

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2025 - 2026
School Name:	Elementary
Principal Name:	Maria Braswell
Date Submitted:	05.27.2025
Revision Date(s):	09.29.2025

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Green Acres Elementary
<i>Team Lead</i>	Maria Braswell
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Maria.braswell@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	678-842-6905
Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems ONLY
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only
Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders).

References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]

School Response: We met with the staff to analyze data, then brainstormed root causes and possible actions as a school. The Guiding Coalition has continually reviewed and revised the plan in order to ensure that it aligns with the current needs. We held input sessions so that parents and other community stakeholders could share their opinions related to our plan and how we are progressing toward our goals.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	June 2, 2025		
-----------------------	--------------	--	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Maria Braswell	
Assistant Principal	Adrienne Martin	
Teacher	Michele Bice	
Teacher	Melissa Gottschalk	
Teacher	Jennifer Murchie	
Teacher	Jennifer Mitchell	
Teacher	Allison Darling	
Teacher	Lorena Gonzalez	
Teacher	Samantha Massey	
Teacher	Cayla Moskal	
Teacher	Emma Snook	
Teacher	Ashley Nesmith	
Teacher	Renee Kroll	
Teacher	Robin Guthrie	
Counselor	Frankie Towner	

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	Increase the percentage of students reading on or above grade level: ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 7% to 12% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 12% to 17% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase from 38% to 41% of students as measured by the within or above grade band Lexile measure of the Georgia Milestones EOG. ☐ In 4th grade, increase from 30% to 35% as measured by the within or above grade band Lexile measure of the Georgia Milestones EOG. ☐ In 5th grade, increase from 49% to 54% as measured by the within or above grade band Lexile measure of the Georgia Milestones EOG.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	31% of 1st graders were proficient or advanced in ELA on the EOY overall placement. 27% of 2nd graders were proficient or advanced in ELA on the EOY overall placement. 36% of 3rd graders were within or above grade band on the Georgia Milestones Lexile measure. 35% of 4th graders were within or above grade band on the Georgia Milestones Lexile measure. 43% of 5th graders were within or above grade band on the Georgia Milestones Lexile measure.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	- There are two distinct groups of readers at our school. One group includes students who need intensive foundational instruction and another group needs intensive comprehension instruction. - Students need more vocabulary instruction - Students need greater opportunities to apply their understanding - Students need to have more a more explicit understanding that answers come from the text - Students need a greater understanding of how to approach questions - Students need more background knowledge - Additional progress monitoring is needed for phonics
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be	- Morphology instruction - Phonics focus - Systematic approach - Application – Socratic Seminar/Interpretive questions - Interdisciplinary connections - Gradual release

implemented to sustain progress?	
----------------------------------	--

Previous Year's Goal #2	Increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the grade level expectation for math: ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 0% to 5% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 1% to 6% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 30% to 35%. ☐ In 4th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 28% to 33%. ☐ In 5th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 21% to 26%.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	36% of 1 st graders were proficient or advanced in math on the EOY overall placement. 17% of 2 nd graders were proficient or advanced in math on the EOY overall placement. 16% of 3rd graders scored a 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG. 39% of 4 th graders scored a 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG. 14% of 5th graders scored a 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	- Showing students how to reason and think through operation selection - Beginning state learning plans earlier - Explicit protocol for problem solving - Word problems (understanding context of the problem, not simply looking for key words) - Addition/subtraction fluency (add as a daily routine) - Development of number sense - Stronger collaboration with math lab - Common vocabulary - Use of manipulatives with fidelity - Number talks - Vertical planning - Use of iReady to build groups

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?	• Intentionally teaching math vocabulary • Math support (push-in)
--	--

