|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **School Year:** | **2025 - 2026** |
| **School Name:**  | **Elementary** |
| **Principal Name:** | **Dr. Pamela Cain** |
| **Date Submitted:**  | **June 2025** |
| **Revision Date(s):**  | **September 2025** |

**School Improvement Plan**

**Title I, Part A**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *District Name* | Cobb County School District |
| *School Name* | Dowell Elementary School |
| *Team Lead* | Dr. Pamela Cain |
|  *Position* |  Principal |
|  *Email* | Pamela.Cain@cobbk12.org |
|  *Phone* | 678-594-8059 |
| **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:   The School Improvement Plan was developed through the coordinated efforts of the administration, instructional leaders, grade-level teams, and support staff. Grade-level teams participated in Root Cause Analysis studies for ELA and Math.  In addition, parents and community partners were involved through participation in the Principal’s Advisory Committee.  |

**IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS**

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE**

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting Dates:** | May 7th, 2025 | May 14th, 2025 | May 21st, 2025 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Position/Role** | **Printed Name** | **Signature** |
| Principal  | Dr. Pamela Cain |  |
| Assistant Principal  | Tina Clark |  |
| Assistant Principal  | Amy Riggins |  |
| Instructional Support Specialist  | Lisa Hendrix |  |
| Media Specialist  | Julie Pszczola |  |
| Parent Facilitator  | Esther Islam |  |
| Kindergarten Lead Teacher  | Tina McNutt |  |
| 1st Grade Lead Teacher  | Brooke Duggan |  |
| 2nd Grade Lead Teacher  | Yiandria Boswell |  |
| 3rd Grade Lead Teacher  | Kristen Schell |  |
| 4th Grade Lead Teacher   | Shannon Herring |  |
|  5th Grade Lead Teacher  | Marlo Williams, Jr. |  |
| Specialist Lead Teacher  | Raina Michaels |  |
| Special Education Lead Teacher | Chelsea Doby |  |

**Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)**

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Previous Year’s Goal #1** | The percentage of K-2 students scoring in the “at or above” range will increase from 24.1% (92 students) to 40% (158 students) as measured by the spring 2025 Amira assessment. |
| **Was the goal met?** [ ]  **YES** [ ]  **NO** [x]  **Partially** |
| What data supports the outcome of the goal? | The percentage of K-2 students scoring in the “at or above” range increased to 38% (150 of 400 students). |
| **Reflecting on Outcomes** |
| If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need? | * Ensuring all teachers are using Science of Reading strategies within their phonics instruction and supplementing District ELF resources to provide intervention where needed.
* Provide additional professional learning in Science of Reading best practices.
 |
| 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 #2** | The percentage of students in grades 3-5 reading on grade level will increase from 59% (258) to 65% (285), as measured by the spring 2025 EOG ELA assessment. |
| **Was the goal met?** [ ]  **YES** [x]  **NO** [ ]  **Partially** |
| What data supports the outcome of the goal? | The percentage of students in grades 3-5 reading on grade level decreased from 59% to 56% , as measured by the spring 2025 EOG ELA assessment. (Although the percentage of students meeting the goal decreased, the number of students meeting the goal increased from 258 students in 2024 to 261 students in 2025. The total number of students taking the assessment increased from 2024-2025 which impacted the overall results.) |
| **Reflecting on Outcomes** |
| If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need? | * Ensuring all teachers are using Science of Reading strategies within their phonics instruction and supplementing District ELF resources to provide intervention where needed.
* Provide additional professional learning in Science of Reading best practices
 |
| 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** | The percentage of students in grades 1-2 scoring prepared will increase from 6.23% (17) to 20% (54), as measured by the spring math Beacon assessment. |
| **Was the goal met?** [ ]  **YES** [ ]  **NO** [x]  **Partially** |
| What data supports the outcome of the goal? | The percentage of students in grades 1-2 scoring prepared increased to 13% (52), as measured by the spring math Beacon assessment. |
| **Reflecting on Outcomes** |
| If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need? | * A direct focus in CCCs on math problem solving and ensuring that Math CCC reps are redelivering quarterly trainings to grade level teammates
* A dedicated use of common assessments to monitor student progress with math problem solving
* Refined professional learning focusing on problem solving strategies and using manipulatives in math instruction
 |
| 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 #4** | The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or 4 will increase from 32% (101) to 41% (131) as measured by the spring 2025 EOG math assessment. |
| **Was the goal met?** [ ]  **YES** [ ]  **NO** [x]  **Partially** |
| What data supports the outcome of the goal? | The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or 4 increased to 37% (146) as measured by the spring 2025 EOG math assessment. |
| **Reflecting on Outcomes** |
| If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need? | * A direct focus in CCCs on math problem solving and ensuring that Math CCC reps are redelivering quarterly trainings to grade level teammates
* A dedicated use of common assessments to monitor student progress with math problem solving
* Refined professional learning focusing on problem solving strategies and using manipulatives in math instruction
 |
| 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 #5** | The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or 4 will increase from 26% (110) to 35% (148) as measured by the spring 2025 EOG ELA assessment. |
| **Was the goal met?** [x]  **YES** [ ]  **NO** [ ]  **Partially** |
| What data supports the outcome of the goal? | The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or 5 increased to 36% (171 out of 475). |
| **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 implemented to sustain progress? | * Continued focus on increasing opportunities for students to respond to text through writing.
* Utilizing CCC’s to unpack standards to calibrate ELA instruction and analyze student writing data.
* Provide writing strategies PL and support for new ELA adopted resources.
 |

