School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A

School Year:	**2025 - 2026**
School Name:	**Osborne High School**
Principal Name:	**Dr. Troy Jones**
Date Submitted:	
Revision Date(s):	

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	Osborne High School
Team Lead	Sherrye Tillman
Position	Instructional Coach
Email	Sherrye.tillman@cobbk12.org
Phone	770 437 5900 ext. 039

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

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

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

School Response:
In developing this plan, the school actively sought input from a diverse group of stakeholders. Instructional coaches and administrators first collaborated to identify key committee members who could provide meaningful input on the graduation rate goal. Each core content department then held a minimum of three structured meetings. During these sessions, teachers and staff analyzed relevant data, identified root causes of performance gaps, and collaboratively developed one to two targeted action steps aligned with their departmental goals. This inclusive process ensured that the voices of educators, support personnel, parents and students were central to shaping the plan's direction and evidence-based strategies.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	April 17, 2025	April 28, 2025	May 5, 2025	May 8, 2025

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	By May 2027, the graduation rate of the FY27 cohort will increase from our current ~~74.33~~ 77.39 to 78.39%.
	• May 2023: 498 Graduated /670 FY23 Cohort = 74.33 Graduation Rate
	• May 2024: 499 Graduated/654 FY24 Cohort = ~~77.63~~ 77.39 Graduation Rate
	• Benchmark 1: May 2024: 575 (0.753 x 764) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)
	  ○ FY27 Cohort May 2024 Progress: 525/764 (69%) of current 9th graders are on track to graduate. (Before Course Ext)
	• Benchmark 2: May 2025: 579 (0.763 0.785 x 738) students will be on track for graduation.
	  ○ FY27 Cohort January 2025 Progress: 611/738 (83%) of current sophomores are on track to graduate. 127 students are off cohort.
	• Benchmark 3: May 2026: 587 (~~0.773~~ 0.795 x ~~764~~ 738) students will be on track for graduation.
	• Benchmark 4: May 2027: 594 (~~0.783~~ 0.785 x ~~764~~ 738) students will graduate (Graduation Rate of 78.39%).

Was the goal met? ☒ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	CCRPI Graduation Rate 9th Grade Intervention Students' Course Pass Rates 11th and 12th Students' Course Pass Withdrawal Spreadsheet
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be	9th Grade Interventional Team: The goal of the team was to provide early interventions to target students who were most at-risk of not graduating in 4 years to positively impact the 4-year graduation rate. The team was formed of teachers, counselors, instructional coaches, and administrators. Each team member mentored students identified from the Title I Rank Order List and monitored their progress towards earning two core content credits and one elective credit each semester. Students were provided incentives by their mentor for reaching attendance targets and grade targets. Edmentum: Based on the 2023 Edmentum training, *100% of Core teachers implemented Cardinal Grade Repair initiative by utilizing Edmentum to allow students to repair their grades every 7 weeks throughout the semester. The non-core teachers implemented the Cardinal Grade Repair initiative through their department Collaborative Team (CT) recovery plan.* Edmentum

implemented to sustain progress?	reports show increased student usage from September to December, based on the students receiving ongoing support in person for the 2024 and 2025 semester. In addition, 100% of the core courses utilized Edmentum for Cardinal Grade Repair and 100% of Non-Core CTs have created and implemented a recovery plan per content. There was a decrease in the number of overall courses that fell between a 69 and below. For all course that fell below 69, 39.9% of students failed by January 2025, which was 833 out of 2085 courses. When looking at core courses, 30.3%, which was 633 out of 2085 final grade fell below 69. The number of students with a 69 and below in the courses offered in the Fall 2024 during each of CGR sessions. There was a decrease in the number seniors in courses failed from the first grade pull to the last, by 18.24% 60 out of 329. This prompted and additional session to be added after final grades were Cohort Cleanup: The goal for FY 23-24 was for 542 students to be on track for graduation out of 780 (69.5% graduation rate). As of graduation 5/22/24, we graduated 496 students out of 654 (76% graduation rate,) which exceeds the previous goal of 74.1% by May 2027 and exceeds the previously written benchmark goals for 2024-2027. This was accomplished by determining who, when, and why we are losing students through withdrawals, transfers, course failure, and dropping out as addressed in the FY24 Plan. These determinations were made through the development of a committee to address these graduation cohort concerns. Trend data and cohort withdrawal data were monitored to help address these concerns and positively impact graduation rate. To address the cohort concerns, a committee made up of administrators, counselors, a clerk, and an instructional coach met to review data and identify students at risk of not graduating. The committee looked at withdrawals, transfers, course failures, drop out lists as well as other data points. Once students were identified, processes were put in place to remove them from the graduating cohort if they were no longer attending the school or interventions were put in place to help students achieve graduation. ELLevation: The teachers continued to go through the modules in ELLevation to support our multilingual learners (ELLs) in the school. For the SY 24-25 school year 96.95% of teacher completed the pathways. Although the goal was to have a 100% completion rate, 3.05% left before the end of the year resulting in us not meeting the 100% completion goal.

Previous Year's Goal #2	Students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Algebra EOC will increase from 30.49% to 31.40% as indicated by the CCRPI data (Closing the Gap, 3% increase).
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	147 of the 751 students tested, scored proficient or distinguished. This makes a 19.57% proficiency rate. This data comes from the EOC scores (SLDS Longitudinal Data).

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Utilize a backward design to plan units based on EOC assessment blueprints, emphasizing both content and depth of knowledge. Establish a systematic approach to data collection and analysis using formative and benchmark aligned with EOC standards. Use data protocols to adjust instruction, group students for targeted interventions, and identify learning gaps early. Integrate more performance tasks and real-world applications to build reasoning, modeling, and problem-solving skills. Administer diagnostic assessments at the beginning of each unit to identify prerequisite skill gaps. Implement targeted intervention or remediation plans for students with foundational deficiencies. Utilize vetted resources to support diverse learning styles.
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

Previous Year's Goal #3	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI American Lit EOC will increase from 29.84% to 30.7% (CCRPI Closing the Gap). Our goal is for 203 (685 approximate total) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2025.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	26% (160 students) of 627 students scored proficient + distinguished, based on local school raw data.

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The English team will implement targeted strategies to strengthen students' literacy and language development through explicit instruction in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and text analysis. Students will engage in regular, structured writing activities—particularly writing on demand—to build fluency and confidence in expressing their ideas under time constraints. Teachers will conduct one-on-one and small group reading and writing conferences to provide personalized feedback and support, while also guiding students in setting and reflecting on individual literacy goals. These strategies aim to create a responsive, student-centered learning environment, with progress monitored through formative assessments, student work samples, and ongoing instructional walkthroughs.
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

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

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATES			
Graduation Rate Longitudinal Data	**SY22**	**SY23**	**SY24**
	68.01%	74.33%	77.39%

OVERALL CONTENT AREA DATA				
EOC Longitudinal Data	**SY22** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY23** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished *raw data
American Literature & Comprehension	27.05%	23.22%	29.84%	26%
Algebra	15.93%	16.07%	30.49%	18.10%
Biology	30.25%	35.37%	34.28%	30.91%
U.S. History	38.63%	32.04%	24.87%	32.31%

GRADUATION RATE DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: Graduation Rate	**By May 2027, the graduation rate of the FY27 cohort will increase from our current 74.33 77.39 to 78.39%.** • May 2023: 498 Graduated /670 FY23 Cohort = 74.33 Graduation Rate • May 2024: 499 Graduated/654 FY24 Cohort = 77.63 77.39 Graduation Rate **Benchmark 1: May 2024: 575 (0.753 x 764) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** • FY27 Cohort May 2024 Progress: 525/764 (69%) of current 9th graders are on track to graduate. (Before Course Ext) **Benchmark 2: May 2025: 579 (0.763 0.785 x 738) students will be on track for graduation.** • FY27 Cohort January 2025 Progress: 611/738 (83%) of current sophomores are on track to graduate. 127 students are off cohort. • *Benchmarks 2 – 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 77.39 and the current enrollment of the FY27 Cohort (738 students). These numbers will adjust over time.* **Benchmark 3: May 2026: 587 (0.773 0.795 x 764 738) students will be on track for graduation.** **Benchmark 4: May 2027: 594 (0.783 0.785 x 764 738) students will graduate (Graduation Rate of 78.39%).**
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	**First time 9th grade students need a system of support with specific interventions aimed at keeping them on track for graduating on time.** **Parents, teachers and students are not clear on all of the available opportunities for students to repair their grades in order to get on track with their cohort (grade repair, CVA, GVA, etc).** **Strong cohort monitoring systems are in place; continued progress requires refining and scaling these efforts to increase personalized support and re-engagement of withdrawn students.** **Teachers need to be equipped with more instructional strategies to provide language support for our growing population of multilingual learners**.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District

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

	• Committee will review survey data to determine needs and effectiveness of intervention strategies. • Committee will update watchlist (if needed). • Committee members plan PL focused on strategies for 9th grade intervention. • All teachers teaching a 9th grade course, will receive PL on the designated intervention strategy for the Spring semester. February-April: • Mentors will meet with students every month. • Committee will collect grade data every two weeks. • Committee will collect informal feedback from teachers for intervention effectiveness. • Administrator will update behavior details (if any) for watchlist students. • Counselors will meet with students for status reports and matriculation information weekly. • Committee will send survey to 9th grade teachers. (Survey inquiring of the strategies implemented for intervention.) • Review data from surveys to inform changes for next semester. May: • Committee will review final grades for the semester in May meeting. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Committee Meeting Minutes • Mentor Tracking Sheet/Teacher Input Form **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** • PL Planning – Once per semester • Grade Pull – Every 2 weeks. • Mentors will meet with students – Monthly Committee Meetings – Monthly		

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **2. Cardinal Grade Repair** **All teachers will implement the Cardinal Grade Repair Plan each 7-week cycle to decrease student failure rate.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of teachers will complete the Cardinal Grade Repair Implementation steps as evidenced by the CT assignment document. **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** **August-September:** • DCs will review the Cardinal Grade Repair process. • Teachers will identify students with a 69 and below assign missing standards-based formative and summative assessments from the first 6 weeks grading period. • Admin will send a CTLS broadcast to notify students and parents by the 4th week. • Notify students during advisory of the opportunity to participate in CGR. • Eligible students and parents will be notified through CTLS messages by 6th week. • Review Edmentum report and CT Excel sheet at the 7th week post completion of the Cardinal grade repair session. • Student Reflection Exit Survey • CGR Team will review student reflection surveys **October-December:** • Teachers will identify students with a 69 and below assign missing standards- based formative and summative assessments from the first 6 weeks grading period and modify one-pager based on the standards for each session. • Admin will send a CTLS broadcast to notify students and parents by the 4th week. • Notify students during advisory of the opportunity to participate in CGR. • Eligible students and parents will be notified through CTLS messages by 6th week.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By May 2026 the number of students failing will decrease by 70% as evidenced by the grade reports. **Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ Synergy Grade Reports **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ 6 weeks after grades are posted ☒ 7 weeks after Cardinal Grade Repair Session **Data Analysis Plan:** • Every 6 weeks CGR Lead, Coach, or Admin will review the failure reports post grading cycle prior to each grade repair session • On the 7th week after each grade repair session, the CGR Lead, Coach or Admin will review updated grades for the course • Analyze survey results from the Student Exit Survey and determine student, teacher and parental support if needed. • Final analysis of course failures from the grade pull will be reviewed in December and in May. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CT Leads	• Edmentum • CT Excel Sheets • Teachers • Cardinal Grade Repair Team • Academic Coaches • Synergy Grade Reports

	• Review Edmentum report and CT Excel sheet at the 7th week post completion of the Cardinal grade repair session.
	• Post December final grade posting, CT determine the # Assignments Tiered based on grading scale
	  ○ 66-69 (2 of assignments)
	  ○ 60-65 (3 of assignments)
	• Review data from each session to determine the completion rate for semester 2025.
	• Student Reflection Exit Survey.
	
	January-February:
	• Teachers will identify students with a 69 and below assign missing standards- based formative and summative assessments from the first 6 weeks grading period.
	• Admin will send a CTLS broadcast to notify students and parents by the 4th week.
	• Notify students during advisory of the opportunity to participate in CGR.
	• Eligible students and parents will be notified through CTLS messages by 6th week.
	• Review Edmentum report and CT Excel sheet at the 7th week post completion of the Cardinal grade repair session.
	• Student Reflection Exit Survey
	
	March-April:
	• Teachers will identify students with a 69 and below assign missing standards- based formative and summative assessments from the first 6 weeks grading period and modify one-pager based on the standards for each session.
	• Admin will send a CTLS broadcast to notify students and parents by the 4th week.
	• Notify students during advisory of the opportunity to participate in CGR.
	• Eligible students and parents will be notified through CTLS messages by 6th week.
	• Review Edmentum report and CT Excel sheet at the 7th week post completion of the Cardinal grade repair session.		