Previous Year's Goal #3	Increase the percentage of students scoring within the developing and expanding band within the oral language domain (speaking and listening): ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 10% to 15% as measured by ACCESS by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 39% to 50% as measured by ACCESS by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase from 35% to 45% as measured by ACCESS by the end of the school year. ☐ In 4th grade, increase from 46% to 56% as measured by the ACCESS by the end of the school year. ☐ In 5th grade, increase from 52% to 62% as measured by the ACCESS by the end of the school year.
	Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	36% of students in 1 st grade scored in the developing and expanding band within the oral language domain on ACCESS. 39% of students in 2 nd grade scored in the developing and expanding band within the oral language domain on ACCESS. 49% of students in 3 rd grade scored in the developing and expanding band within the oral language domain on ACCESS. 52% of students in 4 th grade scored in the developing and expanding band within the oral language domain on ACCESS. 33% of students in 5 th grade scored in the developing and expanding band within the oral language domain on ACCESS.
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	• Increase and expand opportunities for students to speak during regular instruction • Practice with the test format – students record themselves using Book Creator or other software and watch/listen to themselves and others, and evaluate the recorded responses using the speaking rubric • Increasing assessment literacy for our students – how the assessment works, what it measures, and how students can be successful in meeting their assessment-related goals • School-wide effort to require students to speak in full sentences and add detail to their verbal responses in all settings • Teachers will read portions of <i>Hands Down, Speak Out</i> and share strategies across grade-levels
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?	• Implementing an explicit routine for turn and talk using the speaking rubric • Student goal setting

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

ELA DATA				
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	28.6%	20%	15.6%	11.8%
4 th Grade	21.4%	18.5%	17.6%	22.8%
5 th Grade	24.8%	24.7%	22.9%	20.8%

ELA DATA				
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring developing - distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring developing - distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring developing - distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring developing - distinguished
3 rd Grade	52.4%	37.5%	34.9%	39.6%
4 th Grade	60.7%	44.4%	39.2%	44.6%
5 th Grade	62%	50.6%	55.4%	48.1%

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
1 st Grade	56%	24%	20%	58%	24%	18%	56%	23%	21%	61%	215	18%	57%	24%	19%
2 nd Grade	58%	17%	26%	57%	29%	14%	52%	34%	14%	50%	35%	15%	61%	24%	15%

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
3 rd Grade	26%	69%	5%	22%	74%	5%	32%	65%	3%	18%	79%	3%	23%	74%	4%	19%	75%	7%	51%	45%	4%	27%	71%	2%
4 th Grade	30%	62%	9%	35%	52%	13%	35%	56%	9%	34%	59%	7%	33%	59%	8%	35%	56%	9%	53%	44%	3%	36%	54%	10%
5 th Grade	42%	49%	9%	42%	45%	13%	45%	42%	13%	42%	46%	13%	49%	41%	11%	49%	41%	11%	54%	36%	11%	50%	42%	8%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY24 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups) In SY24, out of the 12 SWD 3 rd graders, 11 scored a 1 on the ELA Milestones.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Growth across student cohorts	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Low levels of 3s and 4s in all grade levels

In SY24, out of the 7 SWD 4th graders, 6 scored a 1 on the ELA Milestones. In SY24, out of the 4 SWD 5th graders, 3 scored a 1 on the ELA Milestones. In SY24, out of the 77 active EL 3rd graders, 57 scored a 1 on the ELA Milestones. In SY24, out of the 53 active EL 4th graders, 39 scored a 1 on the ELA Milestones. In SY24, out of the 42 active EL 5th graders, 31 scored a 1 on the ELA Milestones.	• Growth year-over-year in 4th grade • Increase in the number of students scoring 2-4	• Decrease in achievement year-over-year in 3rd and 5th grade EL: • The majority of ELs scored a 1 on the Milestones SWD: • Our SWD students do not perform well on the Milestones. The vast majority scored a 1
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): • Most students are near target in grades 3, 4 and 5 in the majority of ELA domains	Grade Levels (all students): • Interpreting texts in 1st grade and constructing texts in 2nd grade are the two lowest domains. • In 1st and 2nd grade, 50% or more students fall into the Support Needed category in all ELA domains. • Conventions is a weakness in grades 3, 4, and 5. • In 3rd, 4th and 5th grade, less than 15% of students are proficient in any ELA domain.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Teachers heavily emphasize foundational skills. • Teachers are more comfortable teaching phonics because it is systematic. They spend more time on phonics than on other pieces of the instructional block. • Students are not given the opportunity to apply reading skills independently. • Teachers do not explicitly teach students how to independently apply skills • Teacher do not believe students can complete the work independently.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: • In 4th grade, 50 students are developing or expanding • In 3rd grade, 45 students are developing or expanding	Grade Levels (all students): EL: • More students should move out of “entering” from kindergarten to 1st grade. • Decrease in the number of students scoring developing or expanding from 4th to 5th grade

