School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A

Georgia Department of Education

School Year:	**2025 - 2026**
School Name:	**Clarkdale Elementary School**
Principal Name:	**Dwan Jones**
Date Submitted:	**May 30, 2025**
Revision Date(s):	**June 27, 2025**

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	Clarkdale Elementary School
Team Lead	Dwan Jones
Position	Principal
Email	dwan.jones@cobbk12.org
Phone	770-819-2422

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

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

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

School Response: The Building Leadership Team (BLT) and Principals Advisory Council (PAC) at Clarkdale Elementary School, including teachers, administrators, families, and community leaders, meet face-to-face to provide input on the Comprehensive Needs Assessment of the school. The data from the 2024–2025 school year was shared and reviewed. The committees analyzed the data and provided input on the prioritized needs, root causes, goals, and actions for the 2025-2026 school year. The information was then compiled into the School Improvement Plan. Input from school stakeholders, including families, community partners, the Principal Advisory Council, PTA, Building Leadership Team, and other school staff, was collected and incorporated into the School Improvement Plan. FY 25-26 SIP records of attendance are kept at the school and via email records. Families and community members were invited via CTLS Parent, phone, and/or email.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are those individuals with valuable experiences and perspectives who will provide the team with important input, feedback, and guidance. Stakeholders must be engaged in the process to meet the 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:	4/20/2025; 5/19/25	5/27/25; 5/29/25	

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Dwan Jones	**Please see the scanned sign-in sheet**
Assistant Principal	Lorna Holt	
Assistant Principal	Carmen Bandy	
Specialized Services Administrator	Deidre Booker	
Title 1 Supervisor	Cheryl Johnson	
Instructional Support Specialist ELA K-2	Ieshia Wilkerson	
Instructional Support Specialist ELA 3-5	Katy Laine	
Instructional Support Specialist Math K-2	Annette Castleberry	
Instructional Support Specialist Math 3-5	Mechelle Weddington	
RTI Coordinator	Cheryl Chesterfield	
Kindergarten Teacher	Lauren Clark	
First Grade Teacher	Laura Werren	
Second Grade Teacher	Ashlynn Bailey	
Third Grade Teacher	Melissa Cousley	
Fourth Grade Teacher	Darius Jones	
Fifth Grade Teacher	Talecia Tabb	
Counselor	Temika Arnold	
ESOL	Jacquelyn