	• Begin to identify Senior failures and create core and non-core Senior specific one pager.
	• Student Reflection Exit Survey
	
	May:
	• Teachers will identify students with a 69 and below assign missing standards- based formative and summative assessments from the first 6 weeks grading period and modify one-pager based on the standards for each session.
	• Admin will send a CTLS broadcast to notify students and parents by the 4th week.
	• Eligible students and parents will be notified through CTLS messages by 6th week.
	• Create Senior specific Edmentum courses and offer final Senior CGR session.
	• Review data from each session to determine the completion rate for semester 2026.
	• Student Reflection Exit Survey
	• CGR Team will review student reflection surveys
	• Post December final grade posting, CT determine the # Assignments Tiered based on grading scale
	  ○ 66-69 (3 of assignments)
	  ○ 60-65 (5 of assignments)
	
	Artifacts to be Collected:
	• PL Agenda
	• Cardinal Grade Repair One Pager
	• Non-Core Grade Repair Plan
	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
	☒ Principal
	☒ Assistant Principals
	☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
	☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
	Frequency of Monitoring:
	Every 7-week cycle		

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **3. Cohort Clean-Up** **The Cohort Committee will refine the monitoring process to include proactive cohort support and targeted retention for students in Cohorts 2026–2029.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** • 100% of Cohort Monitoring Committee members will document the identification and status of off-cohort and withdrawn students, using On-Track reports and the withdrawal document as evidence. **Implementation Plan:** ▪ **Preplanning**: ❑ Establish cohort committee members ❑ Establish & clarify roles & responsibilities ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ▪ **August-September**: ❑ Establish off-cohort list (Aug) ❑ Assign off-cohort students with mentors (after 6 wks) ❑ Establish student Incentive Distribution spreadsheet ❑ Promotion celebration from last semester (Aug) ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ▪ **October-December**: ❑ Student Incentive Distribution #1 ❑ Monitoring withdrawals and off-cohort students ❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ▪ **January-February**: ❑ Promotion Celebration from 1st Semester ❑ Student Incentive Distribution #2 (Feb) ❑ Identification of seniors at risk of not graduating ❑ Monitoring off-cohort students ❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn	**Evaluation Performance Target:** • By May 2026, the number of students classified as off-cohort will decrease by at least 10%, and a minimum of 10% of students who have withdrawn will be re-engaged through credit recovery, re-enrollment, or alternative diploma pathways, as evidenced by updated cohort status records, credit completion reports, and withdrawal documentation. **Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ Cohort tracking records ▪ Credit recovery completion reports ▪ Enrollment/re-enrollment documentation **Evaluation Plan:** Student cohort data will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** • Cohort and withdrawal data will be reviewed during bi-monthly Cohort Committee meetings, using the Off-Cohort Checklist and Withdrawal Monitoring Form to identify trends, risk factors, and gaps in support. • The Off-Cohort Mentor Tracking Spreadsheet will be updated after each mentor interaction and analyzed quarterly to monitor student progress, engagement levels, and intervention effectiveness. • Data findings will inform the timing and content of quarterly student incentive distributions and guide adjustments to mentor assignments, support strategies, and credit recovery enrollment. • A midyear and end-of-year summary report will be generated to evaluate overall cohort movement, re-	• Personnel • Mentors • Incentives • Alternative Ed Programs

	▪ **March-April**: ❑ Student Incentive Distribution #3 (April) ❑ Monitoring withdrawals and off-cohort students ❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Individual Senior Meetings ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn ▪ **May**: ❑ Monitoring withdrawals and off-cohort students ❑ Mentors working with students providing interventions ❑ Summer school registration (if needed) ❑ Ongoing review, contact, & intervention of students withdrawn **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Withdrawal document • Off-Cohort Committee Meeting Minutes **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒Counselors ☒ Clerks **Frequency of Monitoring:** Bi-Monthly Meetings	engagement outcomes, and alignment to the 10% reduction target **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Counselors ☒ Clerks	

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **4. ELLevation** **All teachers will implement an ELLevation strategy to provide targeted reading and writing language support for Active English Language Learners as evidenced by 6-week cycle ELL Progress Tracker Form.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** **100% of teachers will implement Ellevation strategies on a six-week cycle as evidenced by the ELL Progress tracker form.** **Implementation Plan:** ▪ Preplanning: All-faculty PL – Knowing and Growing our ESOL Learners (Access Scores, Can-Do Descriptors, Student Academic Form, ESOL Tracker Form) ▪ August-September: 1. Teachers will identify their Active and LTELs 2. CTs Select ELLevation Reading or Writing Strategy 3. ESOL Teachers will model ELLevation strategy in Departmental meetings or in CT meetings 4. Admin, ICs, DCs, ESOL Teachers, District will conduct walkthroughs 5. Local School ICs, ESOL CT Lead, District ESOL Consultant or District ICs will provide support for CTs or teachers who need additional support. 6. Teachers will turn in their ESOL tracker forms to their DCs then to ESOL DC. ▪ October-December: 1. CTs Select ELLevation Reading or Writing Strategy 2. ESOL Teachers will model ELLevation strategy in Departmental meetings or in CT meetings 3. Admin, ICs, DCs, ESOL Teachers, District will conduct walkthroughs 4. Local School ICs, ESOL CT Lead, District ESOL Consultant or District ICs will provide support for CTs or teachers needing additional support. 5. Teachers will turn in their ESOL tracker forms to their DCs then to ESOL DC. ▪ January-March: 1. Teachers will identify their Active and LTELs 2. CTs Select ELLevation Reading or Writing Strategy	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **40% of ELLs will show growth on their Lexile i-Ready Reading Assessment every 9 weeks.** **Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ i-Ready Growth Reports **Evaluation Plan:** Teachers will assess targeted Active and Long-Term EL students: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Every nine weeks ☒ At the end of the year (upon ACCESS scores availability) **Data Analysis Plan:** ▪ ESOL advisory, departments, CTs and teachers every six (6) weeks monitor Active ELs grades and attendance. ▪ Collaborative Teams (CTs) will evaluate the effectiveness of the ELLevation strategy in relation to students' formative and summative assessment performance. ▪ Students will be assessed in February using the ACCESS assessment. ▪ Results will be reviewed. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CT Leads ☒ Department Chairs ☒ Teachers	**Ellevation** **WIDA Standards** **District English Learner Programs Consultant**

	3. ESOL Teachers will model ELLevation strategy in Departmental meetings or in CT meetings 4. Admin, ICs, DCs, ESOL Teachers, District will conduct walkthroughs 5. Local School ICs, ESOL CT Lead, District ESOL Consultant or District ICs will provide support for CTs or teachers who need additional support. 6. Teachers will turn in their ESOL tracker forms to their DCs then to ESOL DC. ▪ April-May: 1. CTs Select ELLevation Reading or Writing Strategy 2. ESOL Teachers will model ELLevation strategy in Departmental meetings or in CT meetings 3. Admin, ICs, DCs, ESOL Teachers, District will conduct walkthroughs 4. Local School ICs, ESOL CT Lead, District ESOL Consultant or District ICs will provide support for CTs or teachers needing additional support. 5. Teachers will turn in their ESOL tracker forms to their DCs then to ESOL DC. ▪ May: ACCESS Exit Data Review **Artifacts to be Collected:** • **ELL Progress Tracker form** • **Instructional walk-throughs checklist** **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ Department Chairs ☒ Teachers **Frequency of Monitoring:** **Every six weeks**		

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 4	0%	0%	2%	0%	3%	1%
Level 3	23%	28%	23%	17%	29%	23%
Level 2	44%	44%	39%	47%	35%	42%
Level 1	33%	27%	36%	35%	34%	34%

AMERICAN LITERATURE AND COMPOSITION (READING STATUS) – By Year

Percentage of Students	SY22		SY23		SY24		SY25	
	Winter 21	Spring 22	Winter 22	Spring 23	Winter 23	Spring 24	Winter 24	Spring 25
Grade Level and Above			181/316 – 57%	175/305 – 57%	210/350 – 60%	200/343 – 58%	117/312 – 38%	195/335 – 50%
Below Grade Level			135/316 – 43%	130/305 – 43%	140/350 – 40%	143/343 – 42%	175/312 – 56%	140/335 – 42%

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

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Reading and Vocabulary		Reading Literary Text		Reading Informational	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning *(Met Target)*	48/312 – 15%	61/335 – 18%	37/312 – 12%	59/335 – 18%	41/312 – 13%	55/335 – 16%
Level 2 Monitor Learning *(Approaching Target)*	48/312 – 15%	63/335 – 19%	97/312 – 31%	97/335 – 29%	55/312 – 18%	84/335 – 25%
Level 1 Remediate Learning *(Met Target)*	215/312- 69%	211/335 – 63%	177/312 – 57%	179/335 – 53%	196/312- 63%	196/335 – 59%

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

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	Writing and Language		Writing		Language	
	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring	Winter	Spring
Level 3 Accelerate Learning *(Met Target)*	41/312-13%		40/312 – 13%		28/312 – 9%	

Level 2 Monitor Learning *(Approaching Target)*	55/312-18%		75/312 – 24%		82/312 – 27%	
Level 1 Remediate Learning *(Below Target)*	196/312 -63%		177/312 – 57%		182/312-58%	

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	**Extended Writing Task** Ideas		**Narrative Writing Response**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4 Distinguished	15/312-5%	19/335 – 5%	60/312-19%	84/335 – 25%
Level 3 Proficient	85/312-27%	76/335 – 23%	109/312-35%	112/335 – 33%
Level 2 Developing	130/312-42%	174/335 – 52%	70/312-22%	70/335 – 21%
Level 1 Basic	67/312-21%	55/335 – 16%	40/312-13%	44/335 – 13%

ELA DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

AMERICAN LITERATURE & COMPOSITION (3-year trends) **What trends exist for all students in the:**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	According to the Longitudinal EOC data, from 22-23-24, overall our level 4 students improved- 0% to 2% to 4%.	According to the Longitudinal EOC data, from 22-23-24, all of our students need to be moving up more clearly. The data seems inconsistent.
Percentage of students reading on grade level or below grade level?	Students are improving overall 2.5% of Distinguished Learners	A significantly high percentage of Beginning Learners (63.81%) and 0% of Distinguished Learners. A significantly high percentage of Beginning Learners (61.25%).
Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?	SY22 to SY23 In Winter, the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 increased by 2%. In Winter, the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 increased by 1%. In Winter, the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased by 6%. In Winter, the percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased by 5%.	SY22 to SY23 In Winter, the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 increased by 3%. In Spring, the percentage of students scoring at Level 2 increased by 3%. In Spring, the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 increased by 8%. SY23 to SY24 In Spring, the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 decreased by 11%.

	In Spring, the percentage of students scoring at Level 4 increased by 1%. In Spring, the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 increased by 6%. SY23 to SY24 In Winter, the percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased by 4%. In Winter, the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased by 2%. In Spring, the percentage of students scoring at Level 2 decreased by 5%. In Spring, the percentage of students scoring at Level 1 decreased by 1%.	
Reading domain increases or decreases?	**Reading and Vocabulary:** • Level 3 increased from 15% to 18% • Level 1 decreased from 69% to 63% **Reading Literary Text:** • Level 3 increased from 12% to 18% • Level 1 decreased from 57% to 53% **Reading Informational:** • Level 3 increased from 13% to 16% • Level 1 decreased from 63% to 59% Level 3 Accelerate Learning (Met Target): Winter to Spring: The percentage of students increased from 15% to 19%. Level 2 Monitor Learning (Approaching Target): Winter to Spring: The percentage of students remained relatively stable, with a 2 percent decrease from 31% to 29%. Level 1 Remediate Learning (Below Target): Winter to Spring: Reading Vocabulary - The percentage of students decreased from 69% to 63%.	Grade Level and Above: Spring 23 to Winter 23: The percentage of students at grade level and above decreased from 60% to 58%. Winter 23 to Spring 24: The percentage of students at grade level and above decreased from 58% to 38%. Below Grade Level: Spring 23 to Winter 23: The percentage of students below grade level increased from 40% to 42%. Winter 23 to Spring 24: The percentage of students below grade level increased from 42% to 56%.

