

School Improvement Plan

Title I Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	High School
Principal Name:	Dr. Dana C. Giles
Date Submitted:	June 1, 2026
Revision Date(s):	July 28, 2026

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Pebblebrook High School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Dr. Glenn J. Richard
<i>Position</i>	Assistant Principal
<i>Email</i>	Glenn.Richard@Cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	770-819-2521
Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems ONLY
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only
Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>
School Response: The School Improvement Plan was developed through a collaborative process that actively engaged a diverse group of stakeholders, including administrators, teachers, academic coaches, department chairs, support staff, parents, students, and community representatives. Input was gathered through School Leadership Team meetings, department and Professional Collaborative Community discussions, surveys, data review sessions, and school improvement planning meetings. Stakeholders analyzed student achievement, perception, and program data to identify strengths, areas of need, and priorities for improvement. Feedback from these groups was used to inform the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, establish school improvement goals, and develop action steps designed to support student achievement and overall school success.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are 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 in 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: 4		May 14, 2026	May 21, 2026	May 28, 2026
Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature		
Principal	Dr. Dana Giles	Dana C. Giles		
Title I Supervisor	Delores Thompson	Delores Thompson		
Assistant Principal	Sharon Dixon	Sharon Dixon		
Academic Coach-Social Studies	Lisa Garvey	Lisa Garvey		
Academic Coach-ELA	Sharia Collins	Sharia Collins		
Academic Coach-Math	George Washington	George Washington		
Academic Coach-Science	Rachel Rogers	Rachel Rogers		
Parent Facilitator	Charlene Holder	Charlene Holder		
Parent	Toni Russell	Toni Russell		
Student	Morgan Russell	Morgan Russell		
Title I District Academic Coach	Brittany Matthews	Brittany Matthews		
Title I District Academic Coach	Wendy Torres	Wendy Torres		

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	The percentage of students scoring at or above level reading Lexile scores will increase from 65% to 70% as measured by the EOC assessment data. The non-EOC ELA courses for the FY26 school year will have 65% of students score at or above level on the final reading comprehension exam.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	There is no data to support the EOC assessment data; that data will be available in Fall 2026. CommonLit assessment series data was used for the non-EOC ELA courses. Only 58% of students in non-EOC ELA courses scored at or above level on the final reading comprehension exam.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	- Provide targeted professional learning focused on explicit reading comprehension instruction, including close reading, text annotation, evidence-based responses, and strategies aligned to the new Georgia ELA Standards. - Strengthen intervention and remediation opportunities for students performing below grade level through small-group instruction, targeted tutorials, and differentiated reading supports. - Utilize CommonLit, NoRedInk, and other district-approved resources to provide additional practice with complex literary and informational texts aligned to assessed standards. - Ensure consistent implementation of student-friendly learning targets, success criteria, and higher-order questioning strategies during instruction to improve student engagement and comprehension. - Expand opportunities for students to engage in structured academic discourse, text-based discussions, and writing about reading to deepen comprehension and critical thinking. - Monitor instructional implementation through classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and collaborative planning sessions to ensure evidence-based literacy practices are consistently utilized across all ELA classrooms.

If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	N/A
---	-----

Previous Year's Goal #2	The percentage of math students scoring proficient will increase from 33% (approximately 177 students) to 36% (approximately 201 students) as measured by the EOC data. The non-EOC math courses for the FY26 school year will have 61% (approximately 530 students) to score in the proficient and distinguished level on the final exam.		
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially			
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The EOC data along with the final exam data.		
Reflecting on Outcomes			
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Teachers will receive additional training during pre-planning to address teaching students with disabilities and strategies to support our ELL and IEL students.		
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the	N/A		

success of the goal?	
----------------------	--

Previous Year's Goal #3	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 34% to 38% as measured by 2025-2026 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 43% to 47% as measured by the 2025-2026 Summative Assessments.
Was the goal met? ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished has increased from 34% to 47% as measured by 2025-2026 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished has increased from 43% to 53% as measured by the 2025-2026 Summative Assessments.
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	N/A
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	Students struggled with understanding both Tier 2 (academic/instructional) and Tier 3 (content-specific) vocabulary, which impacted their ability to comprehend complex texts, apply scientific knowledge, and analyze higher-order concepts assessed on the EOC. To address this need, the department implemented consistent, research-based vocabulary strategies across all science classrooms. Teachers embedded explicit vocabulary instruction within each unit, incorporated etymology to help students decode unfamiliar terms, and provided intentional scaffolds to support vocabulary acquisition and comprehension. Structured academic discussions and repeated exposure to key terminology allowed students to engage with vocabulary in meaningful contexts rather than through isolated memorization. Additionally, teachers reinforced vocabulary development during SOAR Week activities and used weekly formative assessments to monitor progress and adjust instruction as needed. The consistent implementation of these strategies across classrooms contributed to increased student familiarity with academic and scientific language, improved comprehension of complex concepts, and stronger performance on classroom and EOC-aligned assessments.

Previous Year's Goal #4	During the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of US History EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC will increase from 41% (approximately 223 students) to 44% (approximately 245 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 US History EOC During the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 45% (approximately 600 students) to 50% as measured by the 2025-2026 summative assessments.
Was the goal met? ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	During the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of US History EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC was 50%, as measured by the 2025-2026 US History EOC During the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of Non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on Summative Assessments was 54% as measured by the 2025-2026 summative assessments.
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	N/A
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	• Overall growth in U.S. History was driven by stronger instructional consistency, increased rigor, and clearer academic expectations across classrooms. • Clear learning targets and success criteria helped students better understand learning goals, increasing ownership, and improving performance. • Increased use of document analysis, academic discourse, and evidence-based thinking strengthened engagement, literacy, and historical thinking skills. • Purposeful instructional routines and clear classroom expectations created more academically focused environments with consistent student participation in rigorous tasks. • Student self-assessment tools, such as checklists and progress monitoring, supported reflection and helped students track progress toward mastery. • Teachers increasingly used instructional data to inform planning and respond to student needs, though opportunities remain to make data usage more explicit during daily instruction.

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

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATES			
Graduation Rate Longitudinal Data	FY24	FY25	FY26
	75.9%		

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	34%	34%	n/a (Lit. 2 Data coming Fall 2026)
Algebra	30%	33%	26%
Biology	41%	34%	47%
U.S. History	38%	40%	50%

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION – By Year						
EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26 (Lit. 2 Data coming Fall 2026)	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	3%	5%	3.3	4	n/a	n/a
Level 3	32.5	27.6	33.3%	28	n/a	n/a
Level 2	36.8	35.1	37.6	37	n/a	n/a
Level 1	27.9	32.3	25.8	29	n/a	n/a

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION (READING STATUS) – By Year						
Percentage of Students	FY24		FY25		FY26 (Lit. 2 Data coming Fall 2026)	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Grade Level and Above	62.9	59.2	69.9%	61%	n/a	n/a
Below Grade Level	37.1	40.8	30.1%	39%	n/a	n/a

AMERICAN LITERATURE (READING) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (Lit. 2 Data coming Fall 2026)						
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Insert Domain HERE		Insert Domain HERE		Insert Domain HERE	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 2 Monitor Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Level 1 Remediate Learning	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Literature & Composition II (Writing) – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (Lit. 2 Data coming Fall 2026)

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

ELA DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

Literature & Composition II (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses
	The percentage of students earning a distinguished score on the American Literature EOC increased from winter to spring in both 2024 and 2025.	Based on the previous American Literature data (24-25), American Literature students did not meet the content mastery learning target by 2.29%. The percentage of students reading on or above grade level decreased by 1% in 2024. The percentage of students reading above grade level decreased by 8.9% in 2025.

• How do the trends differ for EL students? • How do the trends differ for SWD students?	Based on the previous American Lit. Data (24-25), EL students exceeded the improvement target by 1.17% compared to all student data who did not meet the improvement target. Based on the previous American Lit. Data (24-25), SWD students exceeded the improvement target by 1.54%.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Students demonstrate inconsistent use of reading strategies, limiting their ability to navigate and comprehend increasingly complex texts across a variety of genres. Teachers need deeper support in professional learning in unpacking and decoding state standards, impacting teachers’ ability to deliver and align standards-based instruction. Students need support with reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and proficiency. Teachers require training on explicit reading instruction, integrating consistent vocabulary instruction with Greek and Latin morphemes, and implementing strategies for English Language Learners (ELLs). The percentage of transient students and ELL students increased.	

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?	Based on the 9th grade common assessment data The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency increased from 32% on the pre-assessment to 50% on the post-assessment administered via CommonLit. This means that 335 students are either on or above grade-level reading expectations based on the CommonLit assessment series expectations. (There was a 4% decrease in students reading three or more grade levels below from the Fall Administration to the Spring Administration (44% to 40%) on the iReady assessment. 74% of students demonstrate proficiency when analyzing informational texts. Based on the 10th grade common assessment data: The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency increased from 40% on the pre-assessment to 69% on the post-assessment in CommonLit. This means that 427 students are either on or above grade-level reading	Based on the Common Lit. Post-Assessment data, all students need support with analyzing complex literary and informational texts, which align with the new GA Doe Texts domain. EL student proficiency is lower than that of native English speakers on Common Formative Assessments due to limited language proficiency. SWD students demonstrate decreased proficiency opportunities when technology accommodations are not an option in district resources (Common Lit.)

	expectations based on CommonLit assessment series expectations. 76% of 10th-grade students demonstrate proficiency when analyzing literary texts. Based on the 11th grade common assessment data: The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency increased from 28% on the pre-assessment to 65% on the post-assessment in CommonLit. This means that 326 students are either on or above grade-level reading expectations based on the CommonLit assessment series expectations. 72% of 11th-grade students demonstrate proficiency when analyzing literary texts. Based on the 12th grade common assessment data: The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency increased from 28% on the pre-assessment to 58% on the post-assessment. This means that 361 students are either at or above grade-level reading comprehension expectations based on the CommonLit assessment series. Writing:	
--	--	--