**Comprehensive Needs Assessment – Summary of Findings (Schoolwide)** Section 1114(b)(1)(A)
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|  |
| --- |
| **ELA DATA** |
| **ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data** | **SY22**% of students scoring proficient & distinguished | **SY23**% of students scoringproficient & distinguished | **SY24**% of students scoringproficient & distinguished |
| 3rd Grade | 26.4% | 40.7% | 31.5% |
| 4th Grade | 36.3% | 29.4% | 38.2% |
| 5th Grade | 29.9% | 35% | 38.2% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration** | **Foundations** | **Language** | **Texts** | **Interpreting Texts** | **Constructing Texts** |
| **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** | **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** | **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** | **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** | **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** |
| **1st Grade** | 59% | 30% | 12% | 55% | 34% | 11% | 52% | 38% | 9% | 66% | 28% | 6% | 55% | 34% | 11% |
| **2nd Grade** | 31% | 31% | 39% | 36% | 34% | 31% | 38% | 33% | 29% | 37% | 31% | 31% | 38% | 34% | 28% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration** | **Reading** | **Reading Text Types** | **Writing** |
| **Key Ideas & Details** | **Craft & Structure/ Integration of Knowledge & Skills** | **Vocabulary Acquisition & Use** | **Literary** | **Informational** | **Text Types and Purposes** | **Conventions** | **Research** |
| **SN** | **NT** | **P** | **SN** | **NT** | **P** | **SN** | **NT** | **P** | **SN** | **NT** | **P** | **SN** | **NT** | **P** | **SN** | **NT** | **P** | **SN** | **NT** | **P** | **SN** | **NT** | **P** |
| **3rd Grade** | 16% | 74% | 10% | 23% | 61% | 16% | 21% | 68% | 12% | 21% | 66% | 13% | 18% | 72% | 10% | 17% | 70% | 12% | 33% | 55% | 12% | 17% | 72% | 12% |
| **4th Grade** | 18% | 67% | 15% | 20% | 61% | 19% | 17% | 63% | 20% | 19% | 65% | 16% | 23% | 63% | 14% | 21% | 60% | 19% | 31% | 55% | 13% | 21% | 62% | 16% |
| **5th Grade** | 18% | 56% | 26% | 20% | 51% | 28% | 16% | 58% | 26% | 18% | 58% | 24% | 18% | 55% | 28% | 17% | 53% | 30% | 34% | 44% | 22% | 16% | 49% | 34% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Strengths | Weaknesses |
| SY24 ELA Milestones(Grade Levels & Subgroups) | **For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD****Grade Levels (all students):** * From SY22 to SY24, the 4th Grade proficient and distinguished percentage has increased from 26.4% to 31.5% on the ELA EOG assessment.

From SY22 to SY24, the 5th Grade proficient and distinguished percentage has increased from 29.9% to 38.2% on the ELA EOG assessment.**EL:** **SWD:** From SY24 to SY25, the percentage of 4th grade students scoring in levels 1 and 2 decreased from 13.4% to 9.2% | **For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD****Grade Levels (all students):** * From SY23 to SY24, the 3rd Grade proficient and distinguished percentage has decreased from 40.7% to 31.5% on the ELA EOG assessment.
* Though steady growth has been made with the percentage of students scoring in the proficient and distinguished categories from SY22 to SY24, only 36% of 3rd-5th grade students scored in the proficient and distinguished categories of the SY24 EOG assessment.