	Reading Literary Text - The percentage of students decreased from 57% to 53%. Reading Informational - The percentage of students decreased from 63% to 59%.	
Writing domain increases or decreases?	Significant growth in higher mastery levels (Level 4) for both Extended Writing Task Ideas and Narrative Writing Response. Decrease in lower mastery levels (Level 1) for Writing and Language, and Extended Writing Task Ideas. Writing and Language: Level 1 (Remediate Learning) decreased from 63% to 57%. Language: Level 2 (Monitor Learning) decreased from 26% to 0%. Level 1 (Remediate Learning) decreased from 58% to 0%. Extended Writing Task Ideas: Level 4 (Distinguished) increased from 5% to 6%. Level 1 (Basic) decreased from 21% to 16%. Narrative Writing Response: Level 4 (Distinguished) increased from 19% to 25%. Level 2 (Developing) decreased from 22% to 21%.	Writing and Language: Level 3 (Accelerate Learning) no change from 13% to 13%. Level 2 (Monitor Learning) increased from 18% to 24%. Language: Level 3 (Accelerate Learning) decreased from 9% to 0%. Extended Writing Task Ideas: Level 3 (Proficient) decreased from 27% to 23%. Level 2 (Developing) increased from 42% to 52%. Narrative Writing Response: Level 3 (Proficient) decreased from 35% to 33%. Level 1 (Basic) increased from 13% to 13%.
How do the trends differ for EL students? **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	ELs Proficiency was at 9.52%. English Learners (ELs) growth target: 22.86 met and exceeded the target of 21.84 showing measurable growth from the previous year.	While the majority of students across most demographic groups are distributed between the Developing and Proficient levels, ELs and SWDs are disproportionately represented in the Beginning Learner category—63.81% and 61.25%, respectively. SWDs (24.38) did not meet the 30.42 improvement target.

COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	Progress Learning Benchmarks	**Progress Learning Benchmarks**

What trends exist for all students in the: **Percentages mastering standards aligned to reading domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness**	Students demonstrate high mastery in several reading-related standards, indicating strong comprehension and analytical skills in specific areas: • (ELAGSE11-12RI3) Analyze complex ideas/events – 84% • (ELACC11-12RI4) Meaning of words/phrases – 82% These results suggest that students are proficient in: • Understanding and analyzing complex informational texts. • Interpreting the meaning of words and phrases in context. This reflects a solid grasp of textual analysis and vocabulary interpretation within informational reading. **High Mastery (80% and above)** These standards show strong student performance: (ELAGSE11-12RI3) Analyze complex ideas/events – 84% (ELAGSE11-12W1d) Formal style/objective tone – 80% (ELAGSE11-12W8) Gather info. from print/digital sources – 93% Language – 80% (ELAGSE3L1f) Agreement – 88% (ELAGSE11-12L2b) Spell correctly – 81% Speaking and Listening – 82% (ELACC11-12RI4) Meaning of words/phrases – 82% **Moderate Mastery (60%–79%)** These standards are performing adequately but have room for growth: Key Ideas and Details – 75% (ELAGSE11-12RL3) Impact of author's choices – 77% (ELAGSE11-12RI1) Cite textual evidence – 79% Craft & Structure/Integration of Knowledge & Ideas – 66% (ELAGSE11-12RI5) Analyze/evaluate effectiveness of structure – 74%	There are notable areas of low mastery that require targeted instructional support: • (ELAGSE11-12RI2) Determine themes/central ideas – 57% • (ELAGSE11-12RI9) Analyze foundational U.S. documents – 58% • (ELAGSE11-12RI5) Analyze/evaluate effectiveness of structure – 74% • (ELAGSE11-12RI1) Cite textual evidence – 79% These results indicate challenges in: • Identifying central ideas and themes in texts. • Analyzing historical documents. • Evaluating text structure and citing evidence effectively. This suggests a need for focused instruction on comprehension of main ideas, historical context analysis, and evidence-based reasoning. **Low Mastery (Below 60%)** These standards need targeted instructional support: • **(ELAGSE11-12RI2)** Determine themes/central ideas – **57%** • **(ELAGSE11-12RI9)** Analyze foundational U.S. documents – **58%**

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Vocabulary Acquisition and Use – 68%
(ELAGSE11-12RL4) Meaning of words/phrases – 66%
(ELAGSE11-12L5a) Interpret figures of speech – 70%
Writing – 78%
(ELAGSE11-12W2d) Use precise language – 68%
(ELAGSE11-12W5) Develop/strengthen writing – 77%
(ELAGSE11-12L2a) Hyphenation conventions – 61%</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Percentages mastering standards aligned to writing domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness</td><td>My Access
- Out of 1000 students, 4000 submissions. 1/3 of our students are doing more than one essay submission.

Metric Regular Classes ESOL Courses SWD Courses
Avg First Submission 4.41 2.75 3.40
Avg Most Recent Submission 4.63 2.87 3.54
Improvement (%) 4.57% 4.70% 4.10%
Avg Holistic Score 4.36 2.82 3.46
Focus Score 4.29 2.76 3.40
Content Development 3.88 2.51 3.08
Organization 3.78 2.47 3.03
Language/Vocabulary/Style 4.34 2.90 3.49
Grammar & Mechanics 4.04 2.76 3.22

Proficiency Level
Reg ESOL SWD Courses
Mastery 12.9% 6.7% 7.9%
Proficient 9.1% 11.5% 23.9%
At Risk 11.2% 81.7% 68.2%</td><td>My Access
• ESOL Students have the lowest scores across all categories, particularly in content development and organization. A significant 81.7% are at risk, indicating a need for targeted intervention.
• SWD Students perform better than ESOL but still lag behind regular classes. Their proficient rate (23.9%) is higher than ESOL and regular classes, but 68.2% remain at risk.
• 2/3 of students submitted one draft of their essay.</td></tr>
<tr><td>How do the trends differ for EL students?</td><td>Progress Learning Strengths (Reading Domain):

Highest reading standard: RI3 – Analyze complex ideas/events (84%)
Other strong areas: RI4 – Meaning of words/phrases (82%)
EL Data Strengths (Reading Domain):

Multiple standards above 85%, including:
RL7 – Multiple interpretations (100%)
RI4 – Word meanings (91%)</td><td>Progress Learning Weaknesses (Reading Domain):

RI2 – Determine themes/central ideas (57%)
RI9 – Analyze foundational U.S. documents (58%)
Moderate weaknesses in RI5 (74%) and RL4 (66%)
EL Data Weaknesses (Reading Domain):

RI7 – Integrate/evaluate sources (56%)
RI8 – Evaluate reasoning (62%)
L4b – Patterns of word changes (0%)</td></tr>
</table>

	RI5 – Analyze structure (86%) RI1 – Cite textual evidence (85%) RL3 – Author's choices (85%) EL students show stronger performance across a broader range of reading standards, with 9 standards ≥ 85%, compared to only 2 standards ≥ 80% in the general Progress Learning data.	Several standards in the 70–84% range, including RI2 (84%), RI6 (75%), and RL2 (75%) While both groups struggle with RI2 (themes/central ideas) and RI9 (foundational documents), EL students also show extreme lows in L4b (0%) and RI7 (56%), indicating specific gaps in vocabulary development and source evaluation.
How do the trends differ for SWD students?	**Progress Learning Strengths (Reading & Writing):** RI3 – Analyze complex ideas/events: 84% RI4 – Word meanings: 82% W8 – Gather info from sources: 93% L2b – Spell correctly: 81% Speaking & Listening: 82% SWD Strengths (Reading & Writing): RL6 – Distinguish indirect meaning: 100% L4b – Patterns of word changes: 100% W1b – Develop claims/counterclaims: 100% W1e – Provide concluding statement: 100% W3c – Sequence events: 100% W8 – Gather info from sources: 86% SWD students show perfect mastery (100%) in several targeted standards, especially in writing structure and vocabulary, while Progress Learning students show broader but slightly lower mastery across more general reading and writing skills.	**Progress Learning Weaknesses (Reading & Writing):** RI2 – Determine themes/central ideas: 57% RI9 – Analyze foundational U.S. documents: 58% L2a – Hyphenation conventions: 61% W2d – Use precise language: 68% SWD Weaknesses (Reading & Writing): RL2 – Determine themes/central ideas: 0% RL7 – Multiple interpretations: 0% W2a – Introduce a topic: 0% W3e – Provide a conclusion: 0% W4 – Clear/coherent writing: 49% RI7 – Evaluate sources: 58% L5b – Nuances: 20% SWD students show more extreme lows, with multiple 0% scores in foundational comprehension and writing tasks. This contrasts with Progress Learning students, who have fewer critical gaps but still need support in theme identification and document analysis.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒Coherent Instruction ☒Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause:** Students need reading/literacy interventions. Students need more writing opportunities and feedback.	

SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - ELA	Strengths	Weaknesses
• What instructional practices /processes are consistently observed during ELA walks? • What instructional practices /processes are consistently missing or ineffective during ELA walks?	**Instructional Framework Trends** The most frequently observed instructional framework components were: Most common configuration: Learning Questions are posted; • Learning Targets are listed under Learning Question 1 • Open, Work and Closing detailed in Learning Question 2 • All Formative and Summative Assessments are listed in Learning Question 3 • All assignments and activities are standards-aligned to the learning target. → Observed in 10 English classrooms Frequency of students being able to articulate their learning: • What they are learning today: Frequently marked "Yes" • Why they are learning it: Also commonly "Yes" • How they are expected to demonstrate mastery: Slightly less consistent, but still mostly "Yes" Overall: **1.** Student Engagement – Active participation in discussions and group work**.** 2. Differentiation – Tasks tailored to student needs and learning styles.	**Instructional Framework Trends** Some observations included only partial elements (e.g., missing LQ3 or assessment alignment), indicating inconsistency in full framework implementation. Identified Areas of Improvement: • Clarity of Instructional Framework – Improve visibility and readability of posted learning questions and targets. • Student Roles and Routines – Establish clearer expectations for group work and seminars. • Engagement of All Students – Especially those seated at the back or less involved. • Differentiation for Diverse Learners – More targeted support for SPED and ESOL students. • Active Monitoring – Increase teacher movement and formative check-ins during lessons.

	3. Collaborative Teaching – Effective co-teaching and shared responsibilities. 4. Use of Scaffolds – Graphic organizers, modeling, and guided practice. **5.** Positive Classroom Culture – Community feeling and student confidence.	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ **Coherent Instruction** ☒ **Professional Capacity** ☒ **Effective Leadership** ☒ **Supportive Learning Environment**	**Root Cause Explanation:** Inconsistent implementation and visibility of the instructional framework across classrooms is limiting the effectiveness of student engagement and clarity in learning expectations.	
Survey Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☒ Professional Learning Survey ☒ Climate Survey	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	OHS PL Survey Fall 2024 Most 8 respondents scored themselves proficient in all nine TKES Standards, including Professional Knowledge, Instructional Strategies, Differentiation and Assessment Strategies. 4/8 respondents rated themselves a Level 4 on professionalism. School Climate Survey: Personnel Attendance is excellent at 95.21%, showing high reliability and presence of school staff. Administrator Attendance is perfect at 100%, indicating strong leadership presence. Staff Attendance is also high at 95.04%, demonstrating consistent attendance among school staff.	OHS PL Survey Fall 2024 Only 1/8 who responded to the survey identified needing support for assessment strategies. School Climate Survey Student survey score is 65.87%, indicating room for improvement in student perceptions of the school's climate. The Teacher / Staff / Administrator survey score is 66.85%, suggesting that staff perceptions of the school's climate could be improved. The Parent survey score is 68.53%, showing that parent perceptions of the school's climate need enhancement. Discipline: Student Attendance is 68.14%, highlighting the need for strategies to improve student attendance rates.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction	**Root Cause Explanation:** There is a disconnect between staff self-perception of instructional proficiency and the broader school climate, particularly in student engagement and attendance.	

☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment		
Additional Data Analysis (If relevant) **Select all that apply:** **☒ i-Ready 9th & 10th** **☒ WIDA ACCESS**	**Student Strengths**	**Student Weaknesses**
	Based on the ACCESS Scores 2025… …10% (81/804) students exited Active classification. …1% (9/804) exited Active classification with a score of 5.0. …5% (38/804) exited Active classification based on last year's criteria (4.5) …an additional 4% (34/804) exited Active classification based on this year's new criteria for reclassification (4.3 and 4.4) 3% (30/804) exited Active classification are 9th graders. ACCESS 2024- 82% of ESOL students are developing or higher in their listening skills. 75% of ESOL students are developing or higher in their writing skills.	We currently have 738 Active students based on the results of the 2025 Access Results. -9th Grade 319/738 -10th Grade 196/738 -11th Grade 101/738 -12th Grade 122/738 34% (273/804) did not increase by at least one decimal from their last year's score. ACCESS 2024 Results- Students are lowest % in speaking skills and reading skills. 41% of students are developing or higher speaking skills. 44% of students are developing or higher reading skills. ACCESS 2024 Results- There are 10 LTELs (Long term Els) that are entering or lower 2024 ACCESS- 54 % (437/804 tested) of our ESOL students (437/804) are LTELs~~,~~ 2025 Access – 66% (487/738) current enrollment are LTELs
	According to the comprehensive data reports from teachers, 9th Grade interventionist team is seeing at least 31% improvement in reading levels this school year. At least 30% of each class are scoring at reading level or above in on level courses. At least 70% of each class is testing in I-Ready throughout the year.	30% of each class did not attempt or did not test consistently throughout the year. At least 70% of the students are scoring below reading grade level.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction	**Root Cause Explanation:** Some students need language instruction based on their needs. Teachers need professional development on how to incorporate literacy practice within instruction. Teachers need consistent instruction practice and routines to support English Language Learners.	

☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: ELA	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI English II EOC will increase from 26% to 29% (3% increase). Our goal is for 240 (826 approximate 10th graders) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2026.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need explicit writing instruction, frequent practice and immediate feedback.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 1. **All English teachers will implement a systematic structure for giving writing feedback and tailoring enrichment and remediation, as evidenced by teacher NoRedink usage reports.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of English teachers will assign a CER and Extending Writing Task in NoRedInk for each unit as evidenced by NRI teacher usage reports. **Implementation Plan:** **August-September:** ❑ District Coach or AC will facilitate professional learning on assigning writing and giving feedback to student writing. ❑ CTs will select CERs and Extended Writing Task for each unit of study. ❑ ACs will co-plan CER and Extending Writing assessments (formative and summative) with teams. ❑ ACs will co-plan intervention & enrichment plans with teams (ongoing) ❑ CT Leads will submit their semester assessment schedule. **September-December:** ❑ ELA teachers will assign and document student writing proficiency a minimum of twice per unit. **January-February:** ❑ Review previous semester's data to determine instructional shifts for the new semester. ❑ Repeat professional learning for writing instruction and feedback.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** 70% of students will demonstrate writing growth as evidenced by the NoRedInk Proficiency Report. **Evaluation Tool(s):** CTs will evaluate student growth at the end of each unit of study (minimum 3 times a semester). **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 2 times each unit of study (minimum of 3 units of study) ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** ❑ ELA teachers will deliver writing instruction for CER (pre). ❑ ELA teachers will identify targeted level 2 & 3 students from CER results. ❑ ELA teachers will implement remediation and enrichment. ❑ ELA teachers will assess student writing for the Extending Writing Task. ❑ ELA teachers will identify targeted level 2 & 3 students from CER results.	**NoRedInk** **ELA PL Coordinator** **District ICs**

	January - May ❑ Repeat Implementation cycle from September – December. **May:** ❑ Review both the previous semester's data and year-long data to determine instructional shifts for the new semester. **Artifacts to be Collected:** No Red Ink Teacher Usage Reports **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ English Department Chair ☒ CT Leads **Frequency of Monitoring:** **3 times/semester (end of each unit)**	❑ ELA teachers will implement plans during remediation and enrichment cycles. ❑ ELA teachers will chart and discuss student growth from the CER to the Extended Writing Task. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ DC and CT Leads	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	**Students need literacy strategies in Reading and Responding to Literary Texts.**		
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District		
Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* **2. Teachers will implement research-based literacy instructional practices.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of teachers will implement ELLevation or AVID literacy strategy as evidenced by instructional walks. **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** ❑ AC/DC/CT Leads/Teachers model ELLevation and AVID literacy strategies. **August-September:** ❑ AC will work with CTs to identify 1 or 2 ELLevation or AVID strategies to implement during the next 20 days. ❑ Teachers implement selected strategies. ❑ Teachers administer reading comprehension check to track student progress toward standards mastery. **October-December:** ❑ AC/DC/Admin will begin walking classrooms to confirm ELLevation/AVID strategies are being implemented consistently. ❑ AC/DC/CT Leads/Teachers model ELLevation and AVID literacy strategies. ❑ AC will work CTs to identify 1 or 2 ELLevation/AVID strategies to implement during the next 20 days. ❑ Teachers implement selected strategies ❑ Teachers administer common assessments and track student progress toward standards mastery. **January-February:** ❑ AC/DC/Admin and teachers review Winter English II EOC to determine if any changes	**Evaluation Performance Target:** 40% of 9th and 10th grade students will a show a minimum 50-point growth on their Lexile i-Ready Reading Assessment every 9 weeks. **Evaluation Tool(s):** i-Ready Lexile reports. Common Lit proficiency report **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ twice per semester **Data Analysis Plan:** • Teachers review common assessments during CT to determine if ELLevation strategies are having an impact on Gen, SWD and EL students. • Teachers review i-Ready reports every 9 weeks to determine if the evaluation goal is being met. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CT Leads **Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ Common Assessments ▪ I-Ready	**ELLevation** **AVID** **i-Ready** **CommonLit** **CTLS** **Progress Learning**

	occurred in the 4 levels and determine instructional priorities for Spring semester. ❑ Coaches and teachers implement the same plans documented for August - September **March-April:** ❑ AC and teachers implement the same plans documented for October - December **May:** ❑ AC/DC/Admin and teachers review Spring English II EOC to determine if any changes occurred in the 4 levels and determine instructional priorities next year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** Assessment Schedule Instructional Walkthrough Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Classroom walks every other week beginning in October Attend CTs during 20 cycles	**Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ twice a semester	

ALGEBRA – By Year						
EOC Longitudinal Data	**SY22**		**SY23**		**SY24**	
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	2%	1%	1%	0%	9%	6%
Level 3	17%	10%	24%	6%	24%	16%
Level 2	45%	34%	36%	34%	37%	35%
Level 1	36%	55%	39%	60%	30%	44%

ALGEBRA – By Domain of Focus – Current Year								
Domain Mastery Levels (Enter Domain(s) of Concern)	**Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Quadratic Expressions & Equations (A.PAR.6 – Unit 4)**		**Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Exponential Expressions & Equations (A.PAR.8 – Unit 5)**		**Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Arithmetic Sequences & Linear Functions (A.FGR.2 – Unit 1)**		**Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Exponential Functions (A.FGR.9 – Unit 6)**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning *(Met Target)*	17%	19%	20%	12%	10%	12%	15%	10%
Level 2 Monitoring Learning *(Approaching Target)*	24%	29%	16%	25%	32%	28%	21%	28%
Level 1 Remediate Learning *(Below Target)*	59%	52%	64%	63%	58%	60%	64%	10%

MATH DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

ALGEBRA EOC (3-year trends)	Strengths	Weaknesses

• **What trends exist for all students in the:**
  ○ **Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?**
  ○ **Algebra EOC domain increases or decreases?**
• **How do the trends differ for EL students?**
• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**
	1. Based on The Algebra EOC results, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Numerical Reasoning: Rational and Irrational Numbers Domain Achievement A.NR.5 (Unit 3)** with 23% meeting the target established.
	
	2. Based on The Algebra EOC results, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Linear Inequalities Domain Achievement A.PAR.4 (Unit 2)** with 23% meeting the target established.
	
	3. Based on The Algebra EOC results, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Quadratic Expressions and Equations Domain Achievement A.PAR.6 (Unit 4)** with 21% meeting the target established.
	
	4. According to the EL Achievement Historical trend data, the beginning level of EL students has decreased by almost 17 percentage points from the year 2023 to 2024.
		1. Based on The Algebra EOC results, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in **Data & Statistical Reasoning: One- and Two-Variable Statistics Domain Achievement A.DSR.10 (Unit 7)** with 6% meeting target established.
		
		2. Based on The Algebra EOC results, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in **Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Distance, Midpoint, Slope, Area, and Perimeter Domain Achievement A.GSR.3 (Unit 8)** with 9% meeting the target established.
		
		3. Based on The Algebra EOC results, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in **Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Arithmetic Sequences and Linear Functions Domain Achievement A.FGR.2 (Unit 1)** with 10% meeting the target established.
		
		4. Based on the Algebra Historical Content Mastery data, there is little to no difference in proficiency performance in the ELL and SWD student groups over the last 5 years of testing. Both groups are performing the same in comparison to each other.

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**
	1. Based on Advanced Algebra Summative results for units 3 (Radicals) and 7 (Matrices), our students have demonstrated proficiency in computation with radicals with 64.1% scoring Proficient or Distinguished, and only 13.9% scoring Beginning. Our students have demonstrated proficiency in computation with matrices with 81.4% scoring Proficient or Distinguished, and only 10.1% scoring Beginning. 2. Based on the school access scores for the 2024-2025 school year, as there are 385 students' level 3 or higher in reading compared to 193 in listening of students have demonstrated at least expanding in the writing domain. 3. Based on the summative data in geometry, our students have shown an increase in proficiency over time from unit one starting at 18.1% developing to 13.64% developing.	1. 100% of CTs did not/do not routinely update their data monitoring forms and/or provided incomplete data monitoring form. Data from the form is not broken down enough to track SWD and EL students. 2. From the Algebra Semester Spring 25 Data Monitoring Form, there appears to be little to no growth in proficiency from the unit common formative to the unit common summative. Unit 1 Quiz: 42% proficiency, Unit 1 Test: 31% Proficiency. Unit 2 Quiz: 41% Proficiency, Unit 2 Test: 47% proficiency.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:	**Root Cause Explanation:**
☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Curriculum Misalignment - The taught curriculum may not be fully aligned with EOC standards or depth of knowledge required. Learning Gaps- Conceptual understanding of functions and sequences may be weak due to prior math gaps. Instructional Practices- Possible inconsistency in instructional quality or lack of targeted scaffolding and differentiation. There is a possible lack of engaging instructional strategies. Assessment Rigor- Students may not be adequately prepared for the format, language, or rigor of the EOC assessment. Formative and Summative assessments may not be measuring the same skill or rigor levels. Ineffective Data Monitoring and Accountability Structures- Data monitoring form isn't specific enough to track student groups (ELL & SWD) and there is a lack of clear expectations or follow-up for CTs to update data consistently. Weak connections between mathematical concepts- Connections between algebraic & geometric thinking may not be emphasized. More emphasis placed on computation versus reasoning, modeling and application.

SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - MATH • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during MATH walks?** • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during MATH walks?**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	1. Based on the school-developed instructional walk form, about 80% (71/88 entries) of teachers showed proper use of the instructional framework. 2. Based on the summary data from the Instructional Focus Walks, teachers ensured students were engaged during class by action taken by teachers to invoke engagement of students: using 360 boards, using instructional strategies such as turn-and-talk, etc). 3. Based on the summary data from the Instructional Focus Walks, teachers ensured students were engaged during class by action taken by teachers to invoke engagement of students: using 360 boards, using instructional strategies such as turn-and-talk, etc).	1. Based on the school-developed instructional walk form, students were unable to communicate why they were learning information more than 50% of the time classes were observed. 2. Teachers are not using a variety of teaching models in their classes, as seen on the Instructional Focus Walks 3. As evidenced by the instructional walk forms or classroom observations, there is inconsistency in the connection between the implemented lesson and the learning target.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:	**Root Cause Explanation:**
☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Teachers focus on content delivery rather than making connections in the material. Lack of collaboration and resources to implement a varied approach to teaching. Insufficient exposure or training in various teaching models. Misalignment between lessons and learning targets. Inadequate lesson planning.