	All students are using district resources to model writing strategies and to guide writing instruction. SWD and EL students demonstrate increased proficiency when using guided writing practice strategies like sentence stems and graphic organizers.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	1. Teachers need additional training on modeling, explicit teaching, and monitoring student use of evidence-based reading strategies to support all learners. 2. Instructional strategies for writing and methods for providing feedback on constructed and extended responses are inconsistent across the department. 3. Strategies for assessing writing are needed for all teachers.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - ELA • What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during ELA walks? • What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during ELA walks?	Strengths	Weaknesses
	100% of teachers plan to use the 4-question instructional framework model to guide instruction. 100% of teachers consistently use district resources to provide instruction (CommonLit. And No Red Ink).	Based on the ELA instructional walks, 45% of teachers use data collection and data analysis methods used to guide instruction across grade levels (vertical teaming/practices). 45% of teachers did not demonstrate use of student-friendly learning targets aligned with the ELA standards to address the full standard

	80% of teachers are using a variety of active/evidence-based learning strategies (jigsaw, flexible grouping, turn-and-talks, fishbowl discussions, and collaborative group work to guide instruction. 100% of teachers consistently integrating technology in the classroom.	30% of teachers use higher-level question stems aligned with the state's standards to increase rigor in guided instruction. 60% of teachers use formative assessments/exit tickets to measure student mastery/guide remediation. 60% of teachers provide guided and independent reading opportunities using rigorous texts.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers require additional training in leveraging deconstructed standards to develop and deliver rigorous, engaging lesson plans. - Teachers require training on how to monitor students' ability to effectively execute the use of evidence-based strategies.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey	Strengths	Weaknesses

☐ _____		
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 9 th & 10 th grade ☐ WIDA ACCESS Other(s): ☐ ☐	Strengths	Weaknesses
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	(Non-EOC) By Spring 2027, the percentage of students scoring at or above level Lexile scores will increase from 25% to 27% as measured by the Spring administration of the i-Ready diagnostic Assessment (9th grade), and from 40% to 43% (11th grade). (EOC) The Literature II EOC ELA courses for the FY27 school year will have 3% of students score at or above level on the final reading comprehension exam (Common Lit).		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need support with reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and writing proficiency. Teachers require training in explicit reading instruction; integrating consistent vocabulary instruction with Greek and Latin morphemes; creating and analyzing assessments to support instruction and remediation; and implementing strategies for English Language Learners (ELLs).		
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 of Performance Target: At least 90% of ELA teachers will attend and actively engage in monthly professional learning sessions, as evidenced by sign-in sheets, agendas, and facilitator feedback forms.		CTLS Common Lit. Progress Learning Academic Coaches District Coaches Assistant Principals
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: - Review student Lexile data from previous years to identify trends and instructional needs. - Identify monthly evidence-based writing and reading instructional strategies. - Align units with new standards and district instructional frameworks. - Create unit 1 formative assessment calendar		
☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
	Evaluation Performance Target: By February 2027, 90% of teachers will demonstrate daily use of at least one evidence-based reading and writing strategy in lesson plans and classroom instruction.		
	Evaluation Tool(s): • Lesson Plans • Walk through Instruction Observation Forms • Teacher Implementation Feedback Survey • Student Work Samples		

1. ELA teachers will participate in monthly professional learning sessions to develop and demonstrate effective use of evidence-based reading and writing strategies.	- Align Progress Learning assessments with Common Lit. District priority standards (9th grade and 10th Grade) - Create assessment calendar (non-EOC courses) • August-September: • The academic coach and district will deliver professional learning on Common Lit reading and writing practices: common scoring practices and integration of convention/reading comprehension resources and strategies. • The academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing instructional practices. • Administer baseline Lexile assessments and analyze results in PLCs • Administer Common Lit. Pre-Assessment • Analyze Common Lit. Pre-Assessment Data • Identify student Lexile level using iReady 9th grade. • Identify reading comprehension grades 9-12. • Embed skill-building writing strategies such as internalizing common writing strategies and leveraging common GaDOE rubric. • Embed weekly skill-building strategies such as: Text annotation Citing textual evidence - Academic coaches/ CCC leads, and administrators will deliver professional learning on reading and writing instructional practices.	• Each course will use weekly common formative assessments and an end-of-unit summative assessment to evaluate student growth/need for remediation Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks (Formative) ☒ Monthly (Summative) ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: 1. Data Collection: -Common Lit. (Department) -NoRedInk (Department) -i-Ready (non-EOC courses) -Progress Learning (9th and 10th grade) 2. Data Organization- CCC data will be populated in the data monitoring document 3. Data Analysis- CCC's will collect data for weekly common formative assessments and unit summative assessments 4. Interpretation & Action- CCC's will meet to analyze and discuss assessment data during the weekly data dig meetings 5. Reporting Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	- Embed novel studies and analysis in all grade levels to support student reading comprehension and writing proficiency -Analyze formative assessment data in PLC • October-December: • Academic coach and district personnel professional learning on reading instruction practices leveraging Common Lit: • Academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing instructional and scoring practices. • Administer Common Lit. Mid-Assessment and analyze data • Analyze Lexile progress and subgroup data • Implement specific strategies for interpreting informational text features and multimodal texts • Analyze student progress using sample EOC assessment. • Embed novel studies and analysis in all grade levels to support student reading comprehension and writing proficiency • Analyze formative assessment data in PLC • Implement use of the data monitoring document to monitor student performance/needs • Administer Common Lit. Post Assessment • January-February: -Use PLCs to compare Lexile growth from fall. • Teachers complete a strategy reflection survey to identify which strategies most effectively supported Lexile growth and reading comprehension.		
--	---	--	--

	• (EOC) Review EOC data proficiency scores by domain. • Teachers complete a reflection document to identify needs areas by domain/standards, and student groups. • Administer Common Lit. Pre-Assessment • Analyze Common Lit Pre-Assessment Data • Review Common Lit. Pre-Assessment scores • Teachers complete a reflection document to identify needs areas by domain/standards. • Develop exemplar student writing samples and create criteria for proficient, distinguished writing. • Academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing instructional and grading practices. • Student goal setting for Lexile growth • Continue use of the data monitoring document to monitor student performance/needs • Share effective lesson samples and tools. • March-April: • Continue using conferencing to target students' Lexile levels. • Continue common collaborative scoring analysis of student writing. • Continue use of the data monitoring document to monitor student performance/needs • Monitor student goal setting for Lexile growth • Academic coach will deliver professional learning on effective writing, instructional, and reading practices		
--	---	--	--

	• Administer Common Lit. Mid Assessment (Non-Eco) • Analyze Common Lit data • Administer Progress Learning Mock EOC (Lit. II) • Analyze Progress Learning Mock EOC Data • May: - Administer end-of-year Lexile assessments (i-ready Lit. I) - Use PLCs to compare Lexile growth from fall to spring. - Administer Common Lit. Post-Assessment - Review Common Lit. Post- Assessment Data (non-EOC) - Review EOC data (Lit. II) - Teachers complete a strategy reflection survey to identify which strategies most effectively supported Lexile/EOC/CommonLit./NoRedInk growth. - Provide input for next year's PD and instructional priorities Artifacts to be Collected: • PL Sign-In Sheets • Walkthrough Forms with a focus on curriculum embedded reading or writing strategies • Facilitator Feedback Forms • Assessment Data (Lexile levels, formative and summative) • CCC notes • Coaching logs • Student goal sheets		
--	---	--	--

	Exemplar lessons Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers require continued support in leveraging deconstructed ELA standards to design and deliver rigorous, standards-aligned instruction that promotes deep student engagement and mastery. Additional professional learning is needed to strengthen teachers' ability to implement and monitor evidence-based literacy strategies, analyze student performance data, and make instructional adjustments that address diverse learning needs. As curriculum expectations continue to evolve, teachers also need ongoing support to ensure consistent alignment between instructional planning, classroom implementation, and the cognitive demands of the Georgia ELA Standards.		
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: Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - August-September: - October-December: - January-February: - March-April: - May:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): 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>			

2. ELA teachers will participate in dedicated collaborative team meetings to analyze and unpack ELA standards and design high-rigor, aligned lessons.	Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
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: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April: • May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
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>			
3. (Insert action step 3 here)			

ALGEBRA – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	FY23		FY24		FY25	
Administrations	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	9%	4%	11%	6%	10%	3%
Level 3	33%	23%	38%	35%	38%	15%
Level 2	22%	37%	31%	41%	37%	42%
Level 1	36%	36%	20%	29%	15%	40%

ALGEBRA – By Domain of Focus – Current Year

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Arithmetic Sequences and Linear Functions Domain Achievement		Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Quadratic Functions Domain Achievement		Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Exponential Functions Domain Achievement		Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Quadratic Expressions and Equations Domain Achievement	
	Winter 25	Spring 26	Winter 25	Spring 26	Winter 25	Spring 26	Winter 25	Spring 26
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	34%	6%	20%	7%	7%	24%	22%	9%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	16%	24%	37%	22%	51%	31%	38%	30%
Level 1 Remediate Learning	50%	70%	43%	71%	42%	45%	40%	61%

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?	Based on the EOC trend data, Distinguished students have increased from 1.1% to 5%	Based on the EOC trend data, the number of beginning students was on the decline but in SY26 we saw an increase in students. Across ELL and SWD from SY25 to SY25, the number of distinguished students has decreased. ELL SY25 was 3.13% and in SY26 ,1.75%, SWD: from SY'25 4.46% and SY '26 3.11% The students' pass rate is lower than in 2024 and 2025. We currently have a 67% pass rate.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	Teachers need additional training in math literacy.	
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year • What trends exist for all students in the: ○ Percentages mastering standards aligned to math domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness • How do the trends differ for EL students? • How do the trends differ for SWD students?	Strengths	Weaknesses
	Based on the Geometry and Advanced Algebra data monitoring documents, our students have consistently demonstrated a pass rate of 59% or higher on all common summative assessments. Based on our school-developed common assessment data in the Geometry PCC, our students achieved a score of 79.4 and a 72.3% pass rate in Unit 5 on right triangle trigonometry. Based on our school-developed common assessment data in Advanced Algebra, students have demonstrated an algebra achievement score of 78.1, with a 72% pass	Based on the algebra data monitoring document, students achieved a score of 29.21 on the Unit 4 summative assessment. According to the algebra data monitoring document, the students with disabilities in Unit 2, which includes standards on factoring, solving, and graphing polynomial functions, only had 7.4% of students proficient. According to the algebra data monitoring document, the active English Language learners in Unit 4a and 4b only had 11.62% and 15% of students score in the proficient level.