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • There is a lack of emphasis on the domains that impact reading and writing. • Teachers are focusing on speaking and listening. • Speaking and listening have been identified as a school-wide goal. • Teachers were not allowing students to speak. • Teachers believe that they need to do it for the kids rather than letting the students try. • Teachers don't understand the needs of their students.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	• Small Group Instruction ○ Widespread use of UFLI for foundational reading skills. ○ Many teachers effectively led small phonics or comprehension groups, with students working independently or using tech-based applications (e.g., Imagine Learning). ○ Use of decodable texts, word chaining, and phoneme-grapheme mapping was evident in several rooms. • Multisensory & Engagement Strategies ○ Strong implementation of multisensory techniques (e.g., sound boxes, sand trays, mirrors, skywriting). ○ High student engagement when teachers used hands-on activities or creative hooks (e.g., escape rooms, "secret words," warm-ups). • Language-Rich Environments ○ Integration of translanguaging and bilingual support in many classrooms.	• Consistent Student Engagement During Independent Work ○ While small groups were often effective, some students working independently (especially with technology) were off-task or disengaged. ○ Not all center activities appeared aligned with the instructional goals. • Turn and Talk Implementation ○ In some classrooms, Turn and Talk routines were attempted but not explicitly taught, leading to confusion. ○ Providing visual aids or structured expectations may increase success. • Modeling & Gradual Release ○ In some lessons, teachers provided sentence frames or expected writing output without modeling their thinking or guiding students through evidence-finding. ○ Stronger use of the gradual release model would improve student ownership and understanding. • Learning Targets ○ Inconsistency in posting and referencing learning targets. Some rooms had clearly visible and aligned targets, others had none posted. • Instructional Fidelity & Accuracy ○ A few phonics lessons showed mispronunciations or inconsistent instructional routines (e.g., adding the /uh/ sound to phonemes). ○ Teachers may benefit from peer modeling, coaching, or PLC-led walkthroughs for skill refinement.

	○ Use of vocabulary routines, anchor charts, and visual supports (e.g., Unit Vocabulary Cards). ○ Turn and Talk strategies used to support peer-to-peer discourse. • Writing Integration ○ Writing was frequently tied to reading instruction (e.g., opinion pieces based on novels, character trait analyses, science-ELA integration). ○ Use of writing prompts, journals, and prewriting assessments aligned with standards and novels (e.g., <i>Stellaluna</i>, <i>Peter Pan</i>, <i>Holes</i>). • Positive Classroom Culture & Management ○ Clear routines and classroom expectations established in many rooms. ○ Teachers and paraprofessionals often used BIP strategies, token boards, and verbal feedback to maintain engagement and support behavior.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Teachers believe there is a lack of clear expectations/consistency on their teams. • Teachers do not start the year with solid rituals and routines. • Teachers do not have a common understanding of the expectations. • Teachers don't collaborate effectively. • Teachers are not participating in TRUE collaboration.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	Increase the percentage of students demonstrating reading proficiency: ☐ In Kindergarten, increase from 50% to 55% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 31% to 36% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 27% to 32% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 12% to 17%. ☐ In 4th grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 23% to 28%. ☐ In 5th grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 21% to 26%.			
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Students are not given the opportunity to apply reading skills independently. • Teachers do not explicitly teach students how to independently apply skills • Teacher do not believe students can complete the work independently.			
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 implement the new Tier 1 ELA resources daily. Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: ○ PL – Planning with Wonders • August-September: ○ Teachers will begin implementing the new Tier 1 ELA resources. ○ PL – Wonders Assessments & Wonders for Paras ○ Teachers will have a full day collaboration on 8/18 to unpack the		Evaluation Performance Target: 342/570 (60%) of students will score 80% or higher on the common summative assessment for each unit. Evaluation Tool(s): • Common summative assessment Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year	Tier 1 ELA resources Common summative assessments CTLS
Target Student Group ☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD				
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>				