Survey Summary Data	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
☐ **Teacher Survey** ☐ **Parent Survey** ☐ **Professional Learning Survey** ☐ **_____**	1. Based on the results from OHS Math Needs Survey, 80% agree or strongly agree that the math curriculum and resources are adapted for advanced, EL, and SWD students. 2. Based on the results from the OHS Math Dept Needs Survey, 68% of the department members noted that their collaborative team discusses lessons/lesson plans daily or once per week.	1. Based on the results from the collaborative team survey, 2 out of the 6 Math CTs that completed the survey displayed a need for more collaboration with a majority of members rating collaboration at a 5 out of 10. 2. The Needs Survey results showed the top three out of eight areas for professional development with 32% of teachers ranking Active Learning Strategies as number one, 27% of teachers ranking supporting English Language Learners as number two, and

		14% of teachers ranking remediation and enrichment plans as number three. 3. Based on the results from the OHS Math Dept Needs Survey, 54% of the department stated that they analyze data in their collaborative teams once per unit or hardly ever.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Teachers may be unclear about the expectations and goals of collaboration (what should be focused on during meetings, how they should interact, and expected outcomes) causing disengagement. Teachers have limited professional development surrounding language support strategies, active learning strategies, and differentiated instruction. There is an absence of a clear data analysis process/protocol (what to look for and how to use it).	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: MATH	**EOC COURSES**: The total percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Georgia Milestones Algebra EOC will increase from 18.1% to 21.1%. **NON-EOC COURSES**: 20% of students will show proficiency (80% or higher) on their cumulative final exam (baseline year).
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Misalignment of lessons and learning targets • Lack of collaboration, training, and resources to implement a varied approach to teaching. • Gaps in data monitoring, data analysis, and formative assessment needed to drive instructional decisions.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 1. **All math teachers will use student performance data weekly with their collaborative team to plan standards based targeted instruction for students.**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of math teachers will use student performance data to provide targeted supports for students by unit. **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** • Teachers will review/update Unpacking Standards Document for every unit of their course • Teachers will create a pacing guide aligned to the course standards. • Teachers will create an assessment plan aligned to the course standards. **August-December:** • All teachers will receive professional learning on best practices for implementing formative assessments for the purpose of planning data-driven instruction that includes evidenced base instructional strategies by unit. • Teachers will collaboratively design or adjust common formative assessments aligned with unit standards. • Administer common formative assessments for each unit. • Conduct data analysis meetings using data analysis protocol to discuss findings and plan for instructional adjustments.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By December 2025 & May 2026, at least 20% of students will show proficiency (80% or higher) on all summative assessments as evidenced by the data monitoring form. **Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ Data Monitoring Form **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Every unit **Data Analysis Plan:** CTs will: • Collect all common formative and summative data in the data monitoring document. • Meet weekly to discuss data findings from common formative assessments. ○ Identify gaps in learning to plan for interventions	CCSD Math Department Title-I District Coach CCSD ESOL & SWD Departments District Personnel

	• Academic coaches give observational feedback to CTs and provide additional support as needed. **December:** • Collect feedback from teachers to adjust and determine next steps. **January- April:** • Collaborate within content teams to design or adjust common formative assessments aligned with unit standards. • Administer common formative assessments for each unit. • Conduct data analysis meetings to discuss findings and plan for instructional adjustments. • Academic coaches give observational feedback to CTs and provide additional support as needed. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • CT Meeting Minutes • Unit Plans • Walkthrough data and CT observation data Unit Plans **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** • CT Meeting Minutes – Academic Coaches reviewing agendas weekly with CT leads. • CT Unit Plans – Assistant Principal & Academic Coaches will review CT teams folder for unit plans.	○ Identify strengths to plan for enrichment • Meet at least once a month to discuss student performance from common formative(s) to summative assessment(s). ○ Identify student areas of strength and growth ○ Plan remediation for priority standards **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CT Leads	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Lack of targeted scaffolding and differentiation. • Emphasis placed more on computation than reasoning, modeling or applications. • Conceptual understanding of functions and sequences may be weak due to prior math gaps. • The taught curriculum may not be fully aligned with EOC standards or depth of knowledge required.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
☒ Gen Ed
☒ EL
☒ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
 	
2. **All math teachers will implement strategies acquired from monthly professional learning sessions to increase student performance on GSE math standards.**
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of math teachers will use acquired instructional practices from monthly professional learning sessions as evidenced by walkthrough observation data.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	Preplanning:
	• Professional Learning Facilitators will plan sessions for the upcoming year identifying:
	  ○ Focus/Goal of the session
	  ○ Learning Target(s) for the session
	  ○ General Layout/Plan for the session
	• Academic Coaches will review and provide feedback to session facilitators.
	
	August-September:
	• All teachers will receive professional learning on best practices for implementing formative assessments for the purpose of planning data-driven instruction
	
	October-December:
	• Math teachers/Academic Coaches/District Title I Coaches will facilitate professional learning on the implementation of language support, student engagement, and balanced math instructional strategies in math classrooms.
	
	• Participants will implement evidenced-based instructional strategies in their classes and academic coaches will monitor the implementation of the strategies through the spotlight on strategies walkthrough form.
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		For all summative assessments, the average student score for each standard will be 70% or higher as evidenced by the CTLS Standard Analysis report.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		▪ CTLS Standard Analysis Unit Reports
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☐ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☒ Every Unit
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		• Math teachers will analyze student mastery of GSE Math Standards during CT meetings and reflect on strategies impact with students.
		
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
		☐ Principal
		☐ Assistant Principals
		☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
		☒ CT Leads
			CCSD Math Department
			
			Title-I District Coach
			
			CCSD ESOL & SWD Departments
			
			District Personnel

	January-April: • Repeat implementation cycle from October-December. **May:** • Review both the previous semester's data and year-long data to determine instructional shifts for the upcoming year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** PL sign-in sheets PL agendas/Plan Spotlight on Strategies Walkthrough Form **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ PL Facilitators **Frequency of Monitoring:** PL Plans – uploaded to PL folder in teams a month before PL is to be done. PL Review/Feedback – Academic Coaches will provide feedback to PL facilitators		

BIOLOGY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24	SY25		
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	2%	5%	7%	6%	3%	4%	3.35%	5.65%
Level 3	24%	28%	33%	23%	30%	28%	27.51%	25.3%
Level 2	31%	30%	24%	32%	30%	30%	25.5%	26.4%
Level 1	44%	37%	36%	40%	36%	37%	43.6%	42.56%

BIOLOGY – By Domain of Focus – FY '25

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	Domain 1: Cells		Domain 2: Cell Gen & Heredity		Domain 3: Classification & Phylo		Domain 4: Ecology		Domain 5: Evolution	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning *(Met Target)*	21.5%	15.8%	24.2%	28.6%	19.5%	28.6%	18.5%	19.9%	13.8%	26.2%
Level 2 Monitor Learning *(Approaching Target)*	32.5%	20.5%	51.6%	22.6%	26.1%	15.5%	24.8%	22.0%	36.2%	25.6%
Level 1 Remediate Learning *(Below Target)*	45.9%	63.7%	24.2%	52.7%	54.4%	56%	56.7%	58.0%	50%	48.2%

SCIENCE DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

BIOLOGY EOC (3-year trends)

- **What trends exist for all students in the:**
  - **Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?**
  - **Biology EOC domain increases or decreases?**

Strengths

- Isolated domain gains were noted, particularly in Genetics (Domain 2) and Evolution, where students showed measurable growth from Winter to Spring.
- The department has established consistent processes for common formative assessments and data tracking within collaborative teams.
- Level 2 performance has remained relatively stable over time, suggesting a strong core of students consistently approaching proficiency.

Weaknesses

- EOC performance has remained flat or declined, with Level 1 rates peaking at 43% in SY25.
- Critical regression occurred in Cells and Ecology domains, with inconsistent domain gains overall.
- Significant performance gaps persist for SWD, ELL, and Dual Served students, with low proficiency and high remediation rates.
- Changes to ELL accommodations (loss of extended time) may have negatively impacted scores.
- CARD Block scheduling reduced core instructional time, contributing to possible score declines.

• **How do the trends differ for EL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	• Teachers identified some stability in year-to-year domain data, with minimal fluctuation across semesters in certain content areas. • The vertically aligned Science Department and CT structures provided a strong foundation for the current root cause analysis and SIP action planning.	• Common assessments overestimate student readiness, showing misalignment with EOC results. • Inconsistent use of formative assessments limits timely instructional adjustments. • Co-teaching and intervention models lack consistency, reducing support for high-needs students. • Teacher planning time is limited by operational demands, affecting the ability to plan for differentiation. • Chronic attendance concerns have limited student learning continuity and may have contributed to low assessment performance. • Level 4 (Distinguished Learner) scores have remained persistently low, with very few students reaching this highest level of proficiency.
COMMON ASSESSMENTS - Current Year • **What trends exist for all students in the:** ○ **Percentages mastering standards aligned to Bio 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** • High participation rates with 100% of students completing Progress Learning common assessments, providing a strong data set for instructional reflection. • Unit 3 Summative Assessment showed a high percentage of Distinguished Learner performance, indicating mastery of specific content standards. • Evidence of midyear instructional pivot from a literacy strategy focus to a more data-driven model, using Osborne Biology Data Reflection Forms to guide planning. • Consistent data monitoring and reflection cycles have been established as part of the department's PLC work.	**Weaknesses** • Common assessment scores are consistently higher than EOC scores, indicating a lack of alignment and possible overestimation of student readiness. • A proficiency gap exists between Progress Learning common assessments and EOC outcomes, highlighting misalignment. • Assessment rigor is insufficient, with questions perceived as too easy compared to EOC standards. • Students are not consistently challenged at the appropriate cognitive level, limiting preparation for state assessments. • Summative and formative assessment results do not reliably predict EOC performance, reducing their effectiveness for intervention planning. • SWD and ELL accommodations are inconsistent, with some students lacking full access to read-aloud, extended time, or dictionary supports. • The growing ELL population has outpaced available ESOL teacher support, leading to inconsistent delivery of testing accommodations and classroom supports.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Common assessments and daily instruction have not consistently matched the rigor of the Biology EOC, resulting in inflated classroom performance that does not translate to state assessments. • Overly supportive learning environments and lack of high-level questioning have limited student preparation for EOC expectations. • Assessment integrity concerns have arisen, particularly in large class settings (34:1 ratio), with reports of students using technology to gain unfair advantage. • Teachers have increased monitoring and begun shifting to CTLS platforms to lock down tests, but challenges remain. • Persistent domain-specific gaps in content mastery, especially in Cells and Ecology, suggest inconsistent instructional focus on priority standards.	

	• A proficiency gap exists between Progress Learning common assessments and EOC outcomes, reflecting misalignment and reducing the usefulness of assessment data for instructional decisions.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS - SCIENCE • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during SCIENCE walks?** • **What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during SCIENCE walks?**	**Strengths** • Science classrooms consistently exhibit strong classroom management and structured learning environments. • Collaborative learning structures, including group work and lab-based activities, are regularly implemented to support student engagement. • Learning targets and essential questions were posted in 100% of walkthroughs, ensuring clear learning expectations for students. • High frequency of instructional walkthroughs conducted in Science, particularly in Biology and Environmental Science. • Teachers are friendly, communicative, and effectively explain the purpose of walkthroughs, creating a culture of trust and professionalism.	**Weaknesses** • Immediate, actionable feedback is not consistently provided to teachers following walkthroughs. • A stronger culture of regular, purpose-driven walkthroughs needs to be established. • Communication of walkthrough purpose, expectations, and feedback processes is inconsistent. • Limited classroom observations for ELL and SWD classes; small-group instruction was not observed. • Instructional walkthrough data lacks specificity for Science and must be refined for comparative analysis and clearer trends. • Inconsistent use of the full instructional framework: only 26.9% of lessons had a clear opening, and no lessons observed included a structured closing. • Students could often articulate what they were learning but struggled to explain why it mattered or how it connected to larger concepts. • Successful walkthrough culture requires increased teacher vulnerability and openness to feedback.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Lack of a strong culture of ongoing, routine walkthroughs, partly due to a need for increased teacher receptiveness to constructive feedback. • Inconsistent communication of walkthrough purpose, expectations, and feedback processes, limiting their effectiveness. • Feedback following walkthroughs is not always immediate, reducing the opportunity for timely instructional adjustments. • Inconsistent use of structured lesson components, particularly the absence of consistent openings and closings to frame learning. • Mismatch between classroom assessment rigor and the Biology EOC, as reflected by the gap between Progress Learning results and EOC performance.	
Survey Summary Data ☒ **Teacher Survey** ☐ **Parent Survey** ☐ **Professional Learning Survey** ☐ **_____**	**Strengths** • Half of teachers (5 of 10) reported being very comfortable using student data to guide instruction, reflecting strong professional capacity. • Teachers clearly prioritized professional learning topics aligned with high-impact instructional practices, including inquiry-based learning, strategies for ELL and SWD students, and data-driven instruction. • High openness to collaborative support, with preferences for small group sessions and department-wide professional learning, demonstrating a strong team culture.	**Weaknesses** • Limited planning time and access to instructional resources were the most frequently cited barriers, identified by 9 out of 10 teachers. • Ongoing challenges with student engagement and differentiation for diverse learners point to a need for stronger scaffolding and universal design strategies. • Inconsistent comfort levels with using data to inform instruction, with one-third of teachers reporting only moderate confidence or a need for additional guidance. • Lack of clarity and consistency in how instructional support is delivered, with teachers preferring a wide range of

	• Strong interest in improving student engagement and differentiation, indicating teacher recognition of areas for instructional growth. • Many teachers prefer direct, as-needed coaching support, showing self-awareness and autonomy in seeking instructional help when needed.	communication methods and coaching models, leading to potential gaps in follow-through.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** While science teachers are committed to improving student learning, a lack of dedicated planning time, access to resources, and structured data-use support has limited the department's ability to fully implement differentiated, engaging instruction for all learners. • Coherent Instruction: Teachers need more targeted support to implement engagement strategies, differentiation, universal design approaches, and formative assessment practices with fidelity. • Professional Capacity: Gaps in data literacy persist, as not all teachers feel confident using student data to inform instruction and plan responsive interventions. • Supportive Learning Environment: Limited planning time and inconsistent access to instructional materials restrict teachers' ability to innovate and adjust instruction effectively. • Effective Leadership: Inconsistent communication methods and unclear coaching expectations point to the need for a more structured and equitable support system.	

