

Approved Final Copy

August 2024

School Improvement Action Plan



School Year:	2025
School Name:	Clarkdale Elementary School
Principal Name:	Mrs. Dwan Jones
Date Submitted:	June 10, 2024
Revision Dates:	04/17/24; 05/07/24; 05/20/24; 05/31/24; 06/03/24; 06/07/24; 07/26/24; 08/06/24

Distric Name						
Schoo Name		Clarkdale Elementary School				
Team	Lead	Dwan Jones				
Posi	ition	Principal				
Ema	ail	dwan.jones@cobbk12.org				
Pho	ne	770-819-2422				
		Federal Funding Options to Be Employed (SWP Schools) in This Plan (Select all that apply)				
Х	Tradit	ional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)				
	Conso	lidated 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)					
Х	Free/F	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)]

The School Leadership Improvement Team of Clarkdale Elementary School, including teachers, administrators, families, and community leaders met face-to-face to provide input on Comprehensive Needs Assessment. The data from the 2023-2024 school year was shared and reviewed. The committee analyzed the data and provided input on the prioritized needs, root causes, and goals and actions for the 2024-2025 school year. The information was then compiled into the School Improvement Plan. Input from school stakeholders such as families, community partners, Principal Advisory, PTA, as well

as other school staff, was collected and incorporated into the School Improvement Plan. FY24-25 SIP Records of attendance are kept at the school and via email records. Families and community members were invited via CTLS Parent, phone and/or email.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are those individuals with valuable experiences and perspective 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.

- 1. Administrative Team
- 2. Content or Grade Level Teachers
- 3. Local School Academic Coaches
- 4. District Academic Coaches
- 5. Required: At least one Parent (Non CCSD Employee)
- 6. School Counselors
- 7. Parent Facilitators
- 8. Media Specialists
- 9. Public Safety Officers
- 10. Business Partners
- 11. Social Workers
- 12. Faith Based Community Leaders
- 13. School Technology Specialists
- 14. Community Health Care Providers
- 15. Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

COMMITTEE MEMBERS SIGNATURE PAGE

The comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) and school improvement team (SIP) team consist of people who are 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 Date(s): April 17, 2024; May 7, 2024; May 20, 2024, May 31, June 3, June 7, 2024; July 26, 2024; August 6, 2024

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Dwan Jones	
Assistant Principal	Lorna Holt	
Assistant Principal	Carmen Bandy	
District Academic Coach	Angela Mack	
District Title 1 Supervisor	Cheryl Johnson	
Instructional Specialist	Mechelle Weddington	
Instructional Specialist	Annette Castleberry	
Instructional Specialist	Katy Laine	
Instructional Specialist	Cheryl Chesterfield	
Instructional Specialist	leshia Wilkerson	
Parent Facilitator	Cheryl Bush	

Grade K Team Leader	Sandra Moss	
Grade 1 Team Leader	Laura Werren	
Grade 2 Team Leader	Ashlynn Bailey	
Grade 3 Team Leader	Phyllis Foster	
Grade 4 Team Leader	Cathy Shelby	
Grade 5 Team Leader	Talecia Tabb	
Specialist Team Leader	Kaitlin Todero	
Special Education Team Leader	Rebecca Watson	
Counselor	Temika Arnold	
Clarkdale Parent	Dominique Anderson	

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 FY24 School Improvement Plan (SIP).

Previous Year's Goal #1	Increase the percenta assessment from 43% the 2024 school year. *Students in grades K-	(219 of 510	student	s) at the en	d of 2023 sc	hool year to	50% of asse	essed students by	
	Was the goa	al met?	⊠ Y	ES	□ NO				
	Reading	Invento	ory_						
		SY 2024 A	% and # croficient/ Advanced Reading orformance	% and # Advanced Reading Performance	% and # Proficient Reading Performance	% and # Basic Reading Performance	% and # Below Basic Reading Performance	Total students assessed	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	2-5	August 319	156	9% 45 students	22% 111 students	24% 122 students	45% 232 students	510	
		December 409	students	14% 67 students			36% 180 students	496	
		March Goal 509	students	17% 86 students	33% Students	24% 124 Students	26% 132 students	510	
		August		De	cember		March		
	All Anderson Advanced								
	Students in grades 2 (156 students) to M Proficient and Advar Grade 2: 14% (18 of Grade 3: 27% (48 of Grade 4: 24% (31 of Grade 5: 45% (59 of	arch at 53% nced studer 122 studer 128 studer 128 studer	(254 st nt perfo nts) to 4 nts to 52 nts to 40	udents). rmance fro 4% (59 of 1 % (64 of 1 % (52 of 1	om August t 133 student 23 students 29 students	o March ss) s)	ormance le	vels from August	: at 31%

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? Successes: K-2 Teachers lead phonics instruction using CTLS resources based on Structured Literacy / Science of Reading. Small group instruction based on phonics scope and sequence and student performance on the Word Knowledge Inventory. 3-5 teachers, lead instruction using word study based on the Word Knowledge Inventory data and content area vocabulary.

