

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2025 - 2026
School Name:	Austell Elementary School
Principal Name:	Kahliah C. Rachel
Date Submitted:	5/30/2025
Revision Date(s):	

APPROVED

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Austell Elementary School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Ms. Kahliah C. Rachel
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Kahliah.Rachel@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	(770) 819-5804
Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems ONLY
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only
Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>
School Response: We have developed our schoolwide plan with the participation of individuals who will carry out the comprehensive schoolwide/school improvement program plan. Those people involved were the principal, instructional support specialist, teacher representatives, and parents (PTA and Principals Advisory Board). They were involved in helping our building leadership team analyze assessment data. Feedback was given on current academic data. Feedback and reflections were given on the results of last year's academic goals. The group reviewed the 2024-25 goals to formulate the goals for 2025- 2026. The goals were based on current data information and meetings held on 4/21/2025, 5/12/25, 5/19/2025, 5/22/2025, and 6/5/2025.

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: - Kahliah C. Rachel, Principal ; - Tara Oliver, Assistant Principal	Parent Facilitators: LaTosha Smithers-Hall
Content or Grade Level Teachers: - Heather Chancellor – Kindergarten - Penelope Weber – 1st Grade - Brittany Parker – 2nd Grade - Cynthia Bazille – 3rd Grade - Amber Bevins – 4th Grade - Tanya Lodge – 5th Grade - Megan Barton – Specialists - Darrilyn Bernard - SPED	Media Specialists: Noel O’Brien
Local School Academic Coaches Benjamin Green	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches - Dr. Sakinah Dantzler - Dr. Angela Mack	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee) Shuquetar McKenzie	Social Worker Bethany Miller
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists

	• LeAnna Annantaraman
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 5, 2025	May 7, 2025	June 5, 2025
-----------------------	-------------	-------------	--------------

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Kahliah Rachel	
Assistant Principal	Tara Oliver	
Student Services Administrator	Janice Marshall Roberts	
Instructional Support Specialist	Benjamin Green	
Building Leadership Team K-5	Heather Chancellor	
	Penelope Weber	
	Brittany Parker	
	Cynthia Bazille	
	Darrilyn Bernard	
	Amber Bevins	
	Tanya Lodge	
	Rakia Williams	

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	• By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 performing at proficient or above, as measured by the EOG ELA Milestones assessment will increase from 35.4% (70 out of 198 students) in the Spring of 2024 to 45% in the Spring of 2025. • By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of students in grades K-2 reading on or above grade level, will increase by 10% from baseline assessment, based on Amira Lexile measures.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially	

What data supports the outcome of the goal?	2024 EOG Milestones ELA					2025 EOG Milestones ELA									
		# Tested	Proficient	Advanced	% Proficient and Advanced		#Tested	Proficient	Advanced	% Proficient and Advanced					
	3rd	63	15	5	32%	3 rd	56	18	3	38%					
	4th	63	21	5	41%	4 th	62	12	5	27%					
	5 th	62	18	6	39%	5 th	59	22	5	46%					
Beacon ELA Data 2024-2025															
	Grade 1 (37/45/44)			Grade 2 (58/60/64)			Grade 3 (56/58/54)			Grade 4 (60/61/62)			Grade 5 (56/60)		
No. of students	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
Fall	21	14	2	30	23	5	7	47	2	15	45	0	16	35	5
End of Year	12	21	11	19	26	19	2	45	7	11	44	7	10	39	10
Reflecting on Outcomes															
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Strengthen core literacy instruction through daily, explicit teaching of vocabulary, comprehension strategies, and fluency while ensuring students read across multiple genres. Provide targeted small-group interventions by using assessment data to identify student needs and deliver Tier 2 and Tier 3 support in decoding, fluency, and comprehension.														