	rate in Unit 6 (trigonometry and the unit circle). Based on the results from our school-developed common assessment data in AP Pre-Cal, 62.97% of students demonstrated a 3 or higher on Trigonometric Functions.	
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Teachers need additional training in unpacking algebra standards and in instructional strategies to adjust instruction based on student data. Teachers need assistance in identifying problems based on standards. Teachers require additional planning and strategies to address student deficiencies effectively. The student deficiencies identified are the following areas: Geometry • Prove theorems involving similarity • Understand congruence in terms of rigid motions • Prove geometric theorems Advanced Algebra • Represent data with matrices • Perform mathematical operations • Solve systems of linear equations. • Understanding of the unit circle • Solving trigonometric equations using the unit circle AP Pre-Cal • Modeling radical, exponential, and logarithmic functions • Modeling with rational and Piecewise-Defined functions	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - MATH • What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during MATH walks?	Strengths 1. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC consistently discusses formative and summative assessments.	Weaknesses 1. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC is not consistent incorporating reading strategies. 2. Based on instructional walks, geometry teachers were not consistently incorporating ELL strategies to support our ELL students.

• What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during MATH walks?	2. Based on the PCC Walkthrough form, the Algebra PCC consistently aligns all assessments with learning objectives.	3. Based on instructional walks, the Algebra PCC does not consistently incorporate instructional strategies to support learning gaps.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Teachers require additional training to unpack the algebra standards and develop instructional strategies to support students' vocabulary development.	
Survey Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☒ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Strengths 1. The PHS Math Department has effectively adapted the curriculum for advanced students as evidenced by more than 50 percent of students earning a level 3 or higher on the AP Pre-calculus exam. 2. The PHS Math Department completed a survey with teachers who seek ways to improve their instruction, as evidenced by 100 percent of teachers stating that comprehension strategies, strategies for analyzing visuals, problem-solving strategies, and strategies for students to justify and explain their thinking would effectively improve the academic achievement of their students.	Weaknesses 1. The teachers in the PHS Math Department have a significant need for professional development focusing on active learning strategies, as evidenced by it being ranked as our number one area of need on the teacher input survey. 2. The PHS Math Department needs support in providing students with more active learning opportunities, given the extensive curriculum and limited time to teach and plan for the entire curriculum. Support in determining priority standards would be beneficial. 3. The PHS Math Department needs support adapting the curriculum for our English Language Population as that population of students continues to increase.

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

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	The percentage of math students scoring proficient will increase from 27% to 30% as measured by the EOC data. The non-EOC math courses for the FY27 school year will have a 66% score at the proficient and distinguished levels on the final exam.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers need additional training in unpacking standards and implementing instructional strategies to adjust instruction based on student data.		
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: Approximately 85% of teachers participate in professional learning every month, as evidenced by PL sign-in sheets. Preplanning: Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve math literacy August-September: Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve math literacy. October-December: Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on strategies to improve the delivery of math instruction. January-February: Math teachers, academic coaches, and Title I coaches will deliver professional learning on using the 360 classrooms before, during, and after instruction. March-April:	Evaluation Performance Target: By December 2026, 70% of students will demonstrate proficiency on common summative assessments administered after using an evidence-based instructional strategy. Evaluation Tool(s): - Walk-through forms - Summative assessments - Surveys Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ After the completion of the unit	
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. Math teachers will participate in monthly professional learning sessions to improve student achievement on assessments, as evidenced by professional sign-in documents.			

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

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers need to training to support students that struggled on the EOC due to deficiencies in reading comprehension, academic vocabulary, and the ability to analyze complex texts across content areas		
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: 90% of math teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions as scheduled, with at least 85% contributing lesson components aligned to math standards and incorporating instructional strategies.	Evaluation Performance Target: By January of the 2026-27 school year, teacher use of collaboratively planned notes and activities will increase student performance by 25% on summative assessments.	
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. Teachers will engage in weekly collaborative planning sessions to plan lessons that incorporate reading comprehension strategies and academic vocabulary, as evidenced by formative and summative assessments.	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: • Provide training on unpacking the new math standards and identifying evidence-based strategies. • Develop collaborative planning protocols and norms for CCC meetings. • Distribute templates for standard-aligned lesson planning. • Create shared digital Teams folders for each grade level to store artifacts and unit plans. August-September: • Begin weekly PCC meetings with grade-level teams. • Use deconstructed standards to plan first units and align lesson objectives. • Embed one reading comprehension strategy into lessons. • Begin reviewing student work samples to assess evidence of strategy implementation.	Evaluation Tool(s): • Formative and Summative Assessment • Student work samples.\ Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ at the end of the unit.. Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	

	• Academic coach models effective literacy strategies in planning or co-teaching. • Include weekly formative assessment strategies in lesson planning. October-December: • Continue refining units with rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. • Focus CCC time on analyzing exemplar texts and aligning questions and writing tasks. • Continue reviewing student work samples to assess evidence of strategy implementation. • Academic coach models effective literacy strategies in planning or co-teaching. January-February: • Use PCC time to revise and adapt Semester 1 lessons based on student performance data. • Continue integrating one evidence-based strategy into lessons. • Conduct lesson plan checks using a standards alignment rubric • Continue reviewing student work samples to assess evidence of strategy implementation. • Academic coach models effective literacy strategies in PCC. • Revise literacy goals and pacing for new student groups. March-April:		
--	--	--	--

	• Focus PCC sessions on planning rigorous activities that incorporate reading comprehension • Include formative assessment strategies in lesson planning to monitor student performance. • Continue reviewing student work and walkthrough data to identify trends May: • Teachers complete a collaborative planning reflection survey. • PCC teams identify strengths, gaps, and ideas for next year. Artifacts to be Collected: • PCC Meeting Agendas & Minutes • Lesson Plans with Deconstructed Standard Alignment • Unit Notes and Summative assessments • Collaborative Planning Protocols and Norms • PCC Reflection Surveys (mid-year and end-of-year) Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
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: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April: • May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
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>			
3. (Insert action step 3 here)			

BIOLOGY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
Administrations	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	6%	5%	3%	6%	9%	4%
Level 3	26%	41%	29%	31%	39%	42%
Level 2	34%	29%	33%	35%	31%	28%
Level 1	34%	24%	36%	28%	21%	26%

BIOLOGY – By Domain of Focus – Current Year (2025-2026)

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	Classification & Phylogeny		Cells		Cellular Genetics & Heredity		Evolution		Ecology	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Met Target	47%	40%	26%	19%	38%	30%	23%	27%	30%	29%
Level 2 Approaching Target	18%	34%	40%	37%	23%	29%	38%	33%	30%	34%
Level 1 Below Target	35%	26%	34%	44%	39%	41%	39%	40%	39%	37%

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? How do the trends differ for SWD students?	Based on EOC trend data, Biology has demonstrated steady growth in student achievement over the past three years. The percentage of students demonstrating proficiency increased significantly from 36% in SY23 to 47% in SY26. Additionally, the percentage of students scoring in the Distinguished category increased from 4% to 6% during the same period, the highest percentage in the past eight years. This indicates growth not only in overall performance, but also in higher levels of student achievement. Biology EOC Domain Data During the 2025–26 school year, Biology EOC domain data reflected growth across all domains, with the most notable increase occurring in the Classification domain, where the percentage of students meeting the target increased from 32% in SY25 to 44% in SY26. Subgroup Performance Subgroup performance data also reflected significant gains: English Learners (EL) demonstrated a 22%-point increase in proficiency,	- More than half of students (52%) continue to perform in the Beginning or Developing categories in SY26. - While the percentage of students scoring Beginning decreased from 32% to 23%, nearly one-fourth of students still demonstrated significant foundational gaps. - The data indicates continued need for Tier 2 instruction, targeted intervention, and consistent progress monitoring to move more students from Developing to Proficient performance levels. Biology EOC Domain Data Cells remain the weakest domain overall. - Student proficiency decreased from 23% (Spring 2025) to 19% (Spring 2026), while the percentage of students scoring Below Target remained high at 44%. Cellular Genetics & Heredity continues to show limited mastery. - Although there was a slight decrease in students scoring Below Target (44% to 41%), proficiency also declined from 33% to 30%, indicating students continue to struggle with mastery of standards in this domain. Mastery levels across domains remain inconsistent. - Despite reductions in Below Target percentages in some areas, most domains still have fewer than half of students meeting the target, suggesting ongoing gaps in conceptual understanding and application. A large percentage of students continue to perform in the Approaching or Below Target categories.

	increasing from 2% in SY25 to 24% in SY26. Students with Disabilities (SWD) demonstrated a 16%-point increase in proficiency, increasing from 13% in SY25 to 29% in SY26. These gains reflect the intentional use of data-driven instructional practices, targeted intervention opportunities, collaborative planning, and focused support aligned to identified student needs.	- This trend indicates many students are demonstrating partial understanding but are not consistently transferring learning to mastery-level performance. Subgroup Performance EL - Although EL student proficiency increased from 1% (Fall 2024) to 23% (Spring 2026), more than half of EL students (51%) continue to perform at the Beginning level, indicating persistent foundational gaps. - EL students demonstrated limited movement into advanced performance levels, with 0% scoring Distinguished in Spring 2026. - Additionally, 76% of EL students remained in the Beginning or Developing categories in Spring 2026 SWD - Although SWD proficiency increased from 10% (Fall 2024) to 35% (Spring 2026), 50% of SWD students continue to perform at the Beginning level, indicating persistent foundational learning gaps. - While there was growth in students reaching Proficient and Distinguished levels, overall pass rates remained stagnant at 50% from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026. - Additionally, 65% of SWD students remained in the Beginning or Developing categories in Spring 2026
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Although there was a system-wide focus on a supportive learning environment and its application in classroom activities, discussions, and assessments, implementation did not consistently result in measurable gains in language development or content mastery. Vocabulary instruction and discourse routines varied in depth and rigor across classrooms, and Tier 2 scaffolds were not consistently targeted to address persistent foundational gaps. As a result, many students remained in the Beginning and Developing performance levels, indicating the need for more intentional, systematic, and differentiated academic language support aligned to content standards.	

