
Curriculum in Action Night- educate parents on effective strategies to support their children’s success in high school. Range of topics, including study habits, time management, and communication skills. Parents will understand the importance of regular attendance and recognize the signs of academic or emotional struggles. We will provide resources and tips on how to collaborate with teachers and school staff to ensure their child’s academic and personal growth	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3		Non-needed	Sept. 16, 2026	Attendance roster Event Survey	Parent facilitator Principal Transition Specialist Edmentum Liaison
Post-secondary opportunities (What happens after high school) virtual parent session: The session will provide parents with a comprehensive overview of the various pathways available after high school, including college, vocational training, apprenticeships, and direct entry into the workforce. We will discuss the benefits and requirements of each option. We will cover important topics such as the college application process, financial aid, scholarships, and the importance of early planning.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	Info Flyer/Posters	Non-needed	Oct 27, 2026	Attendance Roster; Attendee Survey	Counseling Dept Heads Parent Facilitator Career Coach
A Title I Family Data Night helps families understand their student’s academic performance and progress toward school and graduation goals. Families review student data such as assessment scores, course grades, attendance, and credit completion with support from school staff. The event also provides families with strategies and resources to address areas of need, support learning at home, and partner with the school to improve student achievement.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☒ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☐ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	Presentation	Non-needed	Jan. 27, 2027	Event Survey Attendance Roster	Parent facilitator Core content department leads Counseling Dept

Enrollment Meeting/Orientation At the start of the school year, students and families are invited to campus to receive training on how to access our districtwide communication system: Parent Vue. The program allows families to easily communicate with teachers right from their phones as well as check student grades. They also receive training and support in accessing our learning platform CTLS. For COLA students, this includes how to access the live virtual instruction. (Goal 4 - CTLS Parent Resources - Monitored by Academic Coach with attendance taken)	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	Student Handbook Parent Vue login directions Student transcript	Non-needed	May 27 July 22 July 27 July 30 Aug 11 Aug 18 Sept 29 Oct 6 Oct 20 Dec 15 Jan 4 Jan 12 Jan 19 Mar 2 Mar 9 Mar 23	Attendance roster Student enrollment form Parent survey	Asst Principal
--	--	--	--	-------------------	---	--	-----------------------

GADOE required six "Shall's". Each 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 is 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 on parent input. (#14 in list of "shalls" and "mays")

School Improvement Plan Required Questions

Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)

1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during 1 year; unless the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of the 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, the dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and the dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)**

2. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and, if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. <i>Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)</i>
3. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans remain in effect for the duration of the school’s participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end-of-year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. <i>SWP Checklist 5(c)</i>
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 posts the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school’s website and in multiple languages. <i>SWP Checklist 5(d)</i>
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. <i>SWP Checklist 5(e)</i> <u>Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)</u> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Student participation in career technical education programs positively impacts student progress toward graduation. In addition, the school plan includes the addition of an instructional paraprofessional to support literacy growth.
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 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 a 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 regularly evaluates student performance on EOC and benchmark assessments. In addition course passage rate, number of graduates is evaluated on a quarterly basis.

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: School analyzes course completion and EOC data as well as graduation cohort success rate.

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: School analyzes data at mid-year to determine effectiveness to date and adjustments to the plan that should be made.

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's 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, which specifically identifies 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's 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 and, where applicable, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps.** *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 and, where applicable, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps. <i>SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)</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.). <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: The school mentoring program is designed to address barriers to student success, including lack of attendance and lack of academic progress.
14. <u>Describe professional development</u> and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, <u>and to recruit and retain effective teachers</u>, particularly in high-need subjects. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Professional development regarding differentiation for ELL & SWD, effective vocabulary instructional strategies and interactive strategies was presented.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(v)</i> 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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: The school provides multiple opportunities for students to learn about post-secondary opportunities, including college tours, college representative visits, Life Ready Fair, and lunch and learns.
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, which 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. <i>SWP Checklist 1</i>

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals

SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)

Position	Supports Goal(s)	Supports which system(s)	How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?
Academic Coach	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The Academic Coach will provide and/or coordinate all professional development required by the plan. The Coach will participate in CCC meetings for ELA & Math to monitor implementation and progress. The Coach will also meet with Department Chairs and the AOC team to monitor student progress in coursework.
Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Teacher approval pending TRS letter June/July
Parent Facilitator(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	• Family Engagement and Communication: The Parent Facilitator will establish strong communication channels with families, ensuring they are informed about school goals, programs, and student progress, which fosters a collaborative school-home partnership. • Workshops and Support for Parents: The facilitator will coordinate with teachers and staff to organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies to support their children's academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. • Increased Parental Involvement: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. • Connecting Families with Resources: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.

Instructional Paraprofessional	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	• Tutor struggling students in ELA Courses • Provide writing feedback and assistance to students struggling with writing assignments • Mentor cohort students to improve attendance and academic performance
--------------------------------	--	---	--

School Improvement Goals <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy.</i>	
Goal #1	The percentage of students scoring developing, proficient, and distinguished (Level 2, 3, &4) on the ELA End of Course test writing domain 07 will increase from 33% to 45% for the 2027 school year.
Goal #2	The percentage of students passing the three core math classes (Algebra, Geometry, and Advanced Algebra) will increase from 74% (58 students) to 80% (63 students) in Algebra; 78% (164 students) to 85% (180 students) in Geometry; 92% (358 students) to 95% (370 students) in Advanced Algebra.
Goal #3	The percentage of students in cohort 2027 enrolled at Horizon/COLA in August 2026 will improve from 45% (77 students) projected to graduate on time to 57% (97 students) who have actually graduated or graduated early as of July 2027.