Increase the percentage of K-5 students performing at proficient and advanced levels on the Math Inventory (MI) assessment from 67% (436 of 664 students) at the end of 2023 school year to 72% of assessed students by the end of Previous Year's Goal #2 2024 school year. ☐ YES **⊠** NO Was the goal met? **Math Inventory** % and # % and # % and # Proficient/ % and # Basic % and # Below Total Proficient Advanced SY 2024 Advanced Math Basic Math students Math Math Math Performance Performance assessed Performance Performance Performance Grades 111 54% 379 K-5 September 697 students students students students 316 88 228 184 December 194 694 students students students students 114 435 180 255 164 25% 23% 16% 61% 713 March students students students students students What data supports the outcome of the May Goal goal? August December March

	Students in grades K -5 saw an increase in proficient and advanced levels from August 16% (111 students) to 61% (435 students) based on the Math Inventory. While there were significant gains in math proficiency, there were not enough gains to meet the goal set in the 23-24 SIP.
	Reflecting on Outcomes
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Our math goal was not met this year due to several factors. Students struggled significantly with word problems, impacting their overall math performance. The implementation of new state math standards required time to adapt, and the pacing of instruction made it a challenge to ensure student mastery. The professional learning calendar is revised to begin during preplanning to support teachers as we start the school year. Additionally, insufficient modeling of problem-solving by teachers limited students' ability to develop effective strategies.
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	Increase the percentage of 3 rd – 5 th grade students performing at the Monitor and Accelerate Learning levels in writing, as measured by the EOG, from 44% (155 of 352 students) at the end of 2023 school year to 50% of assessed students by the end of 2024 school year.											
	Was the goa	l me	t?	⊠ Y	'ES		NO					
		2024 EOG Writing Student Performance										
	Grade Levels		Levels Monitor		% and # Accelerate Learning Performance Level		% and # Monitor Learning Performance Level		% and # Remediate Learning Performance Level		Total students assessed	
What data supports the outcome of the		3	49%	62 students	27%	34 students	22%	28 students	51%	64 students	126	
goal?		4	42%	55 students	26%	34 students	16%	21 students	58%	76 students	131	
		5	69%	86 students	41%	51 students	28%	35 students	31%	39 students	125	
		3-5	53%	203 students	31%	119 students	22%	84 students	47%	179 students	382	
		EOG Goal	49%									

	Student performance in May 2024 increased about 9 percentage points above students assessed in May 2023. May 2023 44% (155 of 352 students) to May 2024 53% (203 of 382 students).
	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?	Successes: Intentional focus on writing instruction in whole and small group settings and writing conferences. Teachers in grades 3-5 used Write Score resources to drive targeted instruction based on assessment data. The resources helped to standardize instruction and make collaboration more impactful. To sustain growth in writing, Collaborative Teams will continue to teach writing traits and support students use of cohesive writing strategies across content areas. Consistent analysis of student writing will provide data to support specific whole and small group instruction.

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

Data	Strengths	Concerns	Multiple Data Sources
ELA	Students in grades 2-5 scored 50% proficient and advanced on the March Reading inventory (254 of 510 students) 2nd 44% (59 of 133 students) 3rd 52% (64 of 123 students) 4th 40% (52 of 129 students) 5th 63% (79 of 125 students) As noted by Teams via Staff Surveys, areas of strength include ask and answer questions, main idea, key details, and literal comprehension.	classroom visits, areas of opportunity for students	RI Staff Surveys Interim Assessments EOG
Math	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	As noted from teacher feedback, data analysis from CCC meetings, and classroom observation walks, students need more strategies to support solving one and two-step word problems. Students need to apply instructional strategies to support Numerical Reasoning (operations, operations within word problems, place value, computational fluency, operations with whole numbers, fractions, and decimals), and Measurement and Data Reasoning (Measurement concepts, vocabulary, fractions, intervals of time, and comparisons)	Staff Surveys EOG Walkthrough Observations Interim Assessments

	Students and families participate in at-home STEM	Increase usage of CTLS Science Workshop lessons	Interim Assessments
	· · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	EOG
	projects.	, , ,	
	Claudada abbaira d CTEANA acutification this 22, 24 CVI	the 9-Grid planning format).	Observational Data
	Clarkdale obtained STEAM certification this 23-24 SY!	Frontloading of content related vocabulary and	
	Innovation Lab Teacher (ILT) collaborated with	integrated across the curriculum.	
	classroom teachers to extend the science units taught		
	in class. The ILT teacher incorporated a variety of	EOG Science Data	
Science	technology tools to support the learning whereas the	5 th Grade (125 Students)	
	content from the units was continually reviewed	Level 1 36% (45 students)	
	throughout the year through multiple modes of	Level 2 27% (34 Students)	
	learning.	Level 3 26% (32 students)	
	[Level 4 11%(14 Students)	
	Teachers participated in district professional	Level 4 1170(14 Students)	
	development to support science instruction.	63% (79) of 5 th grade students scored at a level 1 or 2	
	STEM Innovation Academy: 8 Teachers	on the Science EOG. Leaving 37% (46) 5 th grade	
	Problem-Based Learning Academy: 5 Teachers	students performing at proficient or advanced.	
	Froblem-based Learning Academy. 5 Teachers	students performing at proncient of advanced.	
	Social Studies instruction is where Arts integration is	Instruction is limited to the content area block. More	Interim Assessments
	mostly seen and offers students the opportunity to use	time is needed to integrate Social Studies in other	Observational Data
	multiple intelligences to support the learning.	instructional areas (using the 9-Grid planning format).	
		Social Studies Weekly is the main resource for teaching	
		and learning. Many of our students (those reading	
		below grade level) are unable to access all parts of this	
		resource.	
		Increase the use of Social Studies Workshop lessons to	
Social Studies		support inquiry-based learning.	
Journ Studies		Most grade levels' highest student performance	
		averages were on interim assessments at the end of the	
		school year.	