Teachers will implement the new Tier 1 ELA resources daily as indicated by data collected with the districtwide ELA walkthrough form.	standards and take an in-depth look at how the standards are addressed in the first two units of the new ELA resources. ○ September Super Specials planning time will focus on aligning report card standards to Wonders lessons for K-3. 4-5 teachers will review the new ELA Milestones blueprint and compare to rigor of Wonders lessons. ○ Teachers will participate in collaborative scoring of student writing for alignment of scoring expectations. ○ Teachers will participate in Metro RESA PL – “Digging Deeper into the ELA Standards” at Green Acres. ○ Walks will take place as part of our transformational model and will be scheduled with the Academics division. Feedback will be provided after each walk. ● October-December: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. ● January-February: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. ● March-April: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. ● May: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. Artifacts to be Collected:	☒ every 6 weeks Data Analysis Plan: Teachers will review the common summative assessment data in their CCC using the CCC data analysis protocol. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	Districtwide walkthrough forms Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	--	--	--

MATH DATA				
MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	23.8%	25%	27.3%	15.8%
4 th Grade	36.1%	22.2%	20.3%	39.1%
5 th Grade	25.7%	16.5%	8.4%	14.3%

MATH DATA				
MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring developing - distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring developing - distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring developing - distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring developing - distinguished
3 rd Grade	64.3%	71.3%	67.3%	73.3%
4 th Grade	77.9%	66.7%	59.5%	66.3%
5 th Grade	62.8%	50.6%	30.1%	44.2%

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kinder (Winter Administration)	56%	28%	15%	73%	21%	6%	48%	35%	16%	61%	24%	15%
1 st Grade	45%	32%	23%	35%	23%	43%	30 %	33%	37%	39%	38%	23%
2 nd Grade	55%	33%	12%	41%	41%	18%	62%	23%	15%	50%	38%	12%
3 rd Grade	22%	77%	1%	33%	66%	1%	21%	79%	0%	35%	64%	1%
4 th Grade	47%	49%	3%	48%	48%	3%	53%	43%	4%	52%	46%	2%
5 th Grade	66%	34%	0%	74%	23%	3%	69%	27%	4%	70%	29%	1%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY24 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup) In SY24, out of the 12 SWD 3rd graders, 9 scored a 1 on the Math Milestones. In SY24, out of the 7 SWD 4th graders, 3 scored a 1 on the Math Milestones. In SY24, out of the 4 SWD 5th graders, 4 scored a 1 on the Math Milestones. In SY24, out of the 77 active EL 3rd graders, 27 scored a 1 on the Math Milestones. In SY24, out of the 53 active EL 4th graders, 26 scored a 1 on the Math Milestones. In SY24, out of the 42 active EL 5th graders, 35 scored a 1 on the Math Milestones.	• There was year-over-year growth in all areas except 3rd grade levels 3 and 4 • The majority of 3rd and 4th grade ELs scores a 2-4.	• 3rd and 5th grade have a low number of students scoring a 3 or 4 • The cohorts of students did not show growth as they progress through the grade levels. • The majority of SWD students scored a level 1. • The majority of 5th grade ELs scored a level 1.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	• 1st grade had the highest number of students scoring prepared. • 3rd grade had the highest percent of students scoring near target. • Geometric reasoning and measurement and data were the highest domains overall.	• 5th grade had the largest number of students scoring in support needed.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Teachers do not understand how to build number sense, problem solving skills, and the progression of learning from concrete to representation to the abstract. • Teachers do not understand the math content with sufficient depth of understanding. • Teachers do not take time to study, discuss, and learn the standards as they evolve. • Teachers do not recognize this development of pedagogy and content knowledge as being critical to successful practice. • Teachers didn't learn math this way.	