Summary Statement

Analysis of walkthroughs, teacher surveys, assessment data, and student outcomes reveals consistent strengths in classroom management, collaborative learning, and structured environments. However, instruction often lacks clear learning purpose, consistent engagement strategies, and aligned formative assessment. Common assessments overestimate student readiness compared to EOC results, reflecting a misalignment with state standards. Teachers cite limited planning time, inconsistent access to resources, and varying comfort with data use as barriers. Additional gaps exist in differentiation for high-needs students, inconsistent accommodations, and loss of instructional time due to scheduling changes. These findings highlight the need for more coherent curriculum, assessment, and professional learning systems to close persistent gaps, particularly for SWD, ELL, and Dual Served students.

Data Analysis Narrative

The Science Department, organized into vertically aligned grade bands, and school leadership used EOC data, domain mastery, common assessments, classroom observations, CT meeting artifacts, and the Instructional Support Survey to identify key performance trends. All stakeholders provided feedback on the CNA and SIP via Microsoft Forms. FY25 Biology data showed mixed domain gains and ongoing performance gaps. Cells mastery fell from 21.5% to 15.8%, and Ecology remediation exceeded 58%. Notable growth occurred in Evolution (+12.4%) and Classification & Phylogeny (+9.1%).

EOC data over four years revealed low Distinguished Learner rates (4–5%) and a decline in Proficient scores from 33% to 26%, while Beginning Learner rates rose to 43%. Subgroup analysis exposed significant gaps: only 24.5% of English Learners, 8.8% of SWDs, and 12.5% of Dual Served students achieved proficiency, compared to 91.7% of Gifted and 58% of Honors students.

These results informed targeted action steps in the SIP to address instructional rigor, data use, and support structures, especially for underperforming student groups.

BIOLOGY DATA/IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #4: Science	By May 2026, the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished on the Biology EOC will increase from 30.91% to 33%, as measured by the Georgia Milestones Assessment.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	❑ **Coherent Instruction:** Instruction or assessment practices are inconsistently aligned to the rigor and content of the Biology EOC between common summative and EOC Data. Common assessments often overestimate student readiness, and daily instruction lacks consistent incorporation of formative assessments to monitor learning. ❑ **Professional Capacity**: While teachers are collaborative and committed, many report inconsistent confidence in using data to inform planning, differentiation, and extension. Professional learning has focused on resources rather than building data fluency, limiting the department's ability to execute DuFour's Questions 2–4 consistently and effectively. ❑ **Supportive Learning Environment**: Although CARD Block provides responsive intervention time for students, teachers report that cumulative demands from collaborative team meetings, professional learning sessions, class coverage, and duties reduce their protected planning time. These constraints limit their ability to plan for data-informed differentiation, especially for high-needs students such as SWDs and ELLs who could benefit from CARD Block. ❑ **Effective Leadership**: Department-wide systems for assessment design, calibration, and instructional feedback are not yet fully established. Teachers report inconsistent expectations and limited professional learning of how to use student learning data to inform instruction. This weakens the implementation of DuFour-aligned instructional practices and contributes to regression in EOC performance.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)*	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of Biology CT teams will engage in weekly collaborative planning to develop EOC-aligned assessment tasks. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning (July–August)** ❑ Finalize CT calendar and data protocols ❑ Train CT leads on Osborne Data Reflection Forms & DuFour's Four Questions ❑ Review baseline EOC domain data; align unit pacing and assessment calendars ▪ **August–September** ❑ Launch weekly CT meetings with a focus on using Osborne Forms and DuFour's Questions ❑ Analyze pretest and Unit 1 data to identify priority domains	**Evaluation Performance Target:** At least 40% of students will score 80% or higher on domain-aligned common summative assessments, as measured by Progress Learning or CTLS reports, indicating readiness for EOC proficiency. **Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ Progress Learning and/or CTLS Reports **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	▪ Protected planning time for CT Meetings ▪ Monthly Data Digs ▪ PL Opportunities for Assessment and Dufour's Learning Questions

Science teachers will engage in weekly data-driven Collaborative Team (CT) meetings to align formative and summative assessments with EOC rigor.	❑ Begin developing and calibrating EOC-aligned formative/summative tasks (Units 1–2) ❑ Document instructional strategies and interventions for underperforming domains • **October–December** ❑ Continue CTs and monthly data digs focused on Units 3-5 ❑ Adjust instruction based on common assessment data and domain trends ❑ Finalize two EOC-aligned tasks per unit; document DuFour-aligned instructional responses • **January–February** ❑ Analyze midyear benchmark and predictive data ❑ Adjust second semester pacing, strategies, and task design ❑ Continue weekly planning and documentation using Osborne Forms and DuFour Q2–Q4 • **March–April** ❑ Conduct final data digs and reteaching ❑ Begin CNA-aligned data reflection and planning for SIP progress report • **May** ❑ Evaluate implementation fidelity using CT artifacts and Osborne Forms ❑ Summarize domain mastery progress and instructional strategy outcomes **Artifacts to be Collected:** ❑ Osborne Biology Data Reflection Forms (monthly) ❑ EOC-aligned formative and summative tasks (2 per unit) ❑ CT meeting agendas/minutes showing DuFour Q2–Q4 discussion & any reteaching & enrichment plans based on domain data (one per month) ❑ Common assessment performance reports (Progress Learning or CTLS) **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Department Chair	**Data Analysis Plan:** ❑ Common assessment results will be analyzed monthly using Osborne Data Reflection Forms. ❑ CT teams will compare domain-specific performance in monthly data digs to identify trends. ❑ Instructional responses will be adjusted based on analysis of which students have or have not met the 80% benchmark. ❑ Midyear and end-of-year data will be compared to baseline to evaluate progress toward SIP goals. **Data Analysis Plan Narrative:** CT teams will analyze domain-specific common assessment results monthly using Osborne Biology Data Reflection Forms and discuss trends during data digs. Instructional responses—including reteaching and enrichment—will be guided by whether students meet the 80% proficiency benchmark. Midyear and end-of-year data will be compared to the baseline to measure progress toward the SIP goal. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CT Leads	

	☒ CT Leads **Frequency of Monitoring:** ☒ Weekly ☒ Monthly		

U.S. HISTORY – By Year

EOC Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24	
Administrations	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 4	6%	5%	3%	6%	5.5%	8.65%
Level 3	31%	27%	21%	23%	21.31%	30.08%
Level 2	46%	27%	40%	32%	32.65%	34.21%
Level 1	17%	42%	35%	40%	40.89%	27.07%

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

Domain Mastery Levels (Enter domain that is most significant)	**Domain 1: Colonization through the Constitution Domain Mastery**		**Domain 2: New Republic through Reconstruction Domain Mastery**		**Domain 3: Industrialization, Reform, & Imperialism Domain Mastery**		**Domain 4: Establishment as a World Power Domain Mastery**		**Domain 5: Post-World War II to the Present Domain Mastery**	
	Winter	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Level 3 Accelerate Learning	19.20%	19.47%	18.20%	30.92%	17.90%	33.97%	14.80%	35.11%	17.50%	28.24%
Level 2 Monitor Learning	32.60%	40.08%	28.90%	16.41%	27.80 %	19.47%	26.50%	24.81%	27.80%	22.90%
Level 1 Remediate Learning	48.10%	40.46%	52.90%	52.67%	54.30 %	46.56 %	59.80%	40.08%	54.60%	48.85%

U.S. HISTORY Growth Percentages from SY23-SY25

EOC Data	SY23-24		SY24-25		Overall Growth
Administrations	**Students Tested: 611**	**Percentages**	**Students Tested: 553**	**Percentages**	**Percentages**
Level 4	9	1.47%	37	6.69%	5.22%
Level 3	143	23.40%	142	25.68%	2.28%

Level 2	268	43.86%	185	33.45%	-10.41%
Level 1	218	35.68%	189	34.18%	-1.50%

U.S. HISTORY OVERALL SUBGROUP TRENDS					
	S23	**F23**	**S24**	**F24**	**S25**
GEN	75.7333	72.54667	71.57	74.9	78.08375
SWD	68.8	66.53	69.69	69.26	79.082
ESL	69.27	69.57	73.43	69.9	71.38625
DUAL	71.3	65.5	70.22	68.35	67.13
GIFT	77.3667	83	85.11	84.3	83.0825

SOCIAL STUDIES DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

	Strengths	Weaknesses
U.S. HISTORY EOC (3-year trends) • **What trends exist for all students in the:** **Percentage of students scoring in Level 1, 2, 3, 4 (increases, decreases, no increase or decrease)?** **U.S. History EOC domain increases or decreases?** • **How do the trends differ for ESL students?** • **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**	**3-Year Trends (SY23, SY24, SY25)** • SY23 increase Level 4 by 2% • From Winter 24 to Spring 25 there was an increase of Level 4 by 3.15% • Percentage of students scoring in level one is decreasing from SY24 has decreased by 13.83% • SWD-17% growth in achievement and outpaced on-level **SY 24-25-Growth Percentages** • **Level 4** increased by 5.22% • **Level 3** increased by 2.28% • **Level 2** decreased by -**10.41%** and **Level 1** by -**1.50%** demonstrating a decline in the number of students scoring at this level. Student Groups Trend of Improvement from S23 to S25: • **GEN (General Education)**: Increased from 75.73 to 78.08, a growth of 2.35 points **(3.10%).** • **GIFT (Gifted Students)**: Increased from 77.37 to 82.50, a growth of 5.13 points (6.64%). • **ESL (English as a Second Language)**: Increased from 69.27 to 71.39, a growth of 2.12 points **(3.06%).** • **SWD (Students with Disabilities)**: Increased significantly from 68.80 to 79.08, a growth of 10.28 points **(14.94%).**	**3-Year Trends** • Level 3 decreases 4% SY22; Level 1 1% • Level 1 Increase 5% SY 23 Domain 4 had **–4** %change from SY23-SY24 **Current Year**-Domain 1-Although there was a decrease in the number of students below target and an increase in students approaching target, there was little movement of those students that met target **(Level 3)** from the Fall 24 to the Spring 25 by **0.27% and** in approaching target **(Level 2)** there was an increase in the number of students by **7.48 %** • **Dual Served:** Decreased from 71.30 to 67.13, a decline of 4.17 points **(-5.85%).**

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The analysis of the data based on the decline in domain performance can be tied to core literacy skills necessary to meet grade-level expectations. In addition, there is a lack of intentional vertical and horizontal alignment across content areas to build and apply these skills overtime. In addition, instructional feedback is often too vague and does not consistently provide students with clear, actionable next steps, specifically in areas like reading comprehension, analytical writing, and academic vocabulary development. As a result, students are not consistently receiving the guidance needed to progress toward proficiency.	
SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL WALKS – SOCIAL STUDIES • **What instructional practices/processes are consistently observed during SOCIAL STUDIES walks?** • **What instructional practices/processes are consistently missing or ineffective during SOCIAL STUDIES walks?**	**Strengths** 8% of the 88 classes observed 100% of those teachers had the instructional framework posted. The ESOL sheltered SS class displayed a visual (anchor charts) aligned with the text and students also had access to an image to accompany the text. Teachers observed were very knowledgeable of their content Students understood the expectation for the day and what/why they should complete it and the teacher was able to make connections made to U.S. History (vertical alignment) SS teachers effectively utilized digital tools to check for understanding, for the introduction and facilitation of the lesson, and to display the instructional framework in CTLS for student engagement and for students to know what they would be learning for that day.	**Weaknesses** Based on the instructional walks data form, which is aligned with the IFW, students struggled with explain LQ1 contains broad and multiday learning targets opposed to a specific, daily target. Learning Question 3 tends to still be inconsistent across content teams and identifies the product but not the strategy or output of the product. Student progress could be monitored more closely. Some students were off task talking or on phones and never redirected, which is evident that more high-engagement strategies are needed for student engagement as well and differentiation of the learning to support the various learners in the class. Most of the class observed lectured and teachers did more of the heavy lifting instead of allowing students to engage more in productive struggle to enhance their processing and analytical skills.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership	**Root Cause Explanation:** Social Studies instruction is inconsistent because lessons lack specific, daily learning targets and clear strategies for achieving them. Teachers rely too much on lectures and do not provide enough opportunities for students to engage in critical thinking or problem-solving. Additionally, student progress is not closely monitored, and there is limited differentiation in instruction, leading to off-task behaviors and disengagement. This highlights the need for more focused planning, student-centered activities, and better monitoring to meet the diverse needs of all students.	