		ı			T1-24	1	
					Unit Assessment Average %		
				Grade 1	Unit 8 71%		
			Highest	Grade 2	Unit 6 75%		
			Interim Average	Grade 3	Unit 6 64%		
				Grade 4	Unit 5 64%		
				Grade 5	Unit 7 71%		
	The Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) is	There were	110 Offi	ce Referral	s submitted th	nis vear	PBIS
	helping to hold the number of students that require interventions. Some of the systems we have in place	compared t			o oddiniced ti	,	CCSD Discipline Report
	that children can earn rewards are:	3 students	received	more than	10 office refe	rrals each	
	Bus rewards (new plan this year where most	totaling 38 of the 110 office referrals. There 3 significant behaviors that were identified: 1. Disruption					
	incidents were occurring, we collaborate with the drivers to celebrate top behaviors on the						
Discipline / School	buses) Over the course of 12 weeks we were						
Climate Data	able to celebrate 135 students who ride the bus	2. Insubord					
	 for their R³ behavior. PBIS Reward Days: One event per quarter 	3. Rough &	Boistero	us			
	Students use earned PBIS points to purchase	OSS VTD 42) compar				
	the opportunity	OSS YTD 42 compared to 24 last year ISS YTD 20 compared to 20 last year					
	Shared language regarding the "why" a	Many of these behaviors occurred in grades 2, 4 and K from 9, 9:30 and 12:30.					
	student earns a reward						
	Quarterly Math Professional development to support	1			and activities	to support	Survey results
	the new Georgia Math Standards (December 2023 and			_	e new math st		Observational Data
	March 2024).						
				xtension ac	ctivities, unpac	cking the	
Dunfamina II	Impact	new standards)					
Professional Learning What's been provided?					take training	sessions	
What is the impact?	For teachers, these sessions provided crucial insights	prior to the	e new qua	arter.			
	into the updated curriculum, equipped them with innovative strategies and resources to enhance their	This year w	e had thr	ee formal	ELA professior	nal learning	
	instructional practices. This professional development				ve shared sup	_	
	emphasized the incorporation of higher-order thinking				eam meetings,		
					re and provide f strategies.	support	
	<u> </u>	ioi silared	vertical a	ngiiiieiit 0	i strategies.		

	Teachers learned to design lessons that challenge	Grade level teams collaborated to complete an end-of- the-year survey sharing they would like to have quarterly PL/planning days, more scheduled PL, and additional individualized coaching sessions.	
Other			

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

Data	Studer	nt Groups	Strengths					Conc	erns			Multiple Data Sources
Data		English Learners / ELL Foster / Homeless Migrant	Grade 3 4 5 While ELL stimoving thro testing out, students are proficiency a on the EOG. performance teaching and	s based on AC ate that there amber of stud. 0 to 4.0. ELL EOG Data # of ELL 32 4 19 SWD EOG Dat # of SWD 12 18 12 udents are prough ACCESS to both our ELL & estarting to ac and advanced. This improved is evidence of	ents moving P/Adv. 4% (5) 0% 4% (5) ta P/Adv. 2% (2) 0% 2% (2) ogressively esting, and & SWD chieve performance d level of of increased	Level 1 c were 20 level 1.0 countrie language Haitian (Readi Student Group Black / African American Hispanic White / Caucasian English Language Learners Students with Disabilities	on the A %. The are ne s and s es, inclu Creole. Ing Inve Stud # of students 243 208 31 129 57	f ELL st ACCESS studer w to G speak r uding S entory lent Pe Grade Below Basic 21% 34% 19% 44% 60%	tudent S test; nts pe Georgia multip Spanis Demoerformes 2-5 Basic 26% 25% 26% 25% of stu ow Ba	in 2024 rforming a from vile native th, Frence or proficient 33% 32% 22% 9% dents sicileve	Advanced 21% 9% 32% 8% 7%	-
						Grade 3 4 5	s with [_	ities w	ith 60%	(27)	

Math	□ Econ. Disadvantaged ☑ Special Ed. / SWD ☑ Race / Ethnicity	Math I Student Group Black/African American Hispanic White/Caucasian English Language Learners Students with Disabilities Most stu of partici advanced Black/Afr Hispanic White/Ca English L. Students	students 345 279 45 177 87 dent g pants d perficien A 59% aucasi angua	in the ormand America an: 76%	K-5 Basic Performance 22% 26% 20% 32% 16% have a profic ce level an 58% framers:	Proficient Performance 34% 37% 38% 35% 31% at least ient ar els.	Advanced Performance 24% 22% 38% 15% 15% 15% 15%	Grade 3 4 5 ELL student Below Basic SWD stude Below Basic ELL and SW reviewed in	# 12 18 12 12 ts perfect and E cand E cand E	8 2 ormed 3asic le rformed 3asic le	at 509 vels. d at 5 vels.	4% in t	(18) (0) e	MI	
Science	☐ Econ. Disadvantaged ☐ Special Ed. / SWD ☑ Race / Ethnicity	Science percenta who perf Distingui Race/Et Black Hispani Multirac White Asian	ge and orme shed I	d numb d in Pro	per of officien	studer	3/4 10) 41))	125 student (46 student 5 th Grade Domain s Earth Science Physical Science Life Science	ts) sco	red a le	evel 3	or 4.			