**EL:****SWD:** From SY24 to SY25, the percentage of 3rd grade students scoring in levels 1 and 2 increased from 6.6% to 12.4%. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring in levels 1 and 2 increased from 5.7% to 13.6%. |
| Beacon Assessment – ELA(Grade Levels & Subgroups) | **Grade Levels** **K-2 (all students):*** Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Foundations**, with 56% (151 out of 269) scoring **Near Target or Prepared** areas.

**3-5 (all students):*** Based on the 3rd – 5th grade Beacon results for ELA, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Key Ideas and Details**, with 83% (395 out of 475) scoring in the **Near Target or Prepared** areas.

**EL:** * Based on the ELA Beacon results for the ELL student group, 79% of 4th grade students and 69% of 3rd grade students scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.

**SWD:*** Based on the ELA Beacon results for the SWD student group, 74% of 3rd grade students scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.
 | **Grade Levels (all students):** **K-2 (all students):*** Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA our students have demonstrated a weakness in **Interpreting Texts** with 52% (140 out of 269) scoring in **Support Needed.**

**3-5 (all students):*** Based on the 3rd –5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated a weakness in **Writing Conventions**, with 33% (157 out of 475) scoring in the **Support Needed** area.

**EL:*** Based on the ELA Beacon results the ELL student group, 40% of 1st grade students, 30% of 2nd grade students and 43% of 5th grade students, scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.

**SWD:*** Based on the ELA Beacon results for the SWD student group, 39% of 2nd graders and 58% of 4th graders scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.
 |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[x]  Coherent Instruction[x]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:*** Teachers lack resources and instructional alignment for ELA overall.
* Vertical articulation is needed to establish priority standards and vocabulary to promote instructional consistency from one grade level to the next in the areas of writing, grammar and conventions.
 |
| ACCESS Scores(Grade Level Reading & Writing) | * 33 Students have been reclassified/automatically exited the ESOL program this year (2025).
 | **Grade Levels (all students):**

|  |
| --- |
| **2024 Overall PL Average – 3.3****255 total ELs** |
| Listening – 4.4Reading – 3.3Speaking – 3.2Writing – 2.9 | 1 – Entering = 20.4%2 – Emerging = 21.2%3 – Developing = 27.5%4 – Expanding = 26.7%5 – Bridging = 4.3% |

**2025 Overall PL Average – 3.1227 total ELs**Listening – 4.2 1 – Entering = 21.6%Reading – 3.0 2 – Emerging = 24.7% Speaking – 2.9 3 – Developing = 30.4%Writing – 2.8 4 – Expanding = 21.1% 5 – Bridging = 2.2%EL: Average Writing Proficiency Level (K-5):2024 = 2.9 of 62025 = 2.8 of 6* **Average Writing proficiency level decreased by 0.1 from 2024 to 2025.**