☒ Supportive Learning Environment		
Survey Summary Data **Additional:** ☐ **Teacher Survey** ☐ **Parent Survey** ☒ **Professional Learning Survey** ☐ **_____**	**Strengths** Based on the Professional Learning Survey as it relates to Professional Knowledge (TKES 1) Out of the 88 teachers that took the survey • Level 3 78% (64) feels comfortable in classroom as it relates to the following: Content knowledge through Unit Planning, Unpacking the Standards, and Writing Learning Targets to Design Relevant Learning Experiences. • Social Studies Level 3 (13 out of 17) 76%; Level 4 11.76% (2/17) feels comfortable leading a PL	**Weaknesses** Level 2-need support (out of 88 teachers that took the survey): • 12% (10) Instructional Planning (TKES2) • 10% (8) Academically Challenging Environment • 9% (7) Differentiation (TKES 4) • 7% (6) Instructional Strategies (TKES 3) and Assessment Strategies (TKES 5) • 6% (5) Assessment Uses (TKES 6) Social Studies data is in alignment with needing support in instructional planning, assessment strategies and uses, academically challenging environment with 11.76% (2/17)
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** The data shows that many teachers need support with instructional planning, using assessments effectively, and creating academically challenging lessons. These areas are connected and suggest that teachers may not have had enough training or support to plan strong lessons, use data to guide instruction, or push students to think deeply. The Social Studies results match this trend, showing a need for focused professional development in these key areas.	
Additional Data Analysis **(If needed)** **Other(s):** ☒ **ACCESS** ☐ ☐ ☐	**Strengths** Based on the ACCESS Scores 2025 • 10% (81/804) students exited Active classification. • 1% (9/804) exited Active classification with a score of 5.0. • 5% (38/804) exited Active classification based on last year's criteria (4.5) • An additional 4% (34/804) exited Active classification based on this year's new criteria for reclassification (4.3 and 4.4) • 3% (30/804) exited Active classification are 9th graders.	**Weaknesses** We currently have 738 Active students based on the results of the 2025 Access Results. • 9th Grade 319/738 • 10th Grade 196/738 • 11th Grade 101/738 • 12th Grade 122/738 34% (273/804) did not increase by at least one decimal from their last year's score. ACCESS 2024 Results- Students are lowest % in speaking skills and reading skills. 41% of students are developing or higher speaking skills.

	ACCESS 2024- 82% of ESOL students are developing or higher in their listening skills. 75% of ESOL students are developing or higher in their writing skills.	44% of students are developing or higher reading skills. ACCESS 2024 Results- There are 10 LTELs (Long term Els) that are entering or lower 2024 ACCESS- 54 % (437/804 tested) of our ESOL students (437/804) are LTELs~~,~~ 2025 Access – 66% (487/738) current enrollment are LTELs There is a need for enhanced, differentiated instruction that specifically targets speaking and reading proficiency for all ELs, with a strong focus on supporting LTELs who may require additional intervention and sustained support to make meaningful progress.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Our EL students are not making enough progress in speaking and reading skills, with 34% showing no growth in their ACCESS scores. Most students struggle with speaking (41%) and reading (44%), and the number of Long-Term English Learners (LTELs) has increased to 66%. This shows that the current support and instruction provided aren't effectively meeting the needs of these students, especially LTELs. We need targeted strategies and more focused support to improve their language skills and help them make better progress by incorporating the language domains as part of the instructional framework and differentiating the learning based on the WIDA can-do descriptors with in the ELLevation platform and monitored through the ESOL tracker forms. Also, more target support is needed for the whole staff on planning and strategies to implement in the learning as well.	
COMMON ASSESSMENTS – Current Year Current Year • **What trends exist for all students in the:** • **Percentages mastering standards aligned to US domains - identify both standards of strength and weakness** • **How do the trends differ for EL students?**	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
	Students performed better overall on Domain 1 (70.5) and Domain 3 (62.4) based on diagnostic assessment SWD's better on D2 on summative with an average of 75.7 ELs strongest in Domain 1 with an average of 64.9 SWD students in team taught classes with our performed best overall in Domain 1 (67.7) and Domain 3 (64.3) performed best overall	Diagnostic Domain 2 (57.7) lower than on the summative (CTLS ASSESS) All other domains saw a drop from the summative (CTLS ASSESS) ELs low in domain 2 (48.9) and domain 5 (48.7) SWD student in the team-taught classes lowest domain was Domain 5 (69.9) and Domain 2 (50.2)

• **How do the trends differ for SWD students?**		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ **Coherent Instruction** ☒ **Professional Capacity** ☐ **Effective Leadership** ☒ **Supportive Learning Environment**	**Root Cause Explanation:** Students need more foundational skills in literacy and these domains where students performed the lowest requires students to apply critical thinking, analyze cause-and-effect relationships, and make connections across historical events. The drop in performance from diagnostic to summative assessments shows that students are not receiving enough targeted instruction or practice in these skill areas. More focused support, scaffolding, and opportunities to engage with complex tasks are needed to improve understanding and performance in these key domains.	

SOCIAL STUDIES-IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #5: Social Studies	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI United States History EOC will increase from 32.31% to 35.31% (CCRPI Closing the Gap). Our goal is for 196 (557 approximate total) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2026.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students lack consistent opportunities to practice analyzing primary and secondary sources using content-specific vocabulary.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of Teachers will implement academic vocabulary in their daily lessons as evidenced by instructional walks. **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** ▪ CTs will analyze assessment data to identify gaps in reading and writing performance aligned to EOC domains, ▪ CTs/Dept will vertically align skills across grade levels. ▪ CTs will collaborate to develop a student reflection tool and rubric that will be used after each writing task. ▪ ACs will co-plan intervention & enrichment plans with teams (ongoing) ▪ CT Leads will submit their semester assessment schedule.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By Winter 2025 and Spring 2026, 70% of students will demonstrate growth as evidenced by CT Data Spreadsheet growth report. **Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ CTLS Assess Summative Data ▪ Progress Learning Mastery Reports ▪ Student Reflection Artifacts **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Two times within each unit	• CTLS • Progress Learning ▪ ELLevation ▪ CT Data Spreadsheet ▪ AVID
Target Student Group ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)*			

1. *Teachers will integrate primary and secondary source analysis using content-based literacy and vocabulary strategies.*	**August-September:** ▪ AC/ Teacher Leaders will provide professional learning on integrating content-based literacy strategies specific to graph, charts, and carton interpretation (sourcing and application of knowledge). ▪ AC/CT Leads will model how to incorporate student reflection and data analysis into instruction. ▪ Teachers will launch use of the reflection tool and begin collecting student responses after tasks. **October-December:** • AC/District Coach/Teacher Leader will provide professional learning on close reading skills instructional strategies. • CTs will continue vertical planning of skills for implementation and implement strategies. document effectiveness utilizing student reflection tools' • AC/Admin will monitor implementation and effectiveness and provide feedback. **January-February:** • AC/DC/Admin and teachers review Winter 2025 US History EOC data to determine if any changes occurred in the 5 domains and determine instructional priorities for Spring 2026 semester. • Coaches and teachers implement the same plans documented for August - September (content-based literacy strategies specific to graph, charts, and carton interpretation (sourcing and application of knowledge). **March-April:** • AC and teachers implement the same plans documented for October - December **May**: • AC/DC/Admin and teachers review Spring US History EOC to determine if any changes occurred in the 4 levels and determine instructional priorities next year.	**Data Analysis Plan:** • CTs will collect and analyze common assessment data and input in the data form for their content. • CTs will meet weekly to discuss CFAs, plan for remediation and enrichment, focus on different student groups, • CTs will analyze and discuss Summative Assessment data within 2 days after administering, identify gaps and plan for interventions and enrichment. • CTs will discuss pre-assessment data to plan instruction, create differentiated plans for various learning levels, and incorporate student preferences and interests. • CTs will identify students close to the next proficiency level within 2 points, and develop individualized learning plans for these students, including specific goals and timelines. • AC/Admin/CTs will conduct a final analysis of Common Assessment and EOC data in May to evaluate student growth and performance in all CTS, including students close to proficiency, SWD and ELL progress and inform next steps. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CT Leads	

	Artifacts to be Collected: • PLC agendas and notes • Professional learning sign-in sheets • Student work samples with feedback • Walkthrough data and coaching notes **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly		

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	The root cause is that reading and writing tasks are not consistently aligned across grade levels and subjects, which makes it harder for students, especially our Els (Multilingual Learners) to develop the language and literacy skills.		
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District		
Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 2. *Teachers will implement research-based literacy instructional practices.*	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of teachers will implement ELLevation or AVID literacy strategy as evidenced by instructional walks. **Implementation Plan:** **Preplanning:** • AC/DC/CT Leads/Teachers model ELLevation and AVID literacy strategies. **August-September:** • AC will work with CTs to identify 1 or 2 ELLevation or AVID strategies to implement during the next 20 days. • Teachers implement selected strategies. • Teachers implement literacy checks to track for student to utilize specific to the ELLevation and AVID strategies. • District Title III Consultant/ESOL DC/Admin/AC will conduct walks to determine needs and supports for teachers specifically with Els (multi-lingual learners). **October-December:** • AC/DC/Admin will begin walking classrooms to confirm ELLevation/AVID strategies are being implemented consistently. • AC/DC/CT Leads/Teachers model ELLevation and AVID literacy strategies. • AC will work CTs to identify 1 or 2 ELLevation/AVID strategies to implement during the next 20 days. • Teachers implement selected strategies • Teachers administer common assessments (Progress Learning and CTLS Assess) and track student progress toward standards mastery.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** 40% of 9th and 10th grade students will a show a minimum 50-point growth on their Lexile i-Ready Reading Assessment every 9 weeks. **Evaluation Tool(s):** i-Ready Lexile reports. Common Lit proficiency report **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Twice per semester **Data Analysis Plan:** • Teachers review common assessments during CT data meetings to determine if ELLevation strategies are having an impact on Gen, SWD and EL students. • Teachers review i-Ready-Lexile reports every 9 weeks to determine if the evaluation goal is being met. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CT Leads	**CTLS** **Progress Learning** **ELLevation** **CT Data Spreadsheet** **i-ready Lexile** **AVID**

	January-February: • AC/DC/Admin and teachers review Winter 2025 US History EOC data to determine if any changes occurred in the 5 domains and determine instructional priorities for Spring 2026 semester. • Coaches and teachers implement the same plans documented for August - September • District Title III Consultant/ESOL DC/Admin/AC will conduct walks to determine the effectiveness of strategies for teachers specifically with Els (multi-lingual learners). **March-April:** • AC and teachers implement the same plans documented for October - December **May:** • AC/DC/Admin and teachers review Spring US History EOC to determine if any changes occurred in the 4 levels and determine instructional priorities next year. **Artifacts to be Collected:** PL Schedule Assessment Schedule Instructional Walkthrough Data **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Classroom walks every other week beginning in October Attend CTs during 20 cycles	**Evaluation Tool(s):** ▪ Common Assessments ▪ I-Ready Lexile **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ twice a semester	