	☐ Econ. Disadvantaged ☐ Special Ed./SWD	☑ English Learners/ELL☐ Foster/Homeless	Social Studies instruction is where Arts integration is mostly seen and offers students the opportunity to use		cial Stu Demogi	aphic		tudent		Interim Assessment Data Observational Data
Social Studies	☑ Race / Ethnicity	☐ Migrant	multiple intelligences to support the learning.	Student Group Black / African American Hispanic White / Caucasian English Language Learners Students with Disabilities	Grade 1 % Average 66% 61% 78%	Grade 2 % Average 73% 69% 75% 66%	Grade 3 % Average 60% 63% 67% 61%	50% 52% 58% 48%	Grade 5 % Average 74% 69% 66% 60%	
Discipline / School Climate Data	☐ Econ. Disadvantaged ☐ Special Ed. / SWD ☑ Race / Ethnicity	☐ English Learners / ELL ☐ Foster / Homeless ☐ Migrant	students, 38 of the referrals are from 3 students who had multiple incidences. The large majority (650+) of our students have a positive response to	Interven Of the 1: are the r received	ing the tion Sy. 10 office number them. ce/Eth.	PBIS (I stems) e refer of stu	Positive in place rals, th dents t	e Behav e. ie follov	vior wing ve	CCSD Discipline Data
Professional Learning	☐ Econ. Disadvantaged ☑ Special Ed. / SWD ☐ Race / Ethnicity	☑ English Learners / ELL☐ Foster / Homeless☐ Migrant	collaboration with SWD and ELL teachers to learn effective literacy strategies, analyze student performance data, and decide on evidence-based strategies to support student learning. SWD and ELL teachers participated in Math PL to learn effective and standards-based strategies for	More SW the belo grade lev	w basic vel pee d ELL st de leve a shows nt supp to sup Georgi tiation	udents l peers more fort is r port st a stand suppor	perfor s on the intenti- needed udents dards. t is nee	performed bee MI. onal are for the to accorded to	their elow ad e ess the	MI PL Calendar Survey Data

		they relate to the current standards and how they can be taught together.	
	☐ Econ. Disadvantaged ☑ English Learners / ELL		
Other	⊠ Special Ed. / SWD ☐ Foster / Homeless		
	□ Race / Ethnicity □ Migrant		

Statement of Concern #1	Students have difficulty solving word problems.
Root Cause #1 - (Within control) Impacts which system(s): ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Students are challenged with comprehending the meaning in story problems. In math, the rigor of determining meaning is increased because it also directs students to mathematical operations. There is an inferential component to story problems that is challenging for students.
Root Cause #2 - (Within control) Impacts which system(s): ☑ Coherent Instruction ☑ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Teachers provide support with the inferential component by teaching students explicit strategies, such as key words, mnemonics, or poetic ways to determine next steps. These strategies do not extend mathematical capacity or vocabulary extension and have a limited effect on problem solving skills. Teachers are not focused on mathematical modeling as much as they should and making sure that students have those professional connections with the math standards.
Root Cause #3 - (Within control) Impacts which system(s): ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Teachers do not have a vertically aligned way to approach problem solving. Grade-level teams create ways to support the development of problem solving. Unfortunately, when students move to the next level, they are given another strategy to solve word problems. The continued stop and start of strategies slow the momentum of students' continual improvement as math problem solvers.
Contributing Factors (Outside of control)	The school provides learning opportunities to partner with families and provides tools to support their children in work outside of school. This work includes hosting Academic Nights and Academic Parent and Teacher Teams (APTT). However, family participation and engagement are limited.
Goal Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timebound	Increase the percentage of students in K-2 performing at Prepared Quantile Levels on the Math Beacon assessment by 10% of assessed students from August 2024 to March 2025. Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing at Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG Math Assessment from 46% (177 of 380 students) to 56% of assessed students by May of 2025.

Statement of Concern #2	47% of students (338 of 616 total) assessed performed in the Basic and Below Basic proficiency range of the Reading Inventory Reading Comprehension Assessment (RCA). End-of-year data indicates percentages/number of students whose assessment performance falls in the basic and below basic range. 2: 56% (74 of 133 students) 3: 48% (59 of 123 students) 4: 60% (77 of 129 students) 5: 37% (43 of 125 students) While we did meet our ELA goal of 53% proficiency, that still leaves 47% of our students not reading proficiently. We need to address this concern as we move into the 24-25 school year.
Root Cause #1 - (Within control) Impacts which system(s): ☑ Coherent Instruction ☑ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Foundational reading skills gaps caused many of our students to fall between cracks in our instructional practices. We use progress monitoring with the Reading Inventory and Developmental Word Knowledge Inventory with students to close gaps in learning. The depth at which we analyze the acquired data to determine the next instructional steps to take is not as deep as we need to go both in our grade level CCCs and Instructional Leaders CCCs. We need to not only go deeper in our analysis but also in addressing the needs of our EL and SWD student groups.
Root Cause #2 - (Within control) Impacts which system(s): ☐ Coherent Instruction ☑ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	To support the development of vocabulary instruction across the curriculum, teachers need to give students time to read widely, intentionally select works that can be connected through their instruction. Model word solving strategies and provide students with opportunities to engage in collaborative conversations about that vocabulary.
Root Cause #3 - (Within control) Impacts which system(s): Coherent Instruction Professional Capacity Effective Leadership Supportive Learning Environment Family Engagement	Data from Write Score and Interim Assessments show most students' ability to demonstrate reading comprehension through writing is in development. Teachers need to instruct amplified and intentional writing across content areas. Writing pushes students to increase their learning and achievement. Writing is connected to reading because students focus on many layers of thought and production. More teacher professional learning will support students as they determine what is most important in text, make connections to the content, plan their approach, and explain their understanding through writing.

Contributing Factors (Outside of control)	The school provides learning opportunities to partner with families and provides tools to support their children in work outside of school. This work includes hosting Academic Nights and Academic Parent and Teacher Teams (APTT). However, family participation and engagement are limited.
Goal	Increase the percentage of students in K-2 performing at Meeting and Demonstrating Mastery levels on the Amira assessment from 47% (140 of 293) in April 2024 to 69% of assessed students by March 2025.
Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timebound	Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing at Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG ELA Assessment from 41% (152 of 382 students) in May 2024, to 55% of assessed students by May of 2025.