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year	Strengths	Weaknesses
• 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?	Overall student proficiency on 9th and 10th grade common summative assessments increased to 67%, reflecting significant growth from 50% in the previous year. EL & SWD English Learners (EL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD), while still performing below the overall proficiency rate, demonstrated year-over-year growth, indicating continued academic progress within these subgroups. These trends suggest that instructional practices are contributing to improved overall student achievement and supporting measurable gains across all student populations.	Common assessment data reveals consistent trends in student performance across Environmental Science and Physics. In Environmental Science, students demonstrated the lowest proficiency on SEV1 (23%) and SEV4 (26%). SEV1 focuses on analyzing energy flow and matter cycling in ecosystems, while SEV4 emphasizes evaluating human impact on natural resources and sustainability. Notably, human impact has also been identified as a low-performing area in previous years, indicating a persistent instructional gap in this standard. In Physics, students demonstrated the lowest proficiency on SP1 (59%), which involves understanding and applying relationships among distance, displacement, speed, velocity, and acceleration. Data trends indicate that standards requiring higher levels of mathematical application continue to present the greatest challenge for students, suggesting a need for stronger integration of math support within physics instruction. Across both courses, these trends indicate a need to strengthen instructional strategies that support scientific reasoning, data analysis, and academic language to improve student understanding of complex scientific concepts. EL and SWD Trends Data for English Learners (EL) and Students with Disabilities (SWD) generally mirrors overall student performance trends. However, SWD students demonstrated slightly higher proficiency on SEV4 (46%) compared to the overall population, indicating relative strength in this area. EL student performance remained aligned with overall trends, with continued need for targeted language supports to access complex scientific content.

		Contextual Consideration It is also important to note that Physics data may have been impacted by structural changes within the CCC, which transitioned from three teachers to one teacher and two substitute teachers during the instructional period. This shift may have influenced consistency in instruction and student performance outcomes.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Inconsistent and insufficient explicit vocabulary instruction embedded within science content has limited students' ability to accurately interpret, apply, and communicate complex scientific concepts, particularly within SEV1, SEV4, and SP1. As a result, students lack consistent exposure to academic and domain-specific language needed to analyze ecosystems, human impact, and motion, contributing to persistent gaps in comprehension and application of these standards. Additionally, variability in the depth and consistency of vocabulary instruction has limited students' ability to consistently access and apply disciplinary language across tasks and assessments.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – BIOLOGY - What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during BIOLOGY walks? - What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or	Strengths Instructional walks indicate strong consistency in core Tier 1 instructional practices. Most teachers (71%) provide clear, concise, and accurate explanations of skills and incorporate guided practice. A strong majority (85%) ensure students have opportunities for independent practice, and 100% of observed teachers actively monitor student learning and provide immediate, specific feedback to support understanding and correction of misconceptions.	Weaknesses Instructional walk data also indicates areas for refinement in core instructional practices. Modeling is inconsistent, with only 57% of teachers explicitly demonstrating the skill in the same way students are expected to practice it. Additionally, only 50% consistently check for understanding in multiple ways, limiting opportunities to identify and address misconceptions in real time. Think-alouds are observed in only 29% of classrooms, and just 33% of teachers intentionally review previously learned and new skills to strengthen connections and retention.

ineffective during BIOLOGY walks?		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Although there is strong evidence of coherent Tier 1 instruction within a supportive learning environment, there are inconsistencies in how academic vocabulary is explicitly modeled, reinforced, and applied across classrooms. This is especially evident in clear explanations, guided practice, independent practice, and consistent feedback. Modeling is not consistently aligned to student practice, and checks for understanding are not routinely used in multiple ways to surface misconceptions. In addition, limited use of think-alouds and inconsistent review of prior and new learning reflect gaps in instructional coherence that impact skill transfer and retention. As a result, while the learning environment supports engagement, variability in coherent instruction limits deeper mastery.	
Survey Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☒ Student Survey	Strengths	Weaknesses
	Teacher Survey The data from the survey suggests that the focus on vocabulary strategies yielded positive results and was implemented with consistency and perceived as highly impactful by teachers. • 76% of teachers implemented vocabulary strategies on a daily or weekly basis, demonstrating consistent integration of vocabulary instruction across science classrooms. • 95% of teachers reported that vocabulary strategies moderately or significantly improved students' ability to engage in scientific discussion, reading, and writing. • 86% of teachers indicated that vocabulary strategies were effective or highly effective in	Teacher Survey • Inconsistent implementation of vocabulary instruction across classrooms and throughout the school year. • Limited advance planning and development of unit-specific vocabulary resources and instructional supports. • Insufficient use of variety vocabulary strategies provided, resulting in repeated use of the same approaches. • Limited integration of vocabulary instruction with literacy practices such as reading, writing, close reading, guided reading, and morphology.

	supporting students' critical thinking and comprehension of science content. • 86% of teachers reported that vocabulary strategies moderately or significantly impacted student performance on formative and summative assessments. Overall, teacher feedback suggests that consistent vocabulary instruction positively influenced student discourse, content comprehension, critical thinking, and academic performance. Student Survey Student survey data reflects perceived strength in vocabulary instruction and support. 72% of students reported that explanations and examples of science vocabulary were mostly or very clear. 70% of students indicated that instruction was mostly or very helpful in understanding new science words. Additionally, 67% reported that vocabulary instruction was mostly or very helpful in supporting their learning and performance on assignments and assessments.	• Insufficient structures to promote student ownership and ongoing use of vocabulary resources. • Limited opportunities for authentic application of vocabulary through labs, hands-on investigations, and exploratory learning experiences. Overall, teacher feedback identified a need for more consistent, intentional, and integrated vocabulary instruction, with increased opportunities for student engagement and application of academic and content-specific vocabulary. Student Survey Student feedback indicates a need for more consistent and varied opportunities to engage with academic vocabulary. Students requested additional practice activities, including games, to strengthen retention and application of terms. They also noted the need for more consistent exposure to and interaction with vocabulary across lessons. In addition, students suggested incorporating more labs and hands-on experiences, along with accessible study resources to support review and reinforcement outside of class.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Inconsistent and fragmented implementation of vocabulary instruction across classrooms, combined with limited opportunities for students to engage with and apply academic vocabulary through literacy-rich and authentic learning experiences, has resulted in uneven access to the language supports necessary for comprehension, communication, and content mastery.	
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:	

U.S. HISTORY – By Year						
EOC Longitudinal Data	FY24		FY25		FY26	
Administrations	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	5%	7%	4%	3%	9%	11%
Level 3	33%	32%	36%	36%	42%	37%
Level 2	38%	35%	27%	38%	29%	29%
Level 1	24%	26%	32%	23%	20%	22%

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

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	Colonization through Constitution		New Republic Through Reconstruction		Industrialization, Reform, and Imperialism		Establishment as a World Power		Post-World War II to the Present	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Met Target	19%	43%	39%	35%	36%	29%	25%	44%	33%	39%
Approaching Target	32%	16%	31%	27%	33%	30%	32%	28%	24%	30%
Below Target	49%	41%	30%	38%	31%	41%	42%	29%	42%	31%

U.S. HISTORY DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS (if applicable)		
US History EOC (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses
	Overall reduction in Level 1 (Beginning) across all groups - All Students: 30% → 21% - SWD: 60% → 33% - ELL: 71% → 35.5% → Strong evidence that fewer students are at the lowest performance level Growth in Level 3 (Proficient), especially for All Students and ELL - All Students: 30% → 40% (steady increase) - ELL: 5% → 28% (major gain, especially last year) → More students are meeting grade-level expectations Recent gains in Level 4 (Distinguished) - All Students: up to 10% - SWD: up to 7.5% - ELL: up to 9.5% → Improvement at the highest achievement level, especially in the most recent year Domain Data: - Growth from Winter to Spring within years	- SWD and ELL still have high percentages in Levels 1–2 - SWD: 71% (Level 1+2 combined) in 2025–2026 - ELL: 63.5% (Level 1+2 combined) → Many students are still below proficiency - Inconsistent growth for SWD in Level 3 (Proficient) - Jumped to 35%, then dropped to 21.5% → Gains are not yet stable - Level 2 (Developing) remains high or increases in some groups - SWD: 29% → 38% - ELL: stays around 28–33% → Students may be stagnating in mid-level performance - Level 4 (Distinguished) is still relatively low across all groups → Although improving, advanced performance is not yet widespread Domain Data:

• How do the trends differ for SWD students?	○ Many domains show decreases in “Below” and increases in “Approaching/Met” (e.g., Industrialization Met rises from ~16% to ~30% in one year) → Indicates effective instruction and student growth during the year • Strongest performance in early domains (Colonization, New Republic) ○ Spring 2026 Met reaches ~35–43% → Students demonstrate stronger understanding of earlier content • Recent improvement in overall performance ○ Spring 2026 shows higher Met (up to 43%) and lower Below in several domains → Suggests instructional adjustments are having a positive impact	• “Below” remains high across multiple domains • Frequently 30–45%+, especially in Industrialization and Post–WWII → Many students still not meeting expectations • Later domains are consistently weaker • Post–World War II domain still shows ~31–45% Below and lower Met (~27–39%) → Students struggle more with more recent/complex content • Inconsistent growth across domains • Some domains (e.g., Industrialization) show fluctuations rather than steady gains → Learning is not yet stable across all content areas • “Met” is improving but not yet a majority • Most domains remain below 50% Met → Mastery has not been reached for most students
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The most significant areas of need in Social Studies are the development and application of visual literacy and historical thinking skills. Many students struggle to accurately interpret and analyze visuals—such as maps, charts, graphs, political cartoons, and photographs—which are now defined as essential "texts" within the curriculum. This deficit significantly impacts their ability to comprehend historical context, draw inferences, and apply critical reasoning to complex assessment items. Root Causes • Passive Interaction with Visuals: Students often receive content passively rather than interacting with visuals as the "main vehicle for learning".	