MATH Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Teachers did a great job of unpacking standards and developing success criteria.	We did not get through many data cycles together across the grade levels so the common assessments were not useful to us.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers do not understand how to effectively develop, administer, and analyze common assessments in a CCC. - Teachers are getting hung up on the unpacking of standards. - Teachers do not come to CCC meetings prepared to discuss their standards. - Teachers do not see the value in unpacking standards to support instruction. - Teachers have not experienced effective collaboration.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	Increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the grade level expectation for math: ☐ In Kindergarten, increase from 34% to 39% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 36% to 41% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 17% to 22% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 16% to 21%. ☐ In 4th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 39% to 44%. ☐ In 5th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 14% to 19%.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Teachers do not understand how to build number sense, problem solving skills, and the progression of learning from concrete to representation to the abstract. • Teachers do not understand the math content with sufficient depth of understanding. • Teachers do not take time to study, discuss, and learn the standards as they evolve. • Teachers do not recognize this development of pedagogy and content knowledge as being critical to successful practice. • Teachers didn't learn math this way.		
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 manipulatives to support the development of a concrete understanding of math in their daily instruction.	Evaluation Performance Target: 285/570 (50%) of students (K-5) will show growth on their overall performance on the iReady math benchmark from Fall to Winter.	Math manipulatives iReady Math (site license)
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>			
	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: ○ Q1 math overview training will be provided to all teachers (K-5). ○ Teachers will be provided with their grade level manipulative kits.	Evaluation Tool(s): • iReady benchmark Evaluation Plan:	

Teachers will implement the use of manipulatives into their daily instruction.	• August-September: ○ Training will be provided each quarter for all grade levels to discuss the use of manipulatives in depth and to model the use of each manipulative type relative to the standards being taught. ○ Math walks will take place to assess the implementation. Teachers will receive feedback at the conclusion of these walks. • October-December: ○ Training will be provided by unit for all grade levels to discuss the use of manipulatives in depth and to model the use of each manipulative type relative to the standards being taught. ○ Math walks will take place to assess the implementation. Teachers will receive feedback at the conclusion of these walks. • January-February: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. • March-April: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. • May: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. Artifacts to be Collected: ○ Walk forms ○ Training sign in sheets ○ Lesson plans	Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Grade level teams will meet after the Winter administration of iReady to complete a data dig and determine the number of students in each class who showed growth. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	--	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers need support with building student problem solving skills		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will use the Think, Plan, Solve protocol with students any time students solve a math word problem.	Evaluation Performance Target: 342/570 (60%) of students will be able to solve a word problem using all three components of the Think, Plan, Solve protocol by the end of Q1.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:	Evaluation Tool(s):	
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD	- Preplanning: - Training will be provided to ensure that teachers understand the Think, Plan, Solve protocol and how to implement it in the classroom.	- Think, Plan, Solve word problem assessment - Think, Plan, Solve rubric	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	- August-September: - Teachers will begin implementation of the protocol. - The students will spend time in Math Lab learning the protocol in depth. - PL – GaDOE Learning Plans - PL – Planning for small group instruction (including manipulative use) - Teachers will attend Metro RESA training on supporting multilingual learners in Math. - Walks will be conducted to assess the status of implementation. Teachers will be provided feedback at the conclusion of each walk.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Quarterly	
Teachers will implement a common problem-solving protocol that will be used any time students are solving a math word problem.	- October-December: - Teachers will attend the NCTM conference in Atlanta, GA.	Data Analysis Plan: Teachers will analyze the assessment data during CCCs. Based on the data, we will determine next steps for training and implementation to make adjustments prior to the Q2 assessment.	
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists	