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement *(Required Components)*			
Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	**Date(s) Scheduled**	**Date Completed**	**"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed**
1. Required Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (Date) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	September 2025		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline (Date) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	October-November 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline (Date) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	March 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required Building Capacity for Involvement (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) Teacher will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school	PL#1: July-September 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	PL #2: October-December 2025		
	PL#3 January-February 2026		
	PL#4 March-April 2026		
5. Required Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school) Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. **Briefly describe the transition activities here:**	Cardinal Fly By July 2026 Rising 9th Grade Parent Night February 2026		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/program meetings in a format and language parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d*	***List documents translated for parents:*** Family-School Engagement Policy School-Parent Compact		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

Academically Based **School Developed Family Engagement Activities** ***(Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)***							
Academically Based **School Developed Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)**	**"Shall" Addressed**	**Goal(s) Addressed**	**Resources**	**Funding Source(s)** *SWP Checklist 5.e*	**Date**	**How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.**	**Team Lead**
Parent Mini Workshops We offer learning opportunities for parents based on their interests and needs (i.e., how to use ParentVue, CTLS Parent, and understanding graduation requirements).	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4 ☐ Goal 5	Title 1 Parent Facilitator Title III Parent Facilitator Communities in Schools Parent Resource Center Supplies	Title I Title III Local	Every 4-6 weeks August 2025-May 2026	Activities are monitored and evaluated by the Principal and Title I Administrator. The parent facilitator keeps a Teams folder updated with artifacts (i.e., sign in sheets, agendas, supplemental pay forms, parent input data, etc.).	Yoana Banuelos, Title 1 Parent Facilitator Tile III Parent Facilitator Title I Admin
Osborne High School Open House	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4 ☐ Goal 5	Title III Parent Facilitator Communities in Schools Parent Resource Center Supplies	Title I Title III Local	Fall 2025 & Spring 2026	Activities are monitored and evaluated by the Principal and Title I Administrator. The parent facilitator keeps a Teams folder updated with artifacts (i.e., sign in sheets, agendas, supplemental pay forms, parent input data, etc.).	Principal Title 1 Admin Teachers Title 1 Parent Facilitator

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

1. Assist parents in understanding state academic standards, state and local assessments, and how to monitor their child's academic progress.
2. Provide materials and training to help parents work with their child to improve academic achievement. (Ex. Literacy training, technology training)
3. Educate school staff in the value and utility of the contributions of parents, and how to reach, communicate with, and partner with parents to implement parent programs to build ties between parents and the school.

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

School Improvement Plan Required Questions

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

1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages.** *SWP Checklist 5(a)*

2. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings**. *Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)*

3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page.** *SWP Checklist 5(c)*

4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages.** *SWP Checklist 5(d)*

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

This year, each core department, as well as the Administration Team, met over the course of four meetings to determine root causes, action steps, implementation plans, and monitoring plans for our goals. In addition, requests for other significant stakeholder input were sent out by email along with the Title I Parent Facilitator gathering information from parents. We followed the Title I recommendations to include input from stakeholders such as our Food Services Manager, School Social Worker, Course Extension Coordinators, Professional School Counselors, Students, Parents, District Title I Supervisor, District Title I Academic Coach, and Media Specialist. Information was compiled from the meetings and emails and was reviewed by members of the team to use in developing the plan.

The district will provide support for the plan as well with resources such as Read 180 licenses, consumable materials, Edmentum licenses (we formerly used GradPoint), Delta Math, and CTLS Resources. In addition, Title II will provide professional development resources and support, and Title III will provide support for EL and dual-served students, including a Title III Parent Facilitator. The International Welcome Center is utilized for interpretation and translation support

and as an initial intake center for our IEL students. 20-day funds will be utilized for tutoring and summer learning support for our students struggling to meet state standards. Osborne Nest (Wraparound Services) receives multiple resources from our community members and partners. Title I will continue to fund our reading and math interventionalists as well as course extension, summer bridge, tutoring and local school resources. These federal, state, and local programs will work together to meet the needs of the students and families.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:
The school uses GaDOE CCRPI Content Mastery, Progress, Closing the Gap, and Graduation Rate provide a standard, measurable way for us to monitor the school's academic progress. The CCRPI allows us to determine our performance targets for the next year. A combination of course pass rates, EOC scores, EOC Domain data, ACCESS scores, and performance on common formative and summative assessments provide data for CTs to determine the content-specific needs of students.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Osborne High School has an operational Positive Behavioral Intervention Strategies (PBIS) program, which we refer to as SOAR (Supportive, Open-minded, Accountable, & Respectful). The aim of SOAR is to serve as a tiered approach for staff when addressing student behaviors. This year we have refocused on our knowledge of the existing PBIS matrix (i.e., SOAR) and its application with students. We have provided training twice this year in understanding the matrix and we have provided resources to identify and distinguish between minor and major infractions. SOAR emphasizes a progressive approach to discipline; before a student is referred for minor discipline they must have gone through several corrective steps within the classroom. Major discipline infractions are addressed by administration. Monthly discipline reviews occur in SOAR Team meetings as well as faculty/staff meetings. In a recent review of the year's comprehensive discipline data, there was a need to revise the attributes of our matrix to focus on safety, open-mindedness, accountability, and resilience; additionally, we revised the rules expected in the common areas throughout the building (i.e., hallway, cafeteria, restrooms, arrivals/departures, and extra-curriculars) to support our students in reducing our biggest disciplinary issues (i.e., tardies, insubordination, out-of-area/skipping).

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Professional learning is customized to meet the needs of CTs (in Cobb known as CCCs), departments, or individual teachers. Core as well as non-core teams are supported. Teachers work collaboratively with guidance from Instructional Coaches to plan, deliver, assess, and reflect on instruction. Instructional Coaches support core content teams as well as non-core teams. As part of their work, Instructional Coaches develop periodic needs assessment surveys for teachers, which allows them to customize PL in a way that meets teacher, team, and department needs. All teachers can attend conferences or workshops designed to enhance professional practice (co-coordinated through District, Title I, Title II, Title III, SFPSPD, and Local Funds)

The Fall 2024 Teacher PL Needs Survey asked teachers to identify professional learning needs as it related to the TKES standards. Teachers self-rate their proficiency in each standard and the survey gave teachers and opportunity to sign up to lead professional learning. Due to our growing population of Multilingual Learners all staff members were assigned two ELLevation modules to module to complete one each semester. Our teachers were offered additional professional learning opportunities during the Digital Learning Days covering CTLS, Ellevation, Progress Learning, Edmentum, & PBIS. Content specific trainings was offered for IRR teachers from district personnel, ELA teachers for MyAcess, and i-Ready and Math and Science teachers for PRISMS.

New teacher Induction is differentiated among Year 0-3 Teachers and Veteran Teachers New to Osborne. First year teachers attended monthly professional learning while third year teachers attended semester training sessions focused on instructional strategies. New this year was our monthly Lunch and Learn sessions where the new to Osborne faculty members able to learn about different aspects of our school culture, resources, and hear from experienced colleagues while building staff-wide connections. Also, we initiated a CT Leads monthly book study on Learn by Doing to support the PLC process within in our school-wide CTs.

The schoolwide professional learning topics were determined by the Admin, Instructional Coaches and Departments during the leadership retreat after reflecting on the instructional and post pl surveys. The professional learning topics chunked the components of the unit plan. Professional Learning was delivered and followed up with walkthroughs by guiding coalition, Admin/IC/DC walkthroughs, and then peer walkthroughs. Instructional Coaches also conducted classroom walkthroughs by department, by CCC, by new teacher groups, and cross-departments.

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Our professional school counselors offer various Financial Aid and college and career workshops. The Naviance program and its various activities is used to work with students to help them find potential careers and help them with future goals by providing career matchmaker assessments, ability profiler assessments, and post-secondary goal setting that addresses education/financial/career planning. The Osborne Counseling Department hosts Apply to College Day and informs students about Dual Enrollment opportunities (part of Bridge Law) with local technical colleges and universities, as well as Dual Achievement Option B, and conducts "check-in days" where our students can ask post-secondary questions in an open forum.

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

The Counselor Corners' Series focused on giving information about the college application process, partnership with Georgia Hope, financial aid and FAFSA, and our Communities in Schools Rep has planned college visits. The Counseling Department posts a monthly student newsletter to access applications for available scholarship opportunities.

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

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

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

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)*			
Position	**Supports Goal(s)**	**Supports which system(s)**	**How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?**
Paige Roberts Instructional Coach	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The academic coaches will support teachers in content areas to provide professional learning, modeling of strategies, and instructional feedback to teachers.
Miranda Sanders Instructional Coach	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The academic coaches will support teachers in content areas to provide professional learning, modeling of strategies, and instructional feedback to teachers.
April Hamilton-Williams Instructional Coach	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4 ☒ Goal 5	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The academic coaches will support teachers in content areas to provide professional learning, modeling of strategies, and instructional feedback to teachers.
Deidra Carter Math Interventionalist	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The FLP Instructor will support an identified group of at-risk incoming 9th graders to provide foundational math skills in the FLP to Foundations of Algebra looping cohort designed to help them obtain a math credit for graduation and promote to 10th grade.
TBH Reading Interventionalist	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The Reading Interventionist will support an identified group of at-risk incoming 9th graders in improving their reading and writing skills in the Comm. Skills to 9th Lit looping cohort designed to help them obtain an ELA credit for graduation and promote to 10th grade.

Joseph Rice 9-12 Edmentum	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The Grad Point Instructor will provide credit recovery opportunities to students who, during the pandemic, have fallen behind on credits toward graduation (primarily 10th and 11th graders).

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?
Yoana Banuelos Parent Facilitator	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4 ☐ Goal 5	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The Parent Facilitator will provide professional learning to faculty on how to engage families to increase student achievement. The Parent Facilitator will maintain all records for Title I Family Engagement Compliance.
Lindsey Norvell Social Studies Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4 ☒ Goal 5	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The classroom teacher will provide coherent instruction and will use data to drive instructional strategies to provide a supportive learning environment.
Scott Garber Math Teacher	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4 ☐ Goal 5	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The classroom teacher will provide coherent instruction and will use data to drive instructional strategies to provide a supportive learning environment.
TBH Science Teacher	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4 ☐ Goal 5	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The classroom teacher will provide coherent instruction and will use data to drive instructional strategies to provide a supportive learning environment.

School Improvement Goals *Include goals on the parent compacts and policy*	
Goal #1	**By May 2027, the graduation rate of the FY27 cohort will increase from our current 74.33 77.39 to 78.39%.** May 2023: 498 Graduated /670 FY23 Cohort = 74.33 Graduation Rate May 2024: 499 Graduated/654 FY24 Cohort = 77.63 77.39 Graduation Rate **Benchmark 1: May 2024: 575 (0.753 x 764) students will be on track for graduation. (Completed)** FY27 Cohort May 2024 Progress: 525/764 (69%) of current 9th graders are on track to graduate. (Before Course Ext) **Benchmark 2: May 2025: 579 (0.763 0.785 x 738) students will be on track for graduation.** FY27 Cohort January 2025 Progress: 611/738 (83%) of current sophomores are on track to graduate. 127 students are off cohort. *Benchmarks 2 – 4: Adjusted to reflect 1% incremental growth from our current goal of 77.39 and the current enrollment of the FY27 Cohort (738 students). These numbers will adjust over time.* **Benchmark 3: May 2026: 587 (0.773 0.795 x 764 738) students will be on track for graduation.** **Benchmark 4: May 2027: 594 (0.783 0.785 x 764 738) students will graduate (Graduation Rate of 78.39%).**
Goal #2	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI American Lit EOC will increase from 28% to 29.62% (CCRPI Closing the Gap). Our goal is for 203 (685 approximate total) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2026.
Goal #3	**EOC COURSES**: By May 2026, the total percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Georgia Milestone Algebra EOC will increase from 19.57% to 20.16%. **NON-EOC COURSES**: 20% of students will show proficiency (80% or higher) on their cumulative final exam.
Goal #4	By May 2026, the percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished on the Biology EOC will increase from 30.91% to 33%, as measured by the Georgia Milestones Assessment.
Goal #5	Students scoring proficient plus advanced on the CCRPI United States History EOC will increase from 32.31% to 33.28% (CCRPI Closing the Gap). Our goal is for 185 (557 approximate total) students to be proficient plus advanced by May 2026.