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	• By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of students in Grades 3-5 performing proficient or above in Mathematics as measured by the EOG Math Milestones assessment will increase from 37.1% (73 out of 186 students) in the Spring of 2024 to 66% in the Spring of 2025 • By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of students in Grades 1-2 scoring proficient or above, will increase by 10% from baseline assessment, based on Beacon Assessment Math measures. • By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, the percentage of Kindergarten students scoring proficient or above, will increase by 10% on the CTLS End of Unit Math Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	

What data supports the outcome of the goal?		2024 EOG Milestones Math					2025 EOG Milestones Math									
		# Tested	Proficient	Advanced	% Proficient and Advanced		#Tested	Proficient	Advanced	% Proficient and Advanced						
	3rd	63	19	3	32%	3 rd	55	18	5	42%						
	4th	62	21	10	41%	4 th	62	19	5	39%						
	5 th	62	18	2	39%	5 th	59	17	8	42%						
	Beacon Math Data 2024-2025															
	No. of students	Grade 1 (37/35/34)			Grade 2 (57/71/62)			Grade 3 (56/58/54)			Grade 4 (58/63/62)			Grade 5 (51/60/59)		
		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
		Fall	22	15	0	35	21	1	14	42	0	39	19	0	32	19
	End of Year	18	14	2	17	31	14	2	51	1	29	30	1	23	33	3
Grades 1-2: Our goal was met for Beacon math in grades 1 and combined. We went from 39.3% to 63.5% scoring either near target or prepared. Grades 3-5: In math, 72/176 students (41.0%) scored proficient and above on Spring 2025 Math Milestones.																
Reflecting on Outcomes																
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address	Strengthen core math instruction by emphasizing conceptual understanding, problem solving, and math discourse while using manipulatives, visual models, and real-world applications. Provide targeted small-group interventions by using assessment data to identify learning gaps and delivering Tier 2 and Tier 3 support in number sense, computation fluency, and problem solving. Increase math practice and application through daily fluency practice and embedding problem-solving tasks across all subjects.															

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?	

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

ELA DATA

ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	18.9	32.3	30.7	37.5
4 th Grade	37.0	16.1	42.0	27.4
5 th Grade	42.1	39.7	39.3	45.8

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	51	35	14	58	35	7	51	44	5	63	33	5	63	33	5
2nd Grade	30	33	38	31	27	42	34	30	36	33	28	39	27	34	39

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	11	75	14	11	63	27	11	66	23	5	73	21	14	66	20	7	75	18	27	50	23	11	77	13
4th Grade	20	66	14	16	64	20	25	58	17	16	67	17	22	55	23	8	73	19	31	58	11	16	63	22
5th Grade	12	69	19	22	61	17	19	61	20	20	66	14	20	58	22	24	49	27	24	51	25	25	51	24

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
---------------	------------------	-------------------

FY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 71% of fifth graders proficient in reading according to 2025 GA Milestones reading status EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): % of students scoring at level 2-4 in grade 4 dropped from 73% to 69.4% % of students in scoring at level 2-4 in grade 3 remained the same (58%). EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): 5 th Grade: Reduced the percentage of students scoring at support needed from 33% to 15%. EL: 8% of 3 rd Grade EL students need support in ELA (lowest percentage schoolwide) SWD: 20% of 3 rd Grade need support in ELA.	Grade Levels (all students): 3rd Grade: 86% need more support in key ideas and details; 77% need more support in Conventions of Standard English. 4th Grade: 86% need more support in Key Ideas and Details; 83% need more support in Vocabulary Acquisition and Usage. 5th Grade: 73% need more support in Text Types and Purposes; 75% need support in Conventions of Standard English; and 76% need support in Research. EL: 50% of EL students need additional support in 5 th Grade ELA. SWD: 71% of SWDs need more support in 4 th Grade ELA.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - PL has been provided in science of reading; however, teachers need additional training in high impact reading comprehension strategies that promote comprehension of text. - Teachers need professional development in student engagement, academic discourse, and content integration/research. - Time needs to be built into the schoolwide schedule to allow for content integration and research during the ELA block.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): 62% (34) students progressed to the next performance band on ACCESS. SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): - Kindergarten: 45% (5 students) scored level 1 in listening. 1st Grade: 56% (5 students) scored level 1 in listening. SWD:

Check the system that contributes to the root cause ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Students need more opportunities to engage in test-taking skills strategies (attending to the test and building stamina) - Teachers need additional strategies to improve students' listening skills.	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): 1st Grade: 64% of students scored proficient or above on the Q1 ELF assessment (CVC and CCVC and CVCC). 63% of students scored proficient or above on the Q2 ELF assessment. 65% of students scored proficient or above on the Q3 ELF assessment 4th Grade: - Q3 Pre/Post assessment, students' performance of proficient increased from 1 to 9 students. As well as students' performance in advanced increased from 2 to 6 students. There was a 28% increase in performance from Q3 pre/posttest. and EL: - Students who are ELL scoring proficient on common assessment increased 27% SWD: - SWD students scoring proficient on common assessments increased 29%.	Grade Levels (all students): Grades K-2: 36% of kindergarten students need support with blending and segmenting onset and rime 37% of kindergarten students need support with decoding words - Second grade student consistently show a need for support with Identifying the main idea of a text and making inferences. Grades 3-5: - Third through fifth grade students needs support in writing mechanics and conventions - Third through fifth grade students consistently show a need for support with vocabulary acquisition and use - Third through fifth grade students consistently show a need for support with analyzing paired text - Third through fifth grade students consistently show a need for support with understanding figurative language. EL: 75% of Els scored proficient on literary and informational assessments SWD: 75% of SWDs scored proficient on literary and informational assessments
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Students in grades K-2 need more opportunities to engage in a systematic and explicit approach when teaching phonemic awareness (blending/segmenting, manipulating and isolating sounds) is needed. - Students in grades 3-5 need increased exposure to various texts and experiences across disciplines to build background knowledge and academic vocabulary.	

	Teachers need additional support with planning and modeling writing connected to text, emphasizing the development of ideas, organization and structure, and mechanics/conventions.	
School Instructional Walks K-5 Literacy Walks The leadership team constructed walk-throughs to monitor classroom instruction and collaborative planning.	- Grades 3 – 5 Walks: In 52% of classrooms, students were engaged in reading and reading discourse (including vocabulary and comprehension strategies) - Small group instruction was evident in all observed classrooms. - Instructional strategies in 100% of the observed classrooms aligned with the professional learning that was offered (Shifting the Balance 6 Ways to Bring the Science of Reading into a Balanced Literacy Classroom, The Reading Rope) - Teacher/Grade Level teams engaged in frequent discussions about student performance data during CCCs	- The data shows that at least 47% of our K-2 observations had 0-50% of the student participating in a discussion. Students are engaged in reading, but they are not engaged in discourse about the topics being covered - Data shows that at least 4% of the K-2 walks did not observe students engaged in discourse: including practicing vocabulary and reading comprehension.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - In observed classrooms, direct instruction is prioritized over interactive, student-led activities. - There appears to be limited opportunities for student talk time (reading discourse), which supports building their collaborative reasoning.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	N/A	N/A
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: N/A	