	School Improvement Goals Include goals on the parent compacts and policy								
Goal #1	Increase the percentage of students in K-2 performing at Prepared Quantile Levels on the Math Beacon assessment from 7% (8 of 224 students) in August 2024 to 17% of assessed students in March 2025. Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing at Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG Math Assessment from 46% (177 of 380 students) to 56% of assessed students by May of 2025.								
Goal #2	Increase the percentage of students in K-2 performing at Meeting and Demonstrating Mastery levels on the Amira assessment from 47% (140 of 293) in April 2024 to 69% of assessed students by March 2025. Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing at Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG ELA Assessment from 41% (152 of 382 students) in May 2024, to 55% of assessed students by May of 2025.								

	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		Supports which system(s)	How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?							
Parent Facilitator	⊠ Goal 1 ⊠ Goal 2 □ Goal 3 □ Goal 4	 □ Coherent Instruction □ Professional Capacity □ Effective Leadership ⋈ Supportive Learning Environment ⋈ Family Engagement 	The person in this position establishes and maintains positive relationships with families and the community to increase student achievement. The support helps families understand what their children need to know to be successful learners. Our Parent Facilitator assists in coordinating family/community outreach sessions to ensure families are aware of available resources. She is also available to help families as the need arises throughout the school year.							
Half-day Instructional Paraprofessional	☐ Goal 1 ☑ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	 ☑ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☑ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement 	Grade 1 Instructional Paraprofessional provides students with ELA (phonemic awareness, phonics, spelling, and writing) support. The paraprofessional also collaborates with the teacher to analyze assessment data and plan intervention strategies to meet student needs.							
Classroom Teacher (CSR)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Grade 3 Classroom Size Reduction (CSR) Teacher will provide instruction in all content areas.							
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement								

GOAL #1	Increase the percentage of students in K-2 performing at Prepared Quantile Levels on the Math Beacon assessment from 7% (8 of 224 students) in August 2024 to 17% of assessed students in March 2025. Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing at Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG Massessment from 46% (177 of 380 assessed students to 56% of assessed students by May of 2025.							
Action Step(s) SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)	Resources	Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	Start Date	How will the action step be implemented and monitored? What artifacts will be collected to demonstrate implementation? SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26	How will the action step be evaluated for impact? What evidence will be collected to demonstrate impact? SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26	People Responsible		
implement the 3 Reads Protocol during small group instruction to develop students' problem-solving skills as monitored by quarterly instructional walks.	Grade level- organizer Subs for Quarterly Planning Math Manipulatives Generation Genius	Title I Title I	August 2024	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 1st-5th grade teachers will implement the 3 Reads Protocol in small group mathematics instruction by December 2024 as indicated by instructional walk data. Kindergarten teachers will implement the 3 Reads Protocol by March 2025. Implementation Plan: September: Instructional Support Specialists facilitate professional development for teachers on the effective student use of the 3 Reads Protocol. October and November: Instructional Support Specialists support teachers as they implement effective use of instructional strategies with students. This support includes additional professional	Evaluation Performance Target: By December 2024, 80% of students will use the 3 Reads Protocol during small group instruction. By February 55% of students will perform 75% or higher on grade-level common assessments. Evaluation plan: Complete bi-weekly walk- through checklist of effective student use of the 3 Reads Protocol. Share data of student progression to the grade-level Collaborative Teams. Beginning November 2024, 1st - 5th grade teachers will administer common formative assessments that include word problems. Results will be analyzed during Collaborative Team Meetings. Adjustments to	Instructional Support Specialists Grade-Level Collaborative Teams Administrative Team		

				learning, modeling, and providing feedback.	instruction and implementation plans will be noted in the CT minutes.	
				December: Teachers and students use the 3 Reads Protocol with fidelity while solving story problems. Implementation measured with walk-through data.	Evidence: Common assessment data showing student performance with story problems.	
				January – May: Teachers and students use the 3 Reads Protocol with fidelity within their problem-solving small group. Implementation measured with quarterly walk-through data.		
				Kindergarten Teachers begin to use the organizer with their students in small group instruction. The teachers lead the learning, and students provide answers with manipulatives, pictures, and/or verbal answers. Implementation measured with quarterly walk-through data.		
				Artifacts: Walk-through forms completed		
2. 1 st -5 th grade teachers will implement a common math	Math Manipulatives	Title I	October 2024	Implementation Performance Target:	Evaluation Performance Target:	Instructional Support Specialists
assessment during each math unit as indicated by CCC data analysis notes.	Professional Learning Texts	Title I		By December 100% of 1 st -5 th grade teachers will implement common formative math	By December 55% of 1 st -5 th students will demonstrate proficiency on the common math assessment.	Grade level Collaborative Teams

assessments throughout each	Fundamentary views
unit.	Evaluation plan:
	Collaborative Team Data
Implementation Plan:	Analysis of student progress
September-October:	on the common unit
During quarterly planning	assessments.
session, the math coaches will	
provide professional	
development on using	Evidence:
common math assessment	Common Assessment Data
data to drive instructional	CT data analysis notes
decisions.	
October – December:	
Instructional Support	
Specialists support teachers as	
they implement effective use	
of the common formative	
assessment. This support	
includes additional	
professional learning,	
modeling, and providing	
feedback to individual	
teachers and the Collaborative	
Team.	
Team.	
January – May:	
Teachers implement the	
common math assessment and	
with fidelity and analyze	
student performance during	
CT meetings. Implementation	
measured with assessment	
data and CT minutes.	
Artifacts:	
Common math assessment	
data reports	
CT Minutes	
1	<u> </u>