Level 5 – Bridging Proficiency Level (K-5):2024 = 4.3%2025 = 2.2%* **Decreased percentage of students scoring at the Level 5 composite proficiency level by 2.1%.**
 |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[x]  Coherent Instruction[x]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:*** ESOL teachers are not consistently implementing writing strategies across the grade levels
* Classroom teachers lack strategies to effectively address ESOL writing deficits.
 |
| ELA Common Assessments(Grade Level Reading & Writing) | **Grade Levels (all students):** K – Students grew in ability to expand their writing with details, to use finger spaces and to match their writing and picture.1 – Students grew in their understanding of the writing process.2 -  | **Grade Levels (all students):** On the Q4 grade level writing common post assessment:* 45% of kindergarten students scored in the proficient range.
* 39% of first grade students scored in the proficient range.
* 29% of second grade students scored in the proficient range.
* 39% of third grade students scored in the proficient range
* 35% of fourth grade students scored in the proficient range
* 49% of fifth grade students scored in the proficient range
 |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[x]  Coherent Instruction[x]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:*** Teachers lack resources and a clear scope and sequence for writing instruction.
* Teachers lack effective strategies to improve writing deficits of ESOL students.
 |
| School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) | * 81% of kindergarten teachers used phonics lessons in CTLS.
* 100% of 3rd Grade teachers used phonics lessons in CTLS.
* 75% of K-5 teachers used text dependent writing prompts connected to reading.
 | * Out of 88 classroom walkthroughs, students were observed actively speaking only 37% of the time.
* Only 50% of 4th and 5th grade teachers used advanced word study lessons from CTLS.
* Teacher led small group instruction in grades K-5 was observed 17% of the time during the uninterrupted literacy block.
 |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[x]  Coherent Instruction[x]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:*** Teachers lack understanding of strategies to promote active discussions during classroom instruction.
* Limited opportunities for professional learning in differentiated small group instruction.
 |
| Other Summary Data[ ]  Teacher Survey[ ]  Parent Survey[ ]  Professional  Learning Survey[ ]  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[ ]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning  Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN** |
| **GOAL #1: ELA** | The 1st and 2nd grade ELA BEACON scale score in the Texts domain will increase from 491 on the 2025 spring BEACON assessment to 500 on the 2026 spring BEACON assessment.The percentage of in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or 4 will increase from 36% (150) to 45% (187) as measured by the spring 2026 EOG ELA assessment. |
| **Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:** | * Teachers lack instructional resources and curriculum alignment in writing.
* K-5 vertical articulation is needed to establish priority standards and vocabulary to promote instructional consistency in writing, grammar and conventions across grade levels.
 |
| **Funding Source(s)***SWP Checklist 5.e* | [x]  Title I Funds [ ]  Local School Funds [ ]  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Components** | **Implementation Plan***SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Resources** |
| **Who?****One Action (Verb)****What?****Frequency** | **Implementation Performance Target:**By October 2025, 100% of K-5th teachers will use explicit writing instruction using text-dependent writing prompts that are modeled at least three times per week to increase students’ ability to accurately provide a written response. **Implementation Plan:*** Preplanning: Provide teachers with writing instruction requirements. Teachers will collaborate in CCC’s to create Q1 pre/post writing assessments and identify rubrics for evaluation of writing.
* August-September: PL will be provided for explicit writing instruction processes. Coach and county literacy trainer will provide strategies for each component of the process as well as anchor charts and graphic organizers.
* On August 18, Digital Learning Day, teachers will participate in a vertical teaming activity led by the academic coach to establish priority standards and key vocabulary at each grade level in the areas of writing, grammar and conventions.
* Teachers will administer Q1 writing pre-assessment and collaborate in CCCs to analyze student writing pre-assessment data.
* October-December:
* Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of the explicit writing processes. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.
* Teachers will administer Q1 and Q2pre/post writing assessments and collaborate in CCC’s to analyze student writing data.
* Teachers will be given release time in October and December, for collaborative planning, to create Q2/Q3 pre/post writing assessments and identify rubrics for evaluation of writing and plan for Q2/Q3 instruction.
* January-February:
* Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of the explicit writing processes. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.
* Teachers administer Q3 prewriting assessment and collaborate in CCC’s to analyze student writing data.
* March-April:
* Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of the explicit writing processes. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.
* Teachers administer Q3 post and Q4 pre-writing assessments and collaborate in CCC’s to analyze student writing data.
* Teachers will be given release time in March, for collaborative planning, to create Q4 pre/post writing assessments and identify rubrics.
* May: Teachers will give Q4 post writing assessment and collaborate in CCC’s to analyze student writing data

**Artifacts to be Collected:**-Instructional walk forms -PL sign -in sheets**Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:**[x] Principal[x]  Assistant Principals[x]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists**Frequency of Monitoring:**Monthly instructional walksMonthly ELA CCCs | **Evaluation Performance Target:**By December 2025, at least 50% of students in each grade level (grades K-5) will score 3/4 on a grade level common assessment using rubrics from the Wonders Curriculum. By May 2026, at least 65% of students in each grade level (grades K-5) will score 3/4 on a grade level common assessment using rubrics from the Wonders Curriculum**Evaluation Tool(s):*** Grade Level Common Formative Assessments Data

**Evaluation Plan:**Students will be assessed:[ ]  Every 2 weeks[ ]  Monthly[ ]  Every other month[ ]  3 times per year[x]  Quarterly**Data Analysis Plan:**CCCs: - Collaborative scoring of grade level common assessment using Wonders writing rubrics at the end of each unit during CCC meetings to determine progress towards goal, and address student needs and/or necessary changes in lessons. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:**[ ] Principal[ ]  Assistant Principals[x]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists[x] CCC Leads |   |
| **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 Kindergarten-5th grade teachers will use Explicit Writing Instruction that is modeled for students three times per week, with a focus on text-dependent writing prompts to increase students’ ability to accurately provide a written response, during the 120-minute literacy block, as indicated by quarterly common assessment data and classroom walkthroughs. |
| **Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:** | * Classroom teachers lack strategies to effectively address the writing deficits of ELL students.
 |
| **Funding Source(s)***SWP Checklist 5.e* | [ ]  Title I Funds [ ]  Local School Funds [ ]  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Components** | **Implementation Plan***SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Resources** |
| **Who?****One Action (Verb)****What?****Frequency** | **Implementation Performance Target:**By October 2025, 100% of K-5th Grade teachers will implement ELLEvation strategies during the ELA Block as measured by monthly instructional walk forms. **Implementation Plan:*** Preplanning: Provide teachers with school-wide expectations for Utilizing ELLEvation strategies during the ELA block.
* August-September: PL will be provided for ELLEvation Strategies. The ESOL team will provide guidance on how to effectively implement the strategies.
* October-December: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of ELLEvation strategies. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.
* January-February: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of ELLEvation strategies. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.
* March-April: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of ELLEvation strategies. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.