--	--

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the average Reading Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades 1–2 will increase by at least 20 points from the Fall 2025 baseline administration to the Spring 2026 administration, with targeted support for students performing below grade level to accelerate growth. By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 performing at proficient or above, as measured by the EOG ELA Milestones assessment will increase from 38% (67 out of 177 students) in the Spring of 2025 to 43% in the Spring of 2026.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students in grades 1-2 need more opportunities to engage in explicit and systematic instruction in phonemic awareness (blending/segmenting, manipulating and isolating sounds).		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of K-2 Teachers will implement UFLI (high-leverage routines for developing word recognition/phonemic awareness/phonics) at least 4 times per week as evidenced by lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of K-2 students will score proficient or above on monthly district phonics assessment.	Shifting the Balance
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Teachers will receive training on Foundations domain of ELA Standards and UFLI Resources. August-September: Professional Development on High-Leverage Instructional Routines for Word Learning	Evaluation Tool(s): - District Phonics Assessments OR Amira Assessment Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☒ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year	UFLI
☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD			Heggerty
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Teachers in grades K-2 will implement UFLI at least 4 days per week to increase students' phonemic awareness.	October-May: Full implementation of high-leverage word recognition strategies and walk-throughs. Artifacts to be Collected: - Lesson plans/curriculum maps - CCC meeting notes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: - Monthly	☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Grade Level CCC's will analyze District Phonics Assessment and plan small/whole group instruction based on students' needs. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students in grades 3-5 need increased exposure to various texts and experiences across disciplines to build background knowledge and academic vocabulary.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 3-5 Teachers will implement high-leverage, morphology instructional routines for developing academic vocabulary daily as evidenced by lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient or higher on common ELA assessments will increase by 10% quarterly.	Shifting the Balance K-5 Teachers
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:	Evaluation Tool(s):	Academic Coach
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	Preplanning: Teachers will receive training on Shifting the Balance high-leverage morphology instructional routines and Wonders Reading Curriculum.	ELA Common Assessments	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	August-September: Professional Development on High-Leverage Instructional Routines for Word Learning.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year	

2. Teachers in grades 3-5 will use high-leverage morphology instructional routines to develop students' academic vocabulary daily.	• October- May: Full implementation of high-leverage instructional routines to build background knowledge and vocabulary. Artifacts to be Collected: • Lesson Plans • Curriculum Maps • CCC meeting notes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: • Monthly	☒ ___ Quarterly_____ Data Analysis Plan: • Common assessment will be administered at least bi-weekly and analyzed by classroom teacher. • Grade Level CCC's will analyze ELA Common Formative Assessment data at quarterly. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
---	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers need additional support with planning and modeling writing connected to text, emphasizing the development of ideas, organization and structure, and mechanics/conventions.			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____			
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources	
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will use Writing Rope Framework to provide guide explicit writing instruction for constructing texts as evidenced by lesson plans and/or instructional walks.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of K-5 students will score proficient on quarterly writing tasks as measure by on teacher-created/district-provided rubrics.	The Writing Rope (Book) Instructional Support Specialist	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Teachers will receive training on Constructing Texts domain of ELA Standards and UFLI Resources. August-October: Academic Coach will provide professional learning on Writing Rope Framework and constructing multi-modal texts. November-May: Teachers will plan units for narrative, expository, opinion, and research using the Writing Framework and CTLS Resources. Artifacts to be Collected: - Lesson Plans - Curriculum Maps - Swiv'I Documentation - Instructional Walk Look-fors Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists	Evaluation Tool(s): - Common writing assessment - Grade-level developed common writing rubric or district provided writing rubric Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ <u>Quarterly</u>		
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD				Data Analysis Plan: Grade Level teams will analyze student writing pieces for each unit using the CCC Process and adjust whole/small group writing instruction, as needed. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>				
3. K-5 teachers will implement explicit writing instruction focused on constructing texts daily.				

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	41.5	53.3	33.8	44.0
4 th Grade	37.0	28.6	50.8	35.0
5 th Grade	37.4	25.0	32.8	47.0

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)	33	44	23	44	42	14	42	37	21	35	47	19
1 st Grade	21	49	30	16	32	52	14	27	59	27	41	32
2 nd Grade	42	43	15	39	40	21	49	29	22	31	39	31
3 rd Grade	12	88	0	5	89	5	12	75	12	23	67	11
4 th Grade	34	61	5	50	47	3	44	52	5	50	47	3
5 th Grade	53	46	2	51	44	5	41	49	10	37	49	14