	• Gap in Evidence-Based Reasoning: There is a consistent struggle to move beyond recall into the development of evidence-based claims (CER/RACE). • Lack of Scaffolding for Rigor: A lack of consistent, non-optional scaffolds (e.g., sentence frames and graphic organizers) has prevented all students from accessing grade-level rigor. Strategic Response & Implementation To bridge these gaps, the department is committing to an Instructional Goal where teachers will demonstrate daily embedded literacy strategies. The following "Big Four" strategies will be integrated into the 6-Phase Implementation Roadmap: 1. Document Analysis: Using primary/secondary sources and visuals as the primary tool for student-led discovery. 2. CER/RACE: Requiring students to make claims supported by specific textual and visual evidence. 3. Structured Discussion: Moving beyond recall promoting analysis and reasoning through evidence-driven student conversations. 4. Quick Writes: Using handwritten writing as a thinking tool to help students process and clarify ideas in real time. Support and Monitoring To ensure these instructional shifts are successful, the plan requires lesson plans to show clear alignment between Social Studies content and Literacy Standards. Professional development will focus on supporting teachers in the alignment between the content standards along with the Social Studies reading and writing standards along with support in implementing the “big four” strategies effectively. Each PCC will conduct data analysis of student work samples and common writing tasks at least 1x/quarter to identify misconceptions. Teachers will receive ongoing support through professional development, targeted coaching, and instructional walks providing "Glow and Grow" feedback based on a walkthrough tool to ensure growth in teaching and learning.		
	<table> <tr> <th data-bbox="541 1144 1289 1198">Strengths</th><th data-bbox="1289 1144 2016 1198">Weaknesses</th></tr> </table>	Strengths	Weaknesses
Strengths	Weaknesses		

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year

- **What trends exist for all students in the:**
 - Percentages mastering standards aligned to standards- identify both standards of strength and weakness
- **How do the trends differ for EL students?**
- **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**

Overall, for Non-EOC courses, **55%** of the students scored in the proficient range on the final common assessments

ECONOMICS: 60% of students scored in the proficient ranges

- **Personal Finance Summative:** This was the highest-performing overall assessment area with an impressive school average of **89%**. Students demonstrated exceptional mastery on specific standards, including a **98%** average on standard **9-12.SSEPF1.c** and **97%** on both **9-12.SSEPF1.a** and **9-12.SSEPF10**.
- **Unit 1 Economic Fundamentals:** Students achieved a strong **87%** average on this foundational unit. Highlights within this unit include a **97%** average on standard **9-12.SSEF3.b** and a **95%** on **9-12.SSEF2.a**.
- **Macroeconomics Summative:** Students maintained a solid **83%** average on macro-level concepts. They excelled in standard **9-12.SSEMA** with a **91%** average score.
 - **Microeconomics Supply & Demand:** While microeconomics was the lowest unit overall, students showed high proficiency in analyzing standard **9-12.SSEMI3.a** (focusing on supply/demand determinants), scoring an **88%** average.

US GOVERNMENT: 69% of students scored in the proficient

- **Judicial Review (*Marbury v. Madison*):** Students recorded their highest reported performance with a **96%** average on standard **9-12.SSCG13.c**, demonstrating exceptional mastery of how John Marshall established judicial review.
- **The Legislative Process:** Standard **9-12.SSCG8.e** also yielded a very high average of **94%**, showing students heavily understand the precise steps involved in passing a bill.
- **Philosophical Foundations:** Standard **9-12.SSCG2.b** saw a **94%** average score, indicating students clearly comprehend how Enlightenment thinkers like Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and Montesquieu influenced early structures of government.
- **Systems of Power & Executive Structure:** Students excelled in defining civilian participation in authoritarian vs. democratic models (**93%** on standard **9-12.SSCG1.b**), checks and balances (**93%** on standard **9-12.SSCG4.b**), the executive cabinet (**92%** on standard **9-12.SSCG11.b**), and protections guaranteed in the Bill of Rights (**92%** on standard **9-12.SSCG6**).

USWA:

ECONOMICS

- **Microeconomics Summative (Lowest Unit):** This assessment tracked the lowest overall average among the major branches at **79%**.
- **Price Floors and Ceilings (Critical Pain Point):** Standard **9-12.SSEMI2.b** was the absolute lowest-performing topic in the entire report, dropping to a **58%** average score. This indicates a systemic difficulty in understanding government market interventions like price controls.
- **Investments and Financial Risk:** Within the Personal Finance segment, standard **9-12.SSEPF2.b** saw a relative drop compared to surrounding high marks, averaging a lower **73%**.
- **Economic Systems & Social Goals:** Standard **9-12.SSEF6.a** dipped to a **64%** average score, showing that students struggled to evaluate how different economic systems reach their socio-economic goals.

US GOVERNMENT

- **The Supremacy Clause (Critical Pain Point):** By far the lowest-performing standard on the assessment was **9-12.SSCG5.d**. Students averaged just **15%** when tasked with analyzing Article VI and the role of the U.S. Constitution as the "supreme law of the land". This indicates a systemic gap in understanding federal preemption.
- **The Congressional Election Process:** Standard **9-12.SSCG8.b** dipped into the "Beginning" bracket with a **68%** average score. Students struggled to grasp the formal election process for representatives/senators and how the 17th Amendment shifted those structures.

USWA: throughout the school year, an average of **47%** of students scored in the proficiency range and **43.5%**

- **Post-Cold War Relations:** This was the lowest-performing area by a significant margin. Standard **SS.9-12.12** ("Post-Cold War Relations") averaged a **37%**, and its sub-standard **SS.9-12.12.12** (cooperation and conflict after the Cold War) only reached **42%**.

	• Contemporary Terrorism: Students scored their highest average (79%) on standards SS.9-12.11.c ("Analyze terrorism as a form of warfare") and SS.9-12.14 ("Terrorism"). • Post-World War II Americas: Standard SS.9-12.11 yielded an average score of 68%. • WWII Domestic Policy & Exec Powers: On standard 9-12.SSUSH19.e (Roosevelt's executive powers and Japanese-American internment), students averaged 69%. • Totalitarianism: Standard 9-12.SSWH18.c (describing the nature of totalitarianism and police states) saw an average score of 69%. • Kennedy & Johnson Administrations: Standard 9-12.SSUSH21 (U.S. policies, technological advancements, and social changes) also saw a solid average of 70%. • SWD students score on par with nonSWD students on summative assessments and ELL students score close to non-ELL students on summative assessments WORLD HISTORY • Globalization and the Cold War Arms Race: Students reached the "Distinguished" performance band with an exceptional 92% average on standards 9-12.SSWH20.a (the nuclear arms race) and 9-12.SSWH22 (globalization in the contemporary world). • The Enlightenment: Students demonstrated solid proficiency with an 80% average on standard 9-12.SSWH13.b, which covers the political and social philosophies of Locke, Voltaire, and Rousseau	• Social & Political Turmoil of 1968: Students struggled heavily with standard 9-12.SSUSH21.e (covering the 1968 assassinations, Tet Offensive, etc.), averaging just 42%. • Jim Crow & Plessy v. Ferguson: Standard 9-12.SSUSH13.c (connecting <i>Plessy v. Ferguson</i> to Jim Crow and the NAACP) dropped to a 45% average. • Recent Presidential Administrations: Standard 9-12.SSUSH23 (evaluating Reagan through Obama) averaged 46%, while the sub-standard regarding their specific challenges (9-12.SSUSH23.a) sat at 55%. • The United Nations: Standards SS.9-12.18 and SS.9-12.18.18, which analyze the powers and effectiveness of the UN, only saw a 46% average WORLD HISTORY students scored in the proficiency range. While there was growth between S1 and S2, these students still performed below average of other courses (EOC and Non-EOC courses) • Explorers and Conquistadors: Standard 9-12.SSWH10.a was a major pain point, with students averaging a "Beginning" level score of 54% when explaining the roles of these figures. • The Collapse of Empires (WWI Era): Students struggled to analyze the post-WWI destabilization of Europe (standard 9-12.SSWH17.d), scoring a 62%. • Global Impact of World War II: Standard 9-12.SSWH19, measuring the broad political, economic, and social impact of WWII, dropped into the "Beginning" bracket at 63%. • Early Classical Societies: Standards tracking early Asian trade routes and achievements showed room for growth. Students scored a 69% on both 9-12.SSWH2 (Achievements of Chinese/Indian societies) and 9-12.SSWH2.d (Silk Roads and Indian Ocean Trade)
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	The most significant area of need in Social Studies is the development and application of visual literacy and historical thinking skills. Many students struggle to accurately interpret and analyze visuals—such as maps, charts, graphs, political cartoons, and photographs—which are now defined as essential "texts" within the curriculum. This deficit significantly impacts their ability to comprehend historical context, draw inferences, and apply critical reasoning to complex assessment items. Root Causes • Passive Interaction with Visuals: Students often receive content passively rather than interacting with visuals as the "main vehicle for learning". • Gap in Evidence-Based Reasoning: There is a consistent struggle to move beyond recall into the development of evidence-based claims (CER/RACE). • Lack of Scaffolding for Rigor: A lack of consistent, non-optional scaffolds (e.g., sentence frames and graphic organizers) has prevented all students from accessing rigor at grade level. Strategic Response & Implementation To bridge these gaps, the department is committing to an Instructional Goal in which teachers will demonstrate embedded literacy strategies daily. The following "Big Four" strategies will be integrated into the 6-Phase Implementation Roadmap: • Document Analysis: Using primary/secondary sources and visuals as the primary tool for student-led discovery. • CER/RACE: Requiring students to make claims supported by specific textual and visual evidence. • Structured Discussion: Moving beyond recall, promoting analysis and reasoning through evidence-driven student conversations. • Quick Writes: Using handwritten writing as a thinking tool to help students process and clarify ideas in real time. Support and Monitoring To ensure these instructional shifts are successful, the plan requires that lesson plans demonstrate clear alignment between Social Studies content and Literacy Standards. Professional development will focus on supporting teachers in aligning the content standards with the Social Studies reading and writing standards, and on implementing the “big four” strategies effectively. Each PCC will conduct data analysis of student work samples and common writing tasks at least 1x/quarter to identify misconceptions. Teachers will receive ongoing support through professional development, targeted coaching, and instructional walks providing "Glow and Grow" feedback based on a walkthrough tool to ensure growth in teaching and learning.
--	--

SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – US HISTORY	Strengths	Weaknesses
• What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during US HISTORY walks? • What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during US HISTORY walks?	• Clear learning targets and well-defined success criteria that guide instruction and communicate expectations for student mastery • Student self-assessment practices, including the use of checklists and progress-monitoring tools to support ownership of learning • Regular opportunities for students to engage in document analysis, source evaluation, and evidence-based historical thinking • Strong academic discourse through structured discussion, collaborative learning, and student use of historical evidence to support claims • High levels of student engagement supported by clear classroom expectations, purposeful instructional routines, and rigorous learning tasks • Intentional use of student data to inform instructional decisions, monitor progress, and provide targeted support and intervention	• Provide more explicit use of student data during the instructional process to guide real-time adjustments and monitor student understanding throughout the class period • Increased implementation of intentional student grouping strategies to target specific learning needs, including both remediation and enrichment opportunities • Students are in need of more differentiated instructional practices designed to provide targeted support, extend learning, and ensure all students are appropriately challenged based on performance data)
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Overall growth in U.S. History was driven by stronger instructional consistency, increased rigor, and clearer academic expectations across classrooms. • Clear learning targets and success criteria helped students better understand learning goals, increasing ownership and improving performance. • Increased use of document analysis, academic discourse, and evidence-based thinking strengthened engagement, literacy, and historical thinking skills. • Purposeful instructional routines and clear classroom expectations created more academically focused environments with consistent student participation in rigorous tasks. • Student self-assessment tools, such as checklists and progress monitoring, supported reflection and helped students track progress toward mastery. • Teachers increasingly used instructional data to inform planning and respond to student needs, though opportunities remain to make data usage more explicit during daily instruction. • Collaboration among teachers, support staff, and leadership promoted instructional alignment, shared expectations, and continuous reflection on effective practices.	

	Continued growth opportunities include strengthening intentional grouping practices and embedding student performance data more consistently into daily instruction to improve differentiation and targeted support.	
Survey Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Strengths In a self-assessment survey, teachers responded that they are at least Mostly Consistent in the Following Areas: - I post clear learning targets aligned to standards and historical thinking skills (ex: cause and effect, comparison, citing evidence, continuity and change, etc.) - My learning targets are observable, student-friendly, and measurable - My formative assessments include tasks aligned to the learning target and measures of what success criteria say students should be able to do - My PCC reviews data to adjust instruction based on alignment gaps	Weaknesses In a self-assessment survey, this is where some teachers reported some inconsistencies: - I use anchor charts to model historical thinking skills (sourcing, contextualization, etc.) - I introduce and reference success criteria that define what "good work" looks like for tasks - I assign weekly writing and/or skill-building tasks aligned with the learning target (citing evidence, making claims, identifying - I embed reading/writing strategies aligned to the learning target across geography, maps, visuals, and text - I embed at least one historical thinking routine each week (Claim, evidence, reasoning; I used to think...now I think...
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The department has developed strong systems for alignment and assessment planning standards; however, instructional literacy practices and historical thinking routines have not yet been implemented with the same level of consistency across classrooms. Teachers may need additional modeling, embedded support, and opportunities to operationalize these practices into sustainable daily instructional routines.	
	Possible Next Steps	

	Root Cause • Alignment emphasized more than instructional delivery • Practices not yet internalized • Time/cognitive load • Lack of concrete models • Literacy viewed as separate	Potential Action Step • Shift PLC/PCC focus toward modeling instructional practices that specifically align to effective instruction along with alignment • Provide routine-based coaching and walkthrough feedback so practices become internalized • Create grab-and-go literacy routines and anchor chart banks to ensure a streamlined planning process • Develop exemplars for student work and model lessons • Integrate literacy expectations into lesson planning templates and walkthrough tools
Additional Data Analysis (If needed) Other(s): ☒ Student Survey ☐ ☐ ☐	Strengths Of the sample of students who responded to the survey, 70% OR MORE agreed/strongly agreed with the following statements: Learning Targets & Clarity “I understood what I was supposed to learn in each lesson (learning targets were clear and helpful).” —79.3% Vocabulary & Concepts “The vocabulary and key concepts we used in class helped me better understand history.” - 82% Use of Visual Sources (<i>maps, charts, images, political cartoons</i>) “Working with visual sources helped me better understand historical events and ideas.” 82.3% Historical Thinking Skills (<i>cause/effect, sourcing, context</i>) “Our class activities helped me think more deeply about history (like understanding cause and effect or different perspectives).” 80%	Weaknesses Of the sample of students who responded to the survey, LESS THAN 70% agreed/strongly agreed with the following statements: Primary Source Analysis “I feel more confident analyzing primary and secondary sources than I did earlier in the year.” 68.2% Writing & Evidence (CER/DBQ-style thinking) “I improved in explaining my thinking using evidence (in writing or discussion).” 66.5% Thinking Routines (“<i>I used to think... Now I think...</i>”, <i>claim-evidence reasoning</i>) “Class routines helped me reflect on how my thinking has changed.” 68.2% Overall Growth “I feel more confident in my ability to think and work like a historian.” 66.6%

	Practice Opportunities “I had enough chances to practice skills like writing, analyzing sources, and discussing ideas.” 79.2% Engagement & Learning Activities “The activities we did (writing tasks, discussions, DBQs, debates, etc.) helped me learn the material.” 76.6%	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Student responses suggest that instruction is successfully supporting clarity, engagement, vocabulary development, and historical thinking routines. Students overwhelmingly reported that they understood learning targets, benefited from visual support, and engaged meaningfully with classroom activities. However, the lower-rated areas reveal a pattern: students appear to experience strong instructional scaffolds during learning, but fewer students feel fully independent and confident when applying historian-level skills on their own, particularly in: • Source analysis, • Evidence-based writing, • Reflection on thinking, • Overall historical confidence. It creates a kind of “training wheels gap”: students feel supported during activities, but not yet consistently confident transferring those skills independently	

SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: SCIENCE	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 47% to 50% as measured by 2026-2027 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 43% to 48% as measured by the 2026-2027 Summative Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Literacy, Math Skills, & Critical Thinking		
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 of Performance Target: 80% of science teachers will implement evidence-based Tier 2 strategies with an emphasis on flexible grouping as evidenced by instructional walks.	Evaluation Performance Target: By February 2027, 45% of students will demonstrate proficiency on common assessments administered after data informed modifications to instruction.	CTLS ELlevation Pear Assessment
Target Student Group ☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	Implementation Plan: 1ST SEMESTER: • Preplanning: – Provide professional learning for science teachers on evidence-based Tier 2 flexible grouping strategies and differentiated instruction practices. – Train teachers to analyze student performance data to inform grouping and instructional decisions.	Evaluation Tool(s): • Instructional walk-through data • Common assessment data • Student work samples & survey • Teacher reflection survey	Quizlet Gizmos Academic Coaches
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed:		
			District Coaches

Science teachers will implement targeted Tier 2 flexible small-group instruction at least twice per week to address identified student learning needs as evidenced by walk-through data.	– Develop common implementation expectations, formative assessment opportunities, and walk-through look-fors aligned to differentiated instruction. – Summary: Data → Identify Need → Group → Targeted Instruction → Check → Regroup • August-September: – Teachers will implement Tier 2 flexible grouping at least twice per week (10-15 min) using formative assessment data. – Instructional coaches and administrators will conduct walk-throughs to monitor implementation. – Feedback will be provided to teachers within 48 hours of each walk-through. – Instructional coaches will follow up through coaching conversations, classroom support, and PLC discussions to address identified needs. – Teachers demonstrating inconsistent implementation will receive targeted coaching and additional monitoring until implementation expectations are consistently met. • October-December: – Teachers will refine Tier 2 flexible groups based on formative assessment data and student performance trends. – PLC teams will analyze student data and identify instructional adjustments to strengthen differentiation. – Leadership teams will review walk-through data to monitor implementation fidelity. – A formal mid-year implementation review will be conducted in December/January to compare implementation rates against the 80% goal and identify teachers or teams needing additional coaching and support. • January-February:	☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: • Bi-weekly review of walk-through data to monitor Tier 2 instructional implementation fidelity with flexible grouping • PLC analysis of formative and common assessment data every 2 weeks to identify trends and adjust instruction • Monthly review of Unit plans and student work samples for alignment to instructional strategies and grouping practices • Mid-year and end-of-year teacher reflection surveys to capture implementation impact and instructional shifts Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	--	--