May: Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation.**Artifacts to be Collected:** -Instructional walk forms -PL sign -in sheets**Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:**[ ] Principal[ ]  Assistant Principals[x]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists**Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly instructional Walks  | **Evaluation Performance Target:****Kindergarten:** By December 2025, at least 50% of Kindergarten ELL students will score a three(3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric. **1st-5th Grade:** By December 2025, at least 70% of 1st-5th grade ELL students will score in the Near Target category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment. **Kindergarten:** By May 2026, at least 70% of Kindergarten ELL students will score a three(3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric. **1st-5th:** By May 2026, at least 70% of 1st-5th grade ELL students will score in the Prepared category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment. **Evaluation Tool(s):**Kindergarten: Scored Grade Level Common assessment * 1st-5th: Beacon Data

**Evaluation Plan:**Students will be assessed:[ ]  Every 2 weeks[ ]  Monthly[ ]  Every other month[x]  3 times per year[ ]  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Data Analysis Plan:** CCCs: - Collaborative scoring of grade level common assessment using Wonders writing rubrics three times a year during CCC meetings to determine progress toward goal, and address student needs and/or necessary changes in lessons. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:**[ ] Principal[ ]  Assistant Principals[x]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists[x] CCC Leads |  |
| **Target Student Group** |
| [ ]  Gen Ed[x]  EL[ ]  SWD  |
| **Action Step***SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* |
| 2 . The ESOL Team will provide ELLEvation Professional Learning to Kindergarten through 5th grade teachers once a quarter to model ELLEvation strategies that can be used during ELA Instruction. |

|  |
| --- |
| **MATH DATA** |
| **MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data** | **SY22**% of students scoring proficient & distinguished | **SY23**% of students scoringproficient & distinguished | **SY24**% of students scoringproficient & distinguished |
| 3rd Grade | 31.8% | 37.7% | 24.6% |
| 4th Grade | 43% | 29.4% | 38.8% |
| 5th Grade | 29.9% | 26% | 29.2% |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration** | **Numerical Reasoning** | **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning** | **Measurement & Data Reasoning** | **Geometric & Spatial Reasoning** |
| **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** | **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** | **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** | **Support Needed** | **Near Target** | **Prepared** |
| **Kinder** **(Winter Administration)** | 58% | 40% | 2% | 70% | 19% | 12% | 58% | 37% | 5% | 44% | 38% | 18% |
| **1st Grade** | 67% | 28% | 5% | 56% | 33% | 11% | 57% | 35% | 8% | 56% | 39% | 5% |
| **2nd Grade** | 66% | 24% | 9% | 57% | 32% | 11% | 62% | 24% | 13% | 59% | 29% | 12% |
| **3rd Grade** | 13% | 84% | 3% | 17% | 77% | 5% | 19% | 79% | 2% | 23% | 73% | 4% |
| **4th Grade** | 48% | 45% | 6% | 48% | 50% | 3% | 48% | 50% | 3% | 54% | 40% | 6% |
| **5th Grade** | 40% | 55% | 5% | 46% | 47% | 7% | 46% | 45% | 9% | 53% | 42% | 5% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Source | Strengths | Weaknesses |
| SY24 MATH Milestones(Data by grade & subgroup) | * From SY23 to SY24 the 4th grade proficient and distinguished percentage has increased from 29.4% to 38.8% on the Math EOG assessment.
* From SY23 to SY24 the 5th grade proficient and distinguished percentage has increased from 26% to 29.2% on the Math EOG assessment

**EL:** From SY24 to SY25, the percentage of students in 3rd grade scoring in levels 1 and 2 decreased from 27.3% to 24.3%. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring in levels 1 and 2 decreased from 24.4% to 14.2%.**SWD:** From SY24 to SY25, the percentage of 4th grade students scoring in levels 1 and 2 decreased from 12.9% to 10.6%. | * From SY23 to SY24 the 3rd grade proficient and distinguished percentage has decreased from 37.7% to 24.6% on the Math EOG assessment.
* Though intermittent growth has been made with the percentage of students scoring in the proficient and distinguished categories from SY22 to SY24, only 37% of 3rd –5th grade students scored in the proficient and distinguished categories on the 2024 Math EOG assessment.