GOAL #2	Increase the percentage of Grade K-2 students performing at Meeting and Demonstrating Mastery levels on the Amira assessment from 47% (140 of 293 students) in March 2024 to 62% of assessed students in March 2025. Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing at Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG ELA Assessment from 40% (152 of 382 students) in May 2024, to 55% of assessed students by May of 2025.						
Action Step(s) SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)	Resources	Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	Start Date	How will the action step be implemented and monitored? What artifacts will be collected to demonstrate implementation? SWP Checklist 3.a	How will the action step be evaluated for impact? What evidence will be collected to demonstrate impact? SWP Checklist 3.a	People Responsible	
1. Teachers in grades K-5 implement differentiated literacy instruction (word study or comprehension) daily during teacher led small group instruction, measured by monthly walk-through data.	Word work manipulatives Professional Learning Texts: What the Science of Reading Says about Word Recognition Artfully Teaching the Science of Reading	Title 1	August/ September 2024	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of K-5 teachers will implement small-group, targeted word study instruction daily October 2024. Implementation Plan: August — Teachers administer CCSD required assessments and Developmental Word Knowledge Inventory to measure literacy skill levels. Collaborative Teams will analyze the data and use it to form small groups for differentiated instruction. September — November Instructional Support Specialists (ISSs) will facilitate monthly professional learning that gives teachers the resources, strategies, and differentiated approaches to address specific literacy skills that impede reading. The PL sessions will support small	Evaluation Performance Target: By March 2025, least 75% of K-5 students will increase their Lexile score by at least 50 points, as measured by iReady. Evaluation plan: Beginning in September 2024, Teachers will provide differentiated reading instruction and measure student progress through iReady assessment data. ELA ISS will share assessment data with the administrative team quarterly. Evidence: iReady Data	Instructional Support Specialists Grade Level Collaborative Teams Administrative Team	

group word-study learning,
including vocabulary,
background knowledge, and
morphology (language
comprehension skills) The ISSs
will also support within
classrooms through modeling,
observation, and feedback.
October - All students take the
iReady diagnostic to measure
student performance.
Teachers will use assessment
data to create small group
instruction. Students will
complete the individualized
pathways for at least 30
minutes per week.
December – May - Teachers
administer the mid-year
assessments to measure
student performance growth.
In a Collaborative Teams
session, teachers compare
data from the assessments.
Teachers will use assessment
data to create small group
instruction. Students will
complete the individualized
pathways for at least 30
minutes per week.
Implementation measured
with monthly walk- through
data.
March – May
March- Final CCSD assessment
window. Teachers will use

				assessment data to create small group instruction. Students will complete the individualized pathways for at least 30 minutes per week. Implementation measured with monthly walk-through data. Artifacts: Assessment Reports Walkthrough data PL Sign-in Sheets & Agendas		
2. Teachers in Grades 3-5 will implement data-driven content area writing tasks aligned to grade-level informational writing standards as evidenced by walkthroughs.	Professional Learning Texts: The Writing Rope What the Science of Reading Says About Writing What the Science of Reading Says about Reading Says about Reading Comprehension and Content Knowledge The Writing Revolution 2.0 Write Score	Title I	October 2024	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of Teachers integrate informational writing tasks into content area instruction by January 2025. Implementation Plan: October: PL on integrated writing across the curriculum. Teachers collaborate on strategies to teach literacy standards and components necessary for students to comprehend the task and respond accurately. October- January: Common integrated writing instruction across grade levels. Implementation measured through monthly walk-through data. February – May	Evaluation Performance Target: 75% of 2-5 students perform in the Average or Above Level on the Informational Write Score Assessment in March 2025 Evaluation plan: Beginning October 2024, 2-5 teachers will administer common formative writing assessments. Collaborative Teams will analyze results. CT minutes will note adjustments to instruction strategies. CT's will share assessment data with the administrative team quarterly. Evidence: Common scoring class profile based on common rubric. CT minutes	Instructional Support Specialists Grade Level Collaborative Teams Administrative Team

				Common integrated writing instruction across grade levels. Implementation measured through monthly walk-through data. Artifacts: Common scoring class profile based on common rubric. Walk-through data	Write Score Data	
3. Grade K-5 Tutors implement targeted instruction three days a week during tutor-led small group instruction measured by monthly walk-through data.	Tutors Word work Manipulatives Professional Learning Texts: What the Science of Reading Says about Word Recognition Artfully Teaching the Science of Reading iReady	Title I Title I Title I	September 2024	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of Tutors will use assessment data to provide targeted word study instruction. Implementation Plan: August: Students scoring within the 26th to 50th percentile on the Beacon assessment will be ranked based on performance data scores and grouped by similar needs regarding reading. Instructional Support Specialists (ISSs) will facilitate on-going professional learning support that gives tutors the resources, strategies, and targeted approaches to address the phonemic and phonic gaps (word recognition skills) that impede reading. The ISSs will also support tutors through modeling, observation, and feedback.	Evaluation Performance Target: By March 2025, at least 75% of students served by Tutors will increase their Lexile score by at least 50 points, as measured by I-Ready. Evaluation plan: Beginning in September 2024, Tutors will provide targeted reading instruction and progress monitor student growth through I-Ready assessment data. CSOS ISS will share assessment data with the administrative team quarterly. Evidence: I-Ready Data FoRTIfy Data	CSOS Instructional Support Specialist Grade Level Collaborative Teams Administrative Team

Tutors will also be trained to use iReady reports and lesson plans to address students' identified needs.
September – April: Continued: Professional support, as
needed. Monthly Walk-throughs of targeted reading instruction for students served through
Tier 2 interventions. Progress monitoring Quarterly Collaborative meetings with the CSOS
Instructional Support Specialist and Grade Level Collaborative Teams Artifacts:
Walk -through DIEBELS