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY25 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	- Our 4th grade cohort of students had a 1.2 percentage point increase in mathematics achievement from the previous testing year. - There was an increase in mathematics achievement in both 3rd and 5th grades from the FY24 year to the FY25 year. 3rd grade had an increase from 33.8% of students scoring proficient and distinguished to 44%. 5th grade had an increase from 32.8% to 47.0%.	
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	- Our goal was met for Beacon math in grades 1 and combined. We went from 39.3% to 63.5% scoring either near target or prepared. - We also went from 1% to 16% percent being prepared only in 1st and 2nd combined. 52% of 1st graders scored prepared in Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning on the Spring Beacon Assessment 59% of 1st graders scored prepared in Measurement & Data Reasoning on the Spring Beacon Assessment	49% of 2nd graders need support in Measurement and Data Reasoning. 53% of 5th graders need support in Numerical Reasoning. 51% of 5th graders need support in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Professional development is needed in early numeracy, algebraic operations and reasoning, and mathematical modeling. - Teachers need additional professional development in mathematical modeling and integrating mathematics into real-world problem contexts.	
MATH Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	K-2: 90% of first grade students scored proficient or above on addition facts within 10. 83% of students scored proficient or above on the Q4 subtraction facts within 10 common assessment. 3-5:	K-2: 35% of kindergarten students need support in addition/subtraction with 5. - First grade students consistently show a need for support with subtracting within 10

	• Third grade students demonstrated proficiency in geometry concepts and base-ten place value. • 90 percent of fifth grade students performed well on the math common formative assessment on adding and subtracting decimals, earning scores in the proficient or distinguished range.	• Kindergarten through second grade students need support with solving word problems, specifically multi-step word problems and problems with missing addends 3-5 • Third through fifth grade students need support in reading and understanding word problems; multi-step word problems, computational fluency (multiplication and division) • Fifth grade students did not perform well on the math common formative assessment on adding and subtracting decimals.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Students need additional opportunities to develop an understanding of strategies for attaining math facts to build computational fluency. • Students need additional support with comprehending word problems (i.e. 3-read protocol for problem solving). • Teachers need ongoing support in providing students with real-world application of math problems using mathematical modeling.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	• 100% of teachers used Cobb Core Math Package resources with fidelity. • 100% of teachers used Number Sense Routines at start of math lessons. • 100% of teachers implement small group math instruction in observed classrooms.	• We are progressing in embedding mathematical modeling and real-world math application into the curriculum
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Professional development is needed for mathematical modeling integration into the curriculum for real-world application of math skills.	

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	By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the average Math Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades K–2 will increase by at least 50 points from the Fall 2025 benchmark to the Spring 2026 benchmark, with particular focus on subgroups performing below the 40th percentile. By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of students in Grades 3-5 performing proficient or above in Mathematics as measured by the EOG Math Milestones assessment will increase from 41% (72 out of 176 students) in the Spring of 2025 to 46% in the Spring of 2026.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need additional support with comprehending word problems (i.e. 3-read protocol for problem solving).		
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: 100% of K-5 teachers will implement literacy-based problem-solving routines during daily math instruction as evidenced by lesson plans and/or instructional walks. Implementation Plan: August-October: Professional learning on 3-Reads Protocol and Numberless Words in conjunction with Title I District Coach support. November-December: Academic Coach will provide modeling and support for 3-Read Protocol and numberless word problems in math. January-May: Full implementation of 3-Reads Math Protocol and numberless word problems in K-5 classroom using graphic organizer.		i-Ready Math Toolbox Resources 3-Reads Protocol
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)			
K-5 Teachers will implement literacy-based problem-solving routines during daily math instruction.		Evaluation Performance Target: The percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring proficient or higher on common math assessments will increase by 10% quarterly. Evaluation Tool(s): - Common Assessments (formative/summative) - iReady Math Diagnostic Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: - Common formative assessments will be administered and analyzed by classroom	