	– Teachers will use semester assessment data to reorganize flexible groups based on student needs. – Teachers will intensify differentiated instruction for students requiring intervention or enrichment. – PLC teams will monitor formative assessment evidence to guide instructional planning and support decisions. • March-April: – Teachers will continue implementing Tier 2 flexible grouping at least twice per week to address learning gaps and reinforce standards mastery. – Teachers will use formative assessment data to adjust instruction and grouping structures as needed. – Leadership teams will review walk-through and assessment data to evaluate implementation effectiveness and identify next steps. • May: – Teachers and leadership teams will analyze walk-through trends, assessment data, and student performance outcomes. – PLCs will use the Data-Driven Instructional Process to analyze data, identify student needs, plan Tier 2 flexible groups, and evaluate instructional impact. – Departments will reflect on implementation strengths, challenges, and recommendations for the following school year. Artifacts to be Collected: Walk-through data documenting Tier 2 implementation Lesson plans identifying flexible groups and differentiation PLC agendas/notes documenting data analysis and instructional next steps Coaching logs and feedback Formative and common assessment data Student work samples demonstrating growth Teacher reflection survey		
--	--	--	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Bi-weekly		
SOCIAL STUDIES IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
GOAL #4: SOCIAL STUDIES	During the 2026–2027 school year, the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished in social studies will increase from 50% to 53% , as measured by the US History EOC for EOC students and classroom/common assessments for non-EOC students.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Deficit in Evidence-Based Writing and Literacy ○ Across all grade levels, there is a consistent struggle to anchor claims in textual or historical evidence. Students specifically struggle to move past simple recall into the development of structured, evidence-based claims. • Underdeveloped Interpretive and Inference Skills ○ Students face substantial difficulty when required to interpret non-textual data, such as maps, charts, graphs, and political cartoons. Furthermore, there is a marked gap in "tiered comprehension," where students struggle to extend basic reading understanding into deeper, analytical inference skills.		
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 of Performance Target: 100% of teachers will implement one structured writing or disciplinary literacy strategy (e.g., claim-evidence-reasoning, document-based questioning, text annotation with sourcing, structured academic discussion with written response, quick writes using primary/secondary sources) that aligns to: • A current Social Studies content standard (ex: Cold War containment, WWII causes, civic participation, etc.) • A literacy standard for Social Studies (ex: analyzing primary/secondary sources, citing evidence, argumentative writing, determining central ideas, evaluating claims) FREQUENCY: Minimum of DAILY, embedded within core instruction (not as an add-on activity). Implementation Plan Preplanning (Late May–July) • Leadership & Coaches ○ Finalize literacy implementation checklist and success criteria checklist (see Look-Fors below). ○ Build exemplar success criteria bank for common strategies (CER, DBQ mini-tasks, sourcing annotations, quick writes from primary/secondary sources, structured academic discussion with written response). ○ Identify two common mini-writing tasks per course per semester for calibrated scoring. ○ Create a lesson plan header or IF note prompting: “Today’s literacy strategy,” content standard, literacy standard, success criteria. ○ Draft walkthrough schedule • Teachers ○ Map where disciplinary literacy strategies best fit the first 6 weeks of content. ○ Prepare first two weeks of posted success criteria and one mini-writing task. August–September (Weeks 1–6) ○ Daily: Implement 1 literacy strategy and reference success criteria during instruction and checks for understanding. ○ Walkthroughs begin (Minimum of 1 per teacher/month) using literacy checklist. ○ PCCs: Review lesson plans/targets for alignment; norms for success criteria language (student-friendly, observable). ○ Calibration #1 (Week 5–6): Score first common writing sample per course. Coaches run a 45–60 min calibration (anchor samples, discuss criteria, mis-ratings, next steps). October–December (Weeks 7–18)	Evaluation Performance Target: By February 2027, 53% of students will demonstrate proficiency on common assessments administered after data-informed modifications to instruction Evaluation Tool(s): • Walk-Through Observation Tool (for classroom implementation) • Common Assessment Data (for student progress tracking) • Student Writing Samples along with common rubrics • Summative Assessment Data Analysis (for end-of-year evaluation) Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: 1. Data Collection 2. Data Organization 3. Data Analysis 4. Interpretation & Action 5. Reporting HOW DATA WILL BE COLLECTED: • Walk-through look-fors using a literacy implementation checklist/success criteria checklist (or just the form used for the walks this past week) • Lesson plans or posted learning targets showing alignment to both content + literacy standard	CTLS ELlevation Strategies Academic Coaches District Coaches
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>	All Social Studies teachers (9–12) will implement one standards-aligned literacy strategy daily that includes clearly posted and referenced success criteria aligned to both a Social Studies content standard and a Social Studies literacy standard, as evidenced by lesson plans, classroom observations, and student work samples.		

	○ Continue daily literacy strategy with explicit modeling (e.g., “watch me source this doc,” “notice how I cite evidence concisely”). ○ Introduce structured academic discussion → written response sequences weekly or bi-weekly. ○ Walkthroughs continue (2 per teacher/month). ○ PCCs: Short data talks every 4 weeks—review % checklist positives, lesson alignment, student samples; agree on one team move. ○ Calibration #2 (Weeks 14–16): Score second common writing sample. January–February (Weeks 1–6 of Semester 2) ○ Re-orient students to success criteria and disciplinary literacy norms (sourcing stems, CER frames, signal phrases). ○ Calibration #1 (S2) in Week 5–6 on first common writing sample. ○ Walkthroughs and PCC cycles continue. March–April (Weeks 7–14 of Semester 2) ○ Embed student self-assessment against posted success criteria (quick checks, exit slips). ○ Calibration #2 (S2) on second common writing sample (Weeks 12–14). ○ Coaches push targeted supports based on walkthrough trends (e.g., if “criteria referenced during instruction” is low, provide mini-PD and modeling). May (Weeks 15–18 of Semester 2) ○ Compile fidelity data, alignment rates, rubric proficiency rates. ○ Teachers complete a 1-page reflection: which strategies yielded strongest student evidence; 2 commitments for next year. ○ Leadership team drafts refinements to the checklist, exemplars, and walkthrough cadence. Artifacts to Be Collected ● Walkthrough Literacy Implementation Checklist (with success criteria look-fors) ● Lesson Plans / Instructional Framework or posted learning targets (showing content + literacy standard and daily strategy) ● Student Writing Samples (1 per teacher per quarter; common tasks where possible) ● PCC/PLC Agendas & Minutes (evidence of aligned task discussion, action steps) ● Calibration Notes (inter-rater reliability & anchor exemplars) ● Teacher Reflections (May and end of each semester)	● Collection of 1 student writing sample per teacher per quarter ● PCC agenda notes reflecting discussion of aligned tasks ● Teacher and student reflection survey Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	--	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: • Walkthroughs: At least 1 per teacher per month (using the literacy checklist) • Lesson Plan/Instructional framework reviews: Every other week • PCC Data Talks: Every 4 Weeks • Calibration sessions (Writing Samples): 1x/quarter • End of Semester Review/Reflection: 1x/semester		
--	---	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<u>Required Components</u>)		
Family Engagement Activities (<u>*Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required: * Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	9/29/26	☒ 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.	10/28/26	☐ 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 participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	4/27/27	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	9/18/26	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	2/12/27	
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: 1) Rising 9th Grade Parent Meeting 2) Transition to Adulthood (12th Grade Parent Meeting)	1) 10/30/26 2) 4/30/27	☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide translated information related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> - Policy - Compact - Flyers - Handbooks	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)</i>							
Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(*Must be listed in the school policy)</i>	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
1) Curriculum in Action Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4		Title I	1) 9/18/26		Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
2) Family Data Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4		Title II	3) 3/28/27		Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4					Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher

GaDOE required six “Shall’s”. Each shall must be addressed at least once during the school year:

1. Assist parents in understanding state academic standards, state and local assessments, and how to monitor their child’s academic progress.
2. Provide materials and training to help parents work with their child to improve academic achievement. (Ex. Literacy training, technology training)

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

School Improvement Plan Required Questions	
Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)	
1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)	
2. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)	
3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)	
4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)	

5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. *SWP Checklist 5(e)* **Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)**

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The schoolwide plan was developed in coordination with federal, state, district, and local resources to ensure a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement and addressing identified needs. School improvement goals were aligned with district initiatives, academic priorities, and support programs identified through the Comprehensive Needs Assessment.

Title I resources support professional learning, instructional coaching, academic intervention, family engagement activities, and supplemental instructional materials that directly align with school improvement goals. The school coordinates these efforts with district-supported initiatives, including implementation of the Georgia Standards of Excellence, the Cobb Teaching and Learning System (CTLs), Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), CommonLit, NoRedInk, Progress Learning, i-Ready, SOAR strategies, ELlevation, and support for English Learners and Students with Disabilities.

The schoolwide plan is further integrated with Career, Technical, and Agricultural Education (CTAE) pathways, Advanced Placement programs, counseling services, social work services, mental health supports, violence prevention and school safety initiatives, nutrition services, and family engagement programs. Collaboration among school leadership, academic coaches, teachers, district departments, parents, and community partners ensures that resources and services are aligned to meet the academic, social, emotional, and postsecondary readiness needs of all students. This coordinated approach maximizes available resources and supports continuous improvement efforts designed to increase student achievement and success.

ESSA Requirements to Include in the Schoolwide Plan – Section 1116(B)(1)

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

SWP Checklist 4

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - 34 CFR § 200.26

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Pebblebrook High School regularly monitors the implementation and effectiveness of the Schoolwide Program through ongoing review of student achievement data, instructional practices, and progress toward School Improvement Plan goals. School leaders, academic coaches, department chairs, and teachers analyze multiple data sources, including Georgia Milestones End of Course (EOC) assessments, common formative and summative assessments, i-Ready diagnostics, Progress Learning data, ACCESS results, graduation rate data, attendance data, and six-week course pass rates.

Implementation of schoolwide initiatives is monitored through Professional Collaborative Community (PCC) meetings, School Leadership Team meetings, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan reviews, and data analysis sessions. Results and progress toward school improvement goals are regularly shared with stakeholders through the school website, CTLS Parent, parent meetings, School Leadership Team meetings, and other school communication platforms. The school also utilizes electronic communication, social media, newsletters, and the principal's weekly Sunday evening call-outs to keep families and community members informed of student achievement, school initiatives, and opportunities for engagement. Monitoring results are used to adjust instructional practices, interventions, professional learning, and resource allocation to ensure all students have access to the support needed to meet challenging state academic standards.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Pebblebrook High School evaluates the effectiveness of its Schoolwide Program by analyzing a comprehensive set of academic, achievement, and implementation data. Key indicators include Georgia Milestones End of Course (EOC) assessments, ACCESS scores, graduation rates, common formative and summative assessments, Progress Learning data, i-Ready diagnostics, six-week course pass rates, and student subgroup performance data. These measures are used to identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement, particularly for students who are performing below state academic standards.