**EL:** From SY24 to SY25 the percentage of students in 4th grade scoring in levels 1 and 2 increased from 17.7% to 26.8%.**SWD:** From SY24 to SY25, the percentage of 3rd grade students scoring in levels 1 and 2 increased from 6.7% to 12.5%. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring in levels 1 and 2 increased from 7.3% to 13.1%. |
| Beacon Assessment – Math(Grade Level & Subgroups) | **K-2 (all students):*** Based on the K- 2nd grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in

**Geometric and Spatial Reasoning** with 47% (188 out of 400) scoring in the **Near Target or Prepared** areas**.****3-5 (all students):*** Based on the 3rd – 5th grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Numerical Reasoning** with 66% (313 out of 475) scoring in the **Near Target or Prepared** areas**.**

**EL:*** Based on the Beacon Math results for the ELL student group, 67% of 1st grade students and 68% of 3rd grade students scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.

**SWD:*** Based on the Beacon Math results for the SWD student group, 83% of 3rd grade students scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.
 | **K-2 (all students):*** Based on the K- 2nd grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weaknesses in **Numerical Reasoning** with 64% (256 out of 400) scoring in the **Support Needed** area**.**

**3-5 (all students):*** Based on the 3rd – 5th grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in **Geometric and Spatial Reasoning** with 43% (204 out of 475) scoring in the **Support Needed** area.

**EL:*** Based on the Beacon Math results for the ELL student group, 26% of 4th grade students and 10% of 5th grade students scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.

**SWD:*** Based on the Beacon Math results for the SWD student group, 24% of 4th grade students and 17% of 5th grade students scored in the Near Target and Prepared ranges.
 |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[x]  Coherent Instruction[x]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:*** Limited opportunities for students to engage in daily number sense routines to develop foundations skills needed for numerical reasoning.
* Students lack the vocabulary and comprehension skills to effectively solve word problems.
 |
| MATH Common Assessments(Grade Level) | On the Q4 math problem solving common assessment:* 60% of kindergarten students scored in the proficient category.
* 62% of first grader students scored in the proficient category.
* 69% of fifth grade students scored in the proficient category
 | On the Q4 math problem solving common assessment:* 50% of second grade students scored in the proficient category.
* 54% of third grade students scored in the proficient category.
* 35% of fourth grade students scored in the proficient category
 |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[x]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:*** Second, third and fourth grade students have higher expectations for increased independence in solving word problems, whereas kindergarten and first grade students have greater opportunities for scaffolding and opportunities to demonstrate learning in various ways.
* Second through fourth grade teachers are not offering enough opportunities for solving word problems with scaffolded approaches.
 |
| School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) |  |  |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[ ]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:** |
| Other Summary Data[ ]  Teacher Survey[ ]  Parent Survey[ ]  Professional Learning Survey[ ]  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |
| Check the system that contributes to the root cause:[ ]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment | **Root Cause Explanation:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN** |
| **GOAL #2: MATH** | The K-2 BEACON math scale score in the numerical reasoning domain will increase from 440 on the 2025 spring Math BEACON assessment to 450 on the 2026 Math BEACON assessment.The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring level 3 or 4 will increase from 37% (146) to 42% (166) as measured by the spring 2025 EOG math assessment. |
| **Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:** | * Limited opportunities for students to engage in daily number sense routines to develop foundations skills needed for numerical reasoning.
 |
| **Funding Source(s)***SWP Checklist 5.e* | [x]  Title I Funds [ ]  Local School Funds [ ]  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Components** | **Implementation Plan***SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Evaluation Plan***SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Resources** |
| **Who?****One Action (Verb)****What?****Frequency** | **Implementation Performance Target:**By October 2025, 100% of teachers will implement a problem of the day which addresses grade level math fluency deficits.**Implementation Plan:*** Preplanning: Provide teachers with daily number sense routine expectations.
* August-September: PL will be provided in math fluency strategies. Coach/math CCC leads will provide strategies/ideas for implementation of strategies.
* Teachers will participate in a vertical articulation activity led by the academic coach to establish priority standards and key vocabulary at each grade level in the areas of numerical reasoning and fact fluency.
* BFF Kits (Building Fact Fluency) will be purchased for one teacher per grade level and training will be provided for those teachers to pilot the resource.
* October-December: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of daily fluency strategy. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning. Teachers will analyze common assessment data during CCC’s to monitor student application of fluency strategies.
* January-February: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of daily fluency strategy. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning. Teachers will analyze common assessment data during CCC’s to monitor student application of fluency strategies.
* March-April: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of daily fluency strategy. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning. Teachers will analyze common assessment data during CCC’s to monitor student application of fluency strategies.
* May: Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation.