	Actions to Support Student Groups in Meeting School Improvement Goals							
Student Group(s) SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii)		Action steps to improve/support achievement of student groups	Resources	Funding Source				
	□ English Learners / ELL ☑ Foster / Homeless ☑ Migrant	Administrative Team, Professional School Counselors, and Parent Facilitator provide resources and supplies, as needed, to ensure students and families have necessary materials to support mastery of standards. School Social Worker systematically provides support (food, clothing, school needs, counseling, etc.) when a shelter-insecure or foster family registers their child.	Student Supplies Food Clothing	Title I				
☐ Econ. Disadvantaged ☐ Special Ed. / SWD ☐ Race / Ethnicity	☑ English Learners / ELL☐ Foster / Homeless☐ Migrant	ESOL teachers implement targeted instruction and intervention using assessment data: • ACCESS • Developmental Word Knowledge Inventory • Amira (grades K-3) and Beacon (grades 1-5) • common assessments (ELA & Math) Strategic use of supporting materials for multi-lingual learners from Imagine Learning and ELLevation to increase vocabulary skills. Effectiveness of instruction and student progress discussed and analyzed in Grade Level and ESOL Collaborative Team meetings.	Chart paper Markers Hands-on literacy and math manipulatives	Title III				
☐ Econ. Disadvantaged Special Ed. / SWD Race / Ethnicity	☑ English Learners / ELL☐ Foster / Homeless☐ Migrant	SWD teachers implement targeted instruction and intervention using assessment data: • Amira (grades K-3) and Beacon (grades 1-5) • Developmental Word Knowledge Inventory • I-Ready (students identified in the 25 th percentile on Amira/Beacon Assessments) • DreamBox (student performance identifies need for Math interventions) • common assessments (ELA & Math) Effectiveness of instruction and student progress discussed and analyzed in Grade Level and SWD Collaborative Team meetings with Student Support Administrator (SSA). Supporting materials for SWD Students using UFLI to increase foundational gaps and vocabulary skills	Chart paper Markers Hands-on literacy and math manipulatives Resources to support content area learning	Title I				
☐ Econ. Disadvantaged ☐ Special Ed. / SWD ☐ Race / Ethnicity	☐ English Learners / ELL ☐ Foster / Homeless ☐ Migrant							

isadvantaged	☐ English Learners / ELL
Special Ed. / SWD	☐ Foster / Homeless
☐ Race / Ethnicity	☐ Migrant

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (Required Components)							
Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy) Date(s) Scheduled						
1. Required Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline September 30, 2024 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 18, 2024		☑ 1☐ 2☐ 3	□ 4 □ 5 □ 6			
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) — Deadline November 4, 2024 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 9, 2024		□ 1 □ 2 □ 3	□ 4 □ 5 ⊠ 6			
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline April 30,, 2025 Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	April 2, 2025		□ 1 □ 2 □ 3	□ 4 □ 5 ⊠ 6			
4. Required FOUR Building Staff 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 Deadlines: PL#1 9/10/24 PL#2 12/6/24 PL#3 2/14/25 PL#4 4/16/25	September 10, 2024 October 14-18, 2024 January 15, 2025 April 16, 2025		□ 1 □ 2 ⊠ 3	□ 4 □ 5 □ 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: Rising 6 th Grade parent Meeting: Rising 6th-grade families are introduced to expectations and learning opportunities offered in Middle School. Rising Kindergarten Parent Meeting: Rising Kindergarten families are introduced to expectations and learning opportunities offered in Elementary School.	6 th Grade Meeting TBD Monday, July 15- Thursday, 18, 2024		□ 1 □ 2 □ 3	⊠ 4 □ 5 □ 6			

6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and	List documents translated for parents:	□ 1	□ 4
language parents can understand. SWP Checklist 5.d	K-2 Compacts	□ 2	⊠ 5
	3-5 Compacts	□ 3	□ 6
	School Family Engagement Policy		

School Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6) How is the activity **Funding School Developed Family** "Shall" Goal(s) monitored, and evaluated? Source(s) **Engagement Activities** Resources Date **Team Lead** Addressed Addressed Include data/artifacts to be SWP (Must be listed in the school policy) Checklist 5.e collected as evidence. TBD **Parent** \Box 1 A fun and Title I Facilitator Math Night ⊠ 2 informative K-5 □ 3 Math Night at Teachers school. This event is □ 4 designed to help \square 5 Instructional parents understand Support ⊠ 6 the new Georgia Specialists mathematics standards through Math night will be monitored engaging, hands-on through attendance sign-in activities. Parents ⊠ Goal 1 sheets. We will evaluate the will discover how ☐ Goal 2 effectiveness through family these standards will ☐ Goal 3 be implemented in surveys. the classroom and ☐ Goal 4 how they can *Surveys support their child's *Sign-in sheets learning at home. Our interactive stations will provide a glimpse into the innovative teaching methods and tools that make math exciting and accessible for all students. Provide materials to Parent Literacy Night Literacy Night will be monitored \Box 1 January Facilitator support school-⊠ 2 through attendance sign-in related activities sheets. We will evaluate the ☐ Goal 1 □ 3 Teachers requested by □ 4 ⊠ Goal 2 effectiveness through family families to improve Instructional ☐ Goal 3 surveys. □ 5 students' academic Support ☐ Goal 4 achievements. ⊠ 6 Specialists *Surveys *Sign-in sheets

Steam Night	□ 5 □ 6	□ Goal 1 □ Goal 2 □ Goal 3 □ Goal 4	Provide a generating and exciting event that will focus on Science, Technology, engineering, art, math, and an atmosphere for students to learn.	TBD	Steam Night will be monitored through attendance sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets
-------------	------------	----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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:

Clarkdale Elementary School effectively integrates community financial support and federal, state, and local funds in several ways.