Throughout the school year, teachers, academic coaches, department chairs, and administrators engage in ongoing data analysis through Professional Collaborative Community (PCC) meetings, School Leadership Team meetings, instructional walkthroughs, and progress-monitoring cycles. During preplanning and summer collaborative planning sessions, staff review student achievement trends and develop targeted strategies designed to reduce the number of students performing at the Beginning level while increasing the number of students progressing from Developing to Proficient and from Proficient to Distinguished.

The school determines the success of its Schoolwide Program by measuring progress toward School Improvement Plan goals and monitoring growth among all student groups, with particular attention to English Learners, Students with Disabilities, and other historically underserved populations. Increases in academic achievement, course pass rates, graduation outcomes, CCRPI indicators, and student growth data serve as evidence of the program's effectiveness. Additionally, stakeholder feedback, including School Climate Survey results and family engagement data, is used to evaluate the impact of schoolwide initiatives and inform continuous improvement efforts.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The Schoolwide Plan is treated as a living document and is revised as needed to support continuous improvement and increased student achievement. Throughout the school year, teachers, academic coaches, department chairs, and administrators regularly analyze student performance data, including EOC results, common formative and summative assessments, Progress Learning data, i-Ready diagnostics, ACCESS scores, and six-week course pass rates. These data reviews help identify students who have not yet mastered grade-level standards and inform the development of targeted instructional strategies, interventions, and remediation plans.

When monitoring data reveals achievement gaps or areas where expected progress is not being made, adjustments are made to the School Improvement Plan to address identified needs. Revisions may include changes to instructional practices, intervention supports, professional learning priorities, and resource allocation. Attention is given to the performance of English Learners, Students with Disabilities, and other student groups requiring additional support. Professional Collaborative Communities (PCCs), School Leadership Team meetings, and ongoing instructional monitoring processes play a critical role in evaluating the effectiveness of schoolwide initiatives, sharing best practices, and determining next steps. This continuous cycle of monitoring, reflection, and adjustment ensures that the Schoolwide Program remains responsive to student needs and aligned with the goal of improving outcomes for all learners.

Schoolwide Plan Reform Strategies – Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)

10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State’s challenging academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State’s challenging academic standards, where applicable. SWP Checklist 2(a)**

11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable. SWP Checklist 2(b)**

12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include - counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students’ skills outside the academic subject areas. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable. SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)**

13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). *SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: At Pebblebrook High School, we believe that all students can learn and achieve at high levels when provided with appropriate academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support. To ensure student success, the school implements a comprehensive Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) that provides a framework for identifying student needs, delivering targeted interventions, and monitoring progress through a systematic, data-driven process.

The schoolwide MTSS framework consists of three tiers:

Tier 1 – Universal Supports: High-quality, standards-based instruction, positive behavior expectations, social-emotional learning supports, and schoolwide interventions designed to meet the needs of all students.

Tier 2 – Targeted Interventions: Supplemental academic and behavioral support provided to students who require additional assistance beyond Tier 1 instruction. Interventions are based on student data and are monitored regularly to determine effectiveness.

Tier 3 – Intensive Interventions: Individualized academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support designed for students demonstrating significant needs. Intervention plans are developed collaboratively and monitored closely by school personnel and support teams.

Student progress is monitored through multiple data sources, including academic performance, attendance, behavior referrals, progress-monitoring assessments, EOC data, ACCESS results, and other indicators of student success. School counselors, administrators, teachers, social workers, psychologists, and other support personnel regularly collaborate through MTSS and Student Support Team processes to review student data, evaluate intervention effectiveness, and determine appropriate next steps.

Pebblebrook High School coordinates its MTSS efforts with services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to ensure that students with disabilities receive appropriate support and access to the least restrictive learning environment. Early intervening services are designed to address academic and behavioral concerns before they become significant barriers to student achievement.

In addition to intervention support, students are provided opportunities to engage in Advanced Placement courses, Dual Enrollment, CTAE pathways, Work-Based Learning, JROTC, fine arts programs, and college and career readiness initiatives. Through its comprehensive MTSS framework, Pebblebrook High School works to prevent and address problem behaviors, remove barriers to learning, and ensure equitable access to academic success and postsecondary opportunities for all students.

14. Describe professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Professional learning at Pebblebrook High School is designed to strengthen instructional practices, increase student achievement, and improve educators' ability to use data to make informed instructional decisions. Professional learning opportunities are provided to teachers, paraprofessionals, instructional support personnel, and administrators through district training, school based professional learning, Professional Collaborative Community (PCC) meetings, instructional coaching, and collaborative planning sessions.

Throughout the school year, educators engage in professional learning focused on the implementation of the Georgia Standards of Excellence, deconstructed standards, evidence based instructional strategies, literacy across content areas, differentiated instruction, support for English Learners and Students with Disabilities, and the effective use of instructional technology and digital resources. Teachers regularly analyze data from Georgia Milestones EOC assessments, common formative and summative assessments, Progress Learning, i Ready, ACCESS, and course performance data to identify student needs, monitor progress, and adjust instruction.

Professional learning also emphasizes the use of student friendly learning targets, formative assessment practices, academic vocabulary development, student engagement strategies, data analysis protocols, and collaborative planning processes designed to increase rigor and improve student outcomes. Academic coaches, district specialists, and teacher leaders support implementation through classroom modeling, feedback, data discussions, and ongoing coaching cycles.

To recruit and retain highly effective educators, particularly in high need subject areas, Pebblebrook High School fosters a collaborative and supportive professional culture that values continuous growth, leadership development, mentoring, and shared decision making. New teachers receive targeted support through induction and mentoring programs, while veteran educators are providing opportunities to serve in leadership roles, facilitate professional learning, and contribute to school improvement efforts. These comprehensive professional learning opportunities support continuous improvement and help ensure high quality instruction for all students.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: N/A

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Pebblebrook High School is committed to preparing students for success in postsecondary education, career pathways, military service, and the workforce by providing a wide range of rigorous academic and career readiness opportunities. Students are exposed to postsecondary options through Advanced Placement (AP) courses, Dual Enrollment, Career Technical and Agricultural Education (CTAE) pathways, Work Based Learning, and specialized fine arts and performing arts programs.

Students receive ongoing support through counseling services, college and career planning activities, individual graduation advisement, college application workshops, financial aid awareness sessions, and career exploration opportunities. College representatives, technical colleges, military recruiters, and industry partners regularly visit the campus to provide students with information regarding postsecondary pathways and workforce opportunities.

Pebblebrook High School also provides students with opportunities to earn postsecondary credit while enrolled in high school through Advanced Placement and Dual Enrollment programs. Students participating in CTAE pathways have opportunities to earn industry recognized credentials and engage in authentic learning experiences that align with workforce demands. Work Based Learning experiences allow students to apply classroom learning in professional settings while developing employability skills and career competencies.

Additional opportunities such as job fairs, career shadowing experiences, college visits, military awareness programs, and the annual administration of the ASVAB through the JROTC program help students make informed decisions about their future goals. Through these comprehensive supports and opportunities, Pebblebrook High School ensures that students are aware of and prepared for a variety of postsecondary education and workforce options.

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

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

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

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

Position	Supports Goal(s)	Supports which system(s)	How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?
ELA Academic Coach	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The ELA Academic Coach will support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan by providing ongoing professional learning, coaching, and support focused on the Georgia ELA Standards, evidence-based literacy practices, and data driven instruction. The coach will facilitate Professional Collaborative Community (PCC) meetings, support teachers in analyzing assessment data, assist with the development of rigorous standards aligned lessons, and monitor the implementation of reading, writing, and vocabulary strategies. The coach will also provide instructional modeling and feedback to strengthen classroom practices and improve student achievement in ELA.
Math Academic Coach	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engage	The Mathematics Academic Coach will support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan by providing professional learning and coaching focused on unpacking standards, mathematical literacy, student discourse, and effective instructional strategies. The coach will assist teachers in analyzing formative and summative assessment data, developing targeted interventions, and implementing instructional practices that address identified learning gaps. Through collaborative planning, classroom support, and ongoing monitoring, the coach will help increase student proficiency and achievement in mathematics.
Social Studies Academic Coach	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engage	The Social Studies Academic Coach will support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan by providing professional learning and instructional support focused on literacy integration, document-based analysis, academic discourse, and standards-based instruction. The coach will collaborate with teachers to analyze student performance data, develop rigorous learning experiences, and implement strategies that strengthen critical thinking and historical reasoning skills. Through coaching cycles, collaborative planning, and classroom support, the coach will promote instructional consistency and improve student achievement in social studies.
Science Academic Coach	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engage	The Science Academic Coach will support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan by strengthening instructional practices aligned to the Georgia Science Standards and promoting the use of evidence-based teaching strategies. The coach will facilitate data analysis, support collaborative planning, and assist teachers in implementing strategies that improve scientific literacy, academic vocabulary, and student engagement. Through professional learning, instructional modeling, and progress monitoring, the coach will help teachers address student learning needs and increase achievement in science courses.

Parent Facilitator	☐ 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 coordinate with teachers and staff, to organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies to support their children’s academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. • Increased Parental Involvement: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. • Connecting Families with Resources: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.
--------------------	--	---	--

School Improvement Goals <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy</i>	
Goal #1	The percentage of students scoring at or above level reading Lexile scores will increase from 65% to 70% as measured by the EOC assessment data. The non-EOC ELA courses for the FY26 school year will have 65% of students score at or above level on the final reading comprehension exam.

Goal #2	The percentage of math students scoring proficient will increase from 27% to 30% as measured by the EOC data. The non-EOC math courses for the FY27 school year will have 66% to score in the proficient and distinguished level on the final exam.
Goal #3	The percentage of Biology EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 47% to 50% as measured by 2026-2027 Biology EOC. The percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 43% to 48% as measured by the 2026-2027 Summative Assessment.
Goal #4	During the 2026-2027 school year, the percentage of US History EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished on the US History EOC will increase from 50% to 53% as measured by the 2026-2027 US History EOC During the 2026-2027 school year, the percentage of non-EOC students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 50% to 53%