**Artifacts to be Collected:**Instructional walk formSign In Sheets**Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:**[x] Principal[x]  Assistant Principals[x]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists**Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly | **Evaluation Performance Target:**By December 2025, the average scale score on the numerical reasoning portion of the math BEACON will be 455.**Evaluation Tool(s):*** BEACON math assessment data

**Evaluation Plan:**Students will be assessed:[ ]  Every 2 weeks[ ]  Monthly[ ]  Every other month[x]  3 times per year[ ]  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Data Analysis Plan: Beacon** Assessment Data Digs during CCC meetings to determine progress toward goal and address student needs and/or necessary changes in instruction. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:**[ ] Principal[x]  Assistant Principals[ ]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists[ ] CCC Leads |  |
| **Target Student Group** |
| [x]  Gen Ed[ ]  EL[ ]  SWD  |
| **Action Step***SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* |
| 1. Implement a daily number sense routine in all K-5 classrooms to include a problem of the day based on grade-level math fluency priorities.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:** | * Students lack the vocabulary and comprehension skills to effectively solve math word problems.
 |
| **Funding Source(s)***SWP Checklist 5.e* | [x]  Title I Funds [ ]  Local School Funds [ ]  Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Components** | **Implementation Plan***SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26* | **Resources** |
| **Who?****One Action (Verb)****What?****Frequency** | **Implementation Performance Target:**By October 2025, 100% of teachers will implement numberless word problems twice weekly during the math block.**Implementation Plan:*** Preplanning: Provide teachers with numberless word problem instructional expectations.
* August-September: Academic coach and CCC math leads will provide PL on numberless word problems.
* October-December: Teachers will be given release time quarterly to engage in instructional planning where they will create numberless word problems to be used during math instruction. They will collaborate in CCCs to create pre/post math problem solving assessments and rubrics. They will analyze problem solving assessment data in CCC’s to determine next steps.
* January-February: Teachers will be given release time quarterly to engage in instructional planning where they will create numberless word problems to be used during math instruction. They will collaborate in CCCs to create pre/post math problem solving assessments and rubrics. They will analyze problem solving assessment data in CCC’s to determine next steps.
* March-April: Teachers will be given release time quarterly to engage in instructional planning where they will create numberless word problems to be used during math instruction. They will collaborate in CCCs to create pre/post math problem solving assessments and rubrics. They will analyze problem solving assessment data in CCC’s to determine next steps.
* May: Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation.

**Artifacts to be Collected:**Sign In SheetsProblem solving data sheets**Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:**[ ] Principal[ ]  Assistant Principals[x]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists**Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly | **Evaluation Performance Target:**By December 2025, 40% of K-5 students will score in the 80% range on word problems as indicated by quarterly grade level common assessments.**Evaluation Tool(s):*** Common assessments data

**Evaluation Plan:**Students will be assessed:[ ]  Every 2 weeks[ ]  Monthly[x]  Every other month[ ]  3 times per year[ ]  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Data Analysis Plan:** Teachers will collaborate in CCC’s to analyze student data from grade level problem solving common assessments.**Person(s) Collecting Evidence:**[ ] Principal[ ]  Assistant Principals[x]  Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists[x] CCC Leads |  |
| **Target Student Group** |
| [x]  Gen Ed[x]  EL[ ]  SWD  |
| **Action Step***SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* |
| 1. Implement a numberless word problem strategy in all K-5 classrooms twice weekly.
 |

|  |
| --- |
|  **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 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. |  |  | [x]  1 [ ]  4[ ]  2 [ ]  5[ ]  3 [ ]  6 |
| ***2. Required*** Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline ­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. | Fall Conference Week  |  | [ ]  1 [ ]  4[ ]  2 [ ]  5 [ ]  3 [x]  6 |
| ***3. Required*** Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline ­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. |  |  | [ ]  1 [ ]  4[ ]  2 [ ]  5 [ ]  3 [x]  6 |
| ***4. Required*** FOUR Building Capacity Opportunities (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 |  |  | [ ]  1 [ ]  4[ ]  2 [ ]  5 [x]  3 [ ]  6 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| ***5. Required*** Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school) Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child’s education. **Briefly describe the transition activities here:** | **Kindergarten Orientation**: **Transition to Lovinggood**: TBD  **Transition to Tapp**: TBD **Transition to Smitha:** TBD |  | [ ]  1 [x]  4[ ]  2 [ ]  5 [ ]  3 [ ]  6 |
| ***6. Required***: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d* | ***List documents translated for parents:***School Web site Communication through CTLS Parent Flyers Compact Policy  | [ ]  1 [ ]  4[ ]  2 [x]  5 [ ]  3 [ ]  6 |