	Artifacts to be Collected: • Lesson Plan/Curriculum Maps • Student Work Samples • Instructional Walks Look-fors/Data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: • Monthly	teachers as least weekly and used to plan small group instruction. • Grade level teams will analyze common assessments at least monthly and use data to adjust unit plans. • I-Ready data will be analyzed by CCCs and used to plan targeted instruction. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers need ongoing support in providing students with real-world application of math problems using mathematical modeling and integrating science.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By December 2025, 100% of K-5 teachers will implement at least one integrated science problem-based task per week as evidenced by lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of students in each grade level will score proficient or higher on math performance tasks measured by common assessment rubrics.	CCSD Core Math Package Cobb STEM Resources Futuration Lab Resources
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:	Evaluation Tool(s):	
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	Preplanning - August: Conduct PL on STEM framework, performance task design, and integration strategies. Engage in collaborative plan to map out STEM tasks for the quarter. September - May: Each quarter, K-5 teachers will collaborative with STEM lab teacher to plan integrated science performance tasks aligned with the rigor of the grade level standards.	- Common Assessment Rubrics - Integrated performance tasks	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Evaluation Plan:	
2. K-5 teachers will implement problem-based tasks integrating mathematics, science, engineering, and technology using Cobb integrated science resources weekly.	Artifacts to be Collected: - Integrated lesson plans/curriculum map - PBL task with student work samples Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists	Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ at the end of each unit Data Analysis Plan: - Student work samples will be analyzed to determine students' needs and next steps for integrated instruction and performance tasks. - Common formative assessments will be administered and analyzed by classroom teachers as least weekly and used to plan small group instruction. - Grade level teams will analyze common assessments at least monthly and use data to adjust unit plans.	
	Frequency of Monitoring: monthly	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need additional opportunities to develop an understanding of strategies for attaining math facts to build computational fluency.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By December 2025, 100% of K-5 teachers will implement differentiated small group math instruction daily as evidenced by small group lesson plans and/or instructional walks.	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of students in each grade level will score 75% or higher as measured by common summative assessments.	Instructional Lab Resources iReady Math Toolbox Resources
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
3. K-5 teachers will provide differentiated small group math instruction daily.	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: Provide PL on small group instruction best practices and math differentiated instruction. Administer • August -September: Administer diagnostics and formative math assessments to identify student needs and create flexible student groups to begin small group instruction. • October-May: Continue to monitor student performance on common assessments, adjust student groups, and plan differentiated small group instruction. Artifacts to be Collected: • Small group lesson plans • Instructional walk look-fors/data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists	Evaluation Tool(s): • Common Formative Assessments • Common Summative Assessments Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ at the end of each unit	
	Frequency of Monitoring: • monthly	Data Analysis Plan: • Common formative assessments will be administered and analyzed by classroom teachers as least weekly and used to plan small group instruction. • Grade level teams will analyze common assessments at least monthly and use data to adjust unit plans. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required <u>Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline: September 30, 2025</u> 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 4, 2025		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required <u>Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline: November 3, 2025</u> 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 1- November 7		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required <u>Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline: April 30, 2026</u> 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 23, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required <u>TWO Building Staff Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) – Deadlines: September 26, 2025 and February 16, 2026</u> Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school.	September 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5
	January 2026		☒ 3 ☐ 6
5. Required <u>Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school)</u> Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. <u>Briefly describe the transition activities here:</u> - Kindergarten Night-Incoming K students - Garret Informational Rising 6th Graders at Garrett	May 6, 2026 March 13, 2026		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> - Parent Compact - School Informational Brochure - All advertisements		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)</i>							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities <u>(Must be listed in the school policy)</u>	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Team Lead
Open House / Curriculum Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Reading Resources Math Resources	Title I FACE Funds	August 2025	Parents will be given activities for home to assist students in reading activities to increase literacy skills. Sign-in sheets Parent Surveys	Grade Level chairs and Teachers
Title I Literacy and Math Night	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Reading Resources Math Resources	Title I FACE Funds	February 2026	Parents will participate in hands-on activities to foster literacy and math development at home.	Parent Facilitator and Academic Coach
Rising Kindergarten Parent Meeting	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4		Title I FACE Funds	April 2026	Sign-in sheets Parent Surveys	Kindergarten Teachers and 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) <u>Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)</u> SCHOOL RESPONSE: The school will coordinate the following resources: • The school will use FTE Funds to provide instructional staff (teachers and paraprofessionals) to create appropriate class sizes to meet the academic needs of students. • Title I, Part A Funds will be used to provide class size reduction, instructional staff, consumable supplies, technology, expendable equipment, professional learning, and academic coaches. • Title II, Part A Funds will be used to provide professional learning. • Title III Funds will be used to provide ELL instructional support. • Additional state 20-day Funds will be used to provide tutoring services for students in reading and math.