	• Students will be given a problem-solving assessment in Math Lab at the end of Q1 to assess their skill using the protocol. • January-February: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. • March-April: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. • May: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. Artifacts to be Collected: ○ Walkthrough forms ○ Lesson plans Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA/OTHER DATA

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY24 ACCESS (Data by grade & subgroup)	- Most students were in the 0-1 range of growth. - Listening and writing were the two domains in which students scored the highest. 3rd and 4th grade were our highest performing grade levels in oral language and literacy.	- Speaking and writing were the two domains in which students scored the lowest. - Most students are still in the entering and emerging composite proficiency levels. - Kindergarten has most students scoring at the entering composite proficiency level. 3rd grade had 19 students who scored in the -1 – 0 growth. - Kindergarten and 1st had to lowest proficiency levels on literacy.
Check the system impacted: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers don't give students the opportunity to express themselves in speaking or writing. - Teachers don't believe the students can do it independently. - Teachers don't understand the characteristics of ELs.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	Language-Rich Environments - Integration of translanguageing and bilingual support in many classrooms. - Use of vocabulary routines, anchor charts, and visual supports (e.g., Unit Vocabulary Cards). - Turn and Talk strategies used to support peer-to-peer discourse. Writing Integration - Writing was frequently tied to reading instruction (e.g., opinion pieces based on novels, character trait analyses, science-ELA integration). - Use of writing prompts, journals, and prewriting assessments aligned with standards and novels (e.g., <i>Stellaluna</i>, <i>Peter Pan</i>, <i>Holes</i>).	Turn and Talk Implementation - In some classrooms, Turn and Talk routines were attempted but not explicitly taught, leading to confusion. - Providing visual aids or structured expectations may increase success. Modeling & Gradual Release - In some lessons, teachers provided sentence frames or expected writing output without modeling their thinking or guiding students through evidence-finding. - Stronger use of the gradual release model would improve student ownership and understanding.

Check the system impacted: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Teachers are still building their understanding of sound ESOL strategies and how to implement them in their instruction. • ESOL strategies have not been the focus of professional learning. • So many changes have occurred within ELA and math that the focus has been on learning the new standards.
--	---

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA / OTHER DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: OTHER	Decrease the percentage of students scoring in the entering and emerging proficiency levels for the speaking domain on the ACCESS from 65% to 56%.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Teachers are still building their understanding of sound ESOL strategies and how to implement them in their instruction. - ESOL strategies have not been the focus of professional learning. - Teachers don't give students the opportunity to express themselves in speaking or writing. - Teachers don't believe the students can do it independently. - Teachers don't understand the characteristics of ELs.		
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 the Hands Down conversation moves in their daily instruction. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - Teachers will receive a copy of <i>Hands Down Speak Out</i>. - Teachers will participate in discussion and coaching on the first 3 chapters of the text which discuss how to set up Hands Down conversations in the classroom. - Staff will receive a refresher on how to use the speaking rubrics with students.	Evaluation Performance Target: Increase the percentage of students showing growth in the speaking domain from 71% to 76% between ACCESS and the December WIDA Model administration. Evaluation Tool(s): - WIDA Model Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly	<i>Hands Down Speak Out</i> WIDA Model
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>			

Teachers will implement Hands Down conversations into their daily instruction.	• August-September: ○ Teachers will collaborate on the implementation of the microlessons (chapters 4-7). ○ Implementation of Hands Down conversations will begin. ○ Instructional walks will evaluate the implementation of Hands Down conversations. Feedback will be provided to teachers at the conclusion of each walk. • October-December: ○ Teachers will participate in discussion and coaching on chapters 8-10 which focus on content conversations. ○ Instructional walks will continue. Feedback will be provided to teachers at the conclusion of each walk. • January-February: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. • March-April: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. • May: ○ We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. Artifacts to be Collected: • Walkthrough forms • CCC minutes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:	☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ December Data Analysis Plan: Teachers will review the WIDA model data and compare to student's ACCESS scores to identify students who are showing growth and students who need additional speaking opportunities. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	
---	--	--	--

	☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: Implementation Plan: - August-September: - Performing Arts added as a special for 3-5th grades. - October-December: 14 teachers will attend the Arts Integration kick-off training on September 30, 2025. - January-February: - We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. - March-April: - We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. - May: - We will establish steps for the second semester after we evaluate our progress in December. Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ Quarterly Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
Arts Integration			

	☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring:		
--	--	--	--

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</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.	August 2025		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required <u>Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline</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 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required <u>Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline</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 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required <u>FOUR Building Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy)</u> <u>Teacher</u> 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 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	November 2025		
	January 2026		
	March 2026		
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>	April 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> Title I policy and compact Communication regarding family engagement events Grade level newsletter School newsletter		☐ 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
CTLS/ParentVue Support Sessions	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Laptops		07/31 8/5 8/7 8/11	The parent facilitator will collect a sign in sheet.	Parent Facilitator
Kindergarten Preview	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Jump start kits Individually packaged snacks	Title I	04/16	The parent facilitator will use a Sign Up Genius to register participants. All participants will sign in on the day of the event.	Parent Facilitator
Parent Information Meetings	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			08/2025 10/2025 01/2026	The parent facilitator will collect a sign in sheet.	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: Our schoolwide plan was developed in coordination with our district academic and ESOL departments. Our Academics division provides licenses for our iReady reading intervention software. We also receive support and targeted resources from our Title III (ESOL) department through the purchasing of a site license for Imagine Learning. All the resources and materials references support our goals and action steps.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 4</i>
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(a)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Our leadership team, instructional support specialists, and administration monitor the implementation of the plan and review data at every Guiding Coalition meeting. The leadership team and academic coaches conduct frequent classroom walks to assess the level of success of our implementation.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(b)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: As an administrative team, we review data monthly to assess the achievement and growth of our students. We review data with our Guiding Coalition monthly and with the staff at-large quarterly. In addition, we discuss the actions and goals of our plan regularly to determine if they need to be adjusted or modified.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(c)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: As we monitor our goals and action steps through data discussions, classroom walks, and review of artifacts, our team will make adjustments to the plan.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2(a)</i>

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. <i>SWP Checklist 2(b)</i>
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)</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.). <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Green Acres follows the Response to Intervention process (RTI). Our RTI coordinator meets with teachers continually to discuss concerns and determine intervention needed to support students.
14. <u>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,</u> particularly in high need subjects. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Professional development that connects to our goals and action steps is provided for all teachers and paraprofessionals on an ongoing basis. New teachers are assigned a mentor and attend monthly meetings to guide them in improved instruction and use of data to make instructional decisions.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(v)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Our 5th grade students attend a transition workshop with our school counselor. After the transition workshop the students go on a tour of the middle school. Our rising kindergarteners attend Kindergarten orientation with their families. At this event, they tour the school and learn about a typical day at school and all of the resources and programs available to them.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)</i> 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?
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 ensure that parents understand the goals of our plan and are actively involved in supporting their children at home. The parent facilitator coordinates information sessions that equip parents with the skills to do so.
Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The teacher will allow us to maintain smaller class sizes which will increase the engagement and support that students receive when working on critical literacy, math, and speaking skills.
.5 Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The teacher will allow us to maintain smaller class sizes which will increase the engagement and support that students receive when working on critical literacy, math, and speaking skills.
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	

School Improvement Goals
Include goals on the parent compacts and policy

Goal #1	Increase the percentage of students demonstrating reading proficiency: ☐ In Kindergarten, increase from 50% to 55% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 31% to 36% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 27% to 32% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 12% to 17%. ☐ In 4th grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 23% to 28%. ☐ In 5th grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 21% to 26%.
Goal #2	Increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the grade level expectation for math: ☐ In Kindergarten, increase from 34% to 29% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 36% to 41% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 17% to 22% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 16% to 21%. ☐ In 4th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 39% to 44%. In 5th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 14% to 19%
Goal #3	Decrease the percentage of students scoring in the entering and emerging proficiency levels for the speaking domain on the ACCESS from 65% to 56%.