|  |
| --- |
| **School Developed Family Engagement Activities *(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)*** |
| **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** |
| Family Math and Science Night  | [ ]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[x]  6 | [ ]  Goal 1 [ ]  Goal 2 [ ]  Goal 3 [ ]  Goal 4  | Math games | Title 1 STEAM fund |  | Sign in Sheets Parent Surveys Math Game Bags  | Administration STEAM Team Instructional Coaches Parent Facilitator  |
| Winter Family STEAM Showcase (Reading, Writing, and Art Focus)  | [ ]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[x]  6 | [ ]  Goal 1 [ ]  Goal 2 [ ]  Goal 3 [ ]  Goal 4  | Supplies for Arts Integration Projects focused on literacy. | Title 1 STEAM fund |  | Sign In Sheets Parent Surveys  | Administration STEAM Team Instructional Coaches Parent Facilitator  |
| Gobble Up Literacy  | [ ]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4[ ]  5[x]  6 | [ ]  Goal 1 [ ]  Goal 2 [ ]  Goal 3 [ ]  Goal 4  | Take Home books. | Title 1  |  | Sign In Sheets Parent Surveys | Administration Literacy Committee Team Instructional Coaches 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**: The Title I School Improvement Plan is developed in coordination with the additional services and resources we have at Dowell ES.  These services and resources include the state-funded Early Intervention Program, the Food and Nutrition program, and district-funded instructional money.     |
| **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**: At Dowell Elementary School, data is collected and analyzed on a monthly basis during CCC Meetings that include administration, teachers and instructional support staff.  |
| 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**: At Dowell Elementary School, students who are at risk of not achieving standards are monitored and supported through targeted interventions based on analysis of data.  This includes grade-level intervention groups and targeted intervention groups through the RTI process.  |
| 9. Describe how the schoolwide plan will be revised, as necessary, based on regular monitoring to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program. *SWP Checklist 3(c)* |
| **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: The school leadership team will meet monthly to review and analyze data and revisit the needs assessment.  Based on ongoing data and monitoring, modifications to interventions and resources will be made.  |
| **Schoolwide Plan Reform Strategies** – *Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)* |
| 10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State’s challenging academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State’s challenging academic standards, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(a)* |
| 11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(b)* |
| 12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include - counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students’ skills outside the academic subject areas. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)* |
| 13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). *SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)* |
| **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: At Dowell Elementary, the staff utilizes a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). It is a multi-tiered system of academic and behavioral support. MTSS builds on our commitment for teaching and learning beginning with high-quality, differentiated instruction throughout the day and emphasizing early intervention when students first experience academic or behavioral struggles. The staff considers multiple factors including testing data, academic performance, attendance data, social participation, school connectedness, externalizing behaviors, and internalizing behaviors to identify students to receive multi-tiered system of academic and behavioral support (MTSS).  |
| 14. Describe professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)* |
| **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: Professional development is provided to support increasing teacher and paraprofessional effectiveness in reading, writing, and math in support of our school improvement goals.  In addition, teachers new to Dowell will be supported through Dowell’s New Teacher Institute.   |
| 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**: At Dowell Elementary, we provide a “kindergarten camp” as a transition activity for our rising kindergartners.  Students are exposed to the routines and environment in kindergarten.  Students are prescreened for kindergarten readiness skills.    |
| 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**: n/a |
| **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?** |
|  | [ ]  Goal 1 [ ]  Goal 2 [ ]  Goal 3 [ ]  Goal 4  | [ ]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment[ ]  Family Engagement |  |
|  | [ ]  Goal 1 [ ]  Goal 2 [ ]  Goal 3 [ ]  Goal 4  | [ ]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment[ ]  Family Engagement |  |
|  | [ ]  Goal 1 [ ]  Goal 2 [ ]  Goal 3 [ ]  Goal 4  | [ ]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment[ ]  Family Engagement |  |
|  | [ ]  Goal 1 [ ]  Goal 2 [ ]  Goal 3 [ ]  Goal 4  | [ ]  Coherent Instruction[ ]  Professional Capacity[ ]  Effective Leadership[ ]  Supportive Learning Environment[ ]  Family Engagement |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **School Improvement Goals** ***Include goals on the parent compacts and policy*** |
| **Goal #1** |  |
| **Goal #2** |  |
| **Goal #3** |  |
| **Goal #4** |  |