- Title II provides professional learning support to our teachers. The resources give educators tools to learn and implement current evidence-based practices.
- Title III funds support language proficiency through resources, including teacher and student materials, digital learning programs, and professional learning for Teachers of English Language Learners. It also pays for resources and substitute teachers so educators can learn and implement arts integration and STEAM strategies.
- CCSD supports Clarkdale's plan to utilize Extended Day funds to provide specific interventions (i.e., after school tutoring) for students striving to meet state standards.

- The Office of Student Assistance supports the school's implementation of the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support Program (PBIS).
- Partners in Education provide resources (human and financial) to support family engagement, student encouragement, and literacy and math initiatives.
- Title I supports Clarkdale's participation in the following CCSD initiatives Early Literacy Framework, Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS), and iReady.

These programs work together to meet the needs of the students and families identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and through our parent and family surveys.

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:

Using both quantitative and qualitative data, Clarkdale regularly monitors the implementation of their schoolwide plan. Analyzing common assessment and district mandated data guides and supports instructional adjustments needed to ensure achievement of school-wide goals. Data from EOGs helps to determine the areas of potential growth in the upcoming school year. Qualitative data from parent and staff surveys indicate the school climate and areas that can be improved.

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:

Clarkdale leaders identify and assess all school practices to align with Georgia's Systems of Continuous Improvement framework. We disaggregate several data sources, including student and educator progress and stakeholder feedback, to determine the overall effectiveness of our instructional program. Attention to data-driven work is vital, particularly for students striving to demonstrate proficient performance. This data drives targeted instruction and school improvement to meet student needs and support academic growth.

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 Instructional Leadership Team evaluates student progress and observational walk-through data throughout the school year. This team partners with Collaborative Teams to support continuous progress toward meeting the School Improvement goals. The Instructional Support Specialists meet with our Title I coach monthly to share progress and focus on ways to support student and teacher continual improvement. School and teacher leaders reflect upon the data quarterly to revise and enhance the goals and action steps, as needed.

At the midpoint of the school year, the Instructional Leadership Team presents data benchmarks to our Title I team. This data-driven approach allows us to evaluate progress and determine if revisions to the School Improvement Plan are needed. At the end of the school year, the Instructional Leadership and Building Leadership Teams conduct a needs assessment, reflecting on the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan. The data collected guides our decision-making process, helping us determine what changes to make for the next school year. If viable action steps helped the school meet the goal, the evidence directs whether to continue or reformulate them for the next school year. If the data show that the action steps had minimal impact, the team will formulate an improved plan to move the learning community toward accomplishing the goal.

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 seg.). SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

We serve our students through the Cobb System of Support (CSOS) Framework. Our goal is to provide students with the instruction and guidance they need at the moment they need it. Teachers analyze student data to determine the intensity and intentionality of support through three tiers.

Tier I instruction and support are provided to all students every day. The approach and resources align with our curricula, and evidence-based practices and strategies have proven effective for most students. Tier I examples include the Early Learning Framework, Georgia K-5 Mathematics Learning Plans, and Clarkdale's PBIS Matrix- Respectful Responsible Role Models.

Tier 2 instruction and support provide explicit, teacher-led, small-group intervention. Teachers administer the intervention with fidelity and regularly implement progress monitoring to track student progress over a specified time. Teachers and our CSOS Instructional Specialist contact families to share the data, intervention plan, and student progress of students served through the Tier 2 Framework. Tier 2 examples include Small-group instruction during teacher-led intervention, Tutor-led small groups, Interventionist-led learning, ESOL Teacher-led intervention, DreamBox, or Check-in-Check-out (CICO).

Tier 3 instruction and support is an intensive version of the Tier 2 intervention. The intensity may come from more frequent sessions, smaller group sizes, or individual support. The teacher conducts more frequent progress monitoring to measure growth and, if needed, adjusts the intervention. Teachers and our CSOS Instructional Support Specialist meet with families regularly to share the data, intervention plan, and student progress of students served through the Tier 3 Framework. Tier 3 examples include Tutor-led small group or individual intervention or a Function-Based Behavior Support Plan.

For students who continue to perform below grade-level expectations after moving through all tiers of service, our CSOS Instructional Support Specialist collaborates with Tutors, Teachers, the Student Support Specialist, and the Psychologist to determine the next steps. This committee decides if the data suggests the students should undergo professional assessments to determine eligibility for instructional support through an Individual Education Plan (IEP). If the consensus is no request for diagnostic testing, the committee discusses ways to support the student through CSOS. If the testing proceeds, the committee reconvenes with the results to decide the student's next steps. If the group's consensus is to move forward and create an IEP, they will develop one, and an SWD will lead instructional support for the student

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Our SIP outlines the Professional Learning Plan, a tool that empowers educators to support progression in student performance and meet or exceed our goals. We have specific ELA and Math Action Steps with Implementation Plans to facilitate continual educator improvement. We will measure growth through fidelity of teacher application and progress in student performance. The data for educators and students will drive progress in the instructional next steps. This year, our Collaborative Teams will meet twice a week to focus on the four CCC questions and analyze data to drive the use of evidence-based instructional, intervention, and extension practices for all learners. Teams will collaborate quarterly to create integrated content area learning through ninegrid STEAM plans.

Fortunately, we recruited eight highly qualified teachers to support learning during the 24-25 school year. In addition to the rich professional learning plan for all teachers, those new to Clarkdale will participate in onboarding through the New Teacher Academy and professional support through the New to Clarkdale Cohort (monthly) and Clarkdale Mentors program (monthly).

We intentionally extend leadership opportunities to our staff locally and system wide. The Leadership Team encourages our staff to continually improve their craft and reach their professional goals.

15. **ONLY MIDDLE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED** Describe the transition activities provided for preschool children to kindergarten, 5^{th} grade students to 6^{th} grade and 8^{th} grade students to 9^{th} 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:

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*