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: Classroom teachers, intervention teachers, administrators, and academic coach meet weekly through CCCs and analyze data, review learning goals, and discuss best instructional strategies to improve student achievement. During the CCCS the following assessment data is used (RTI/MTSS, ELF, Beacon Interims, i-Ready, MFI).

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The school will analyze Amira, Interim and i-Ready diagnostic data quarterly to determine if student achievement is increasing. The academic coach will provide support and resources for teachers in need of improving certain areas of the curriculum where teachers must reteach un-mastered skills by the students.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

The Schoolwide Title I committee will meet a minimum of three times a year (Fall, Winter, and Spring) to monitor the continuous improvement process

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:

The RTI team meets monthly to follow the RTI Tiers of Intervention for students in all grade levels. Special education teachers will be trained in using specialized instruction strategies consistently with the students in the inclusion classrooms.

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:

Teachers and paraprofessionals are provided training at the beginning of the year through their CCC subject areas at the district level. The local school provides training on using and interpreting data and using resources provided by the school district. Cobb County School District provides school administrators the opportunity to interview candidates and select from a “pool” of highly qualified candidates. Candidates are also screened through Human Resources. This helps principals and schools with the initial hiring process in the selection of “Highly Qualified” teachers. Periodically throughout the school year principals are provided a Highly Qualified Report and school roster which indicates any certification deficiencies that need to be addressed. If there are any deficiencies the principal directs the teacher to the proper channel to remove deficiency from the teacher’s record. The academic coaches work with new teachers on staff to provide them with the support they need to be successful at the school.

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: In late Spring of the academic year, our school partners with our feeder school for 6th grade transition. Sessions are held for students and parents to learn about the transition to middle school, expectations, course schedules, extracurricular activities, and other pertinent info. Additionally, a kindergarten visit is arranged with a local preschool program so that rising kindergarten students and their families can receive information about Kindergarten. The district offers Incoming kindergarteners an opportunity to attend Summer Learning Quest prior to entering kindergarten in August.

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*

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?
Title I Parent Facilitator	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The Parent Facilitator will serve as a liaison between the school and family, providing resources and support to increase family engagement and foster home-school connections and learning at home focused on literacy and mathematics.
	☐ 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 <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy</i>	
Goal #1	By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the average Reading Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades 1–2 will increase by at least 20 points from the Fall 2025 baseline administration to the Spring 2026 administration, with targeted support for students performing below grade level to accelerate growth. By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 performing at proficient or above, as measured by the EOG ELA Milestones assessment will increase from 38% (67 out of 177 students) in the Spring of 2025 to 43% in the Spring of 2026.
Goal #2	By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the average Math Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades 1–2 will increase by at least 50 points from the Fall 2025 benchmark to the Spring 2026 benchmark, with particular focus on subgroups performing below the 40th percentile. By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of students in Grades 3-5 performing proficient or above in Mathematics as measured by the EOG Math Milestones assessment will increase from 41% (72 out of 176 students) in the Spring of 2025 to 46% in the Spring of 2026.
Goal #3	
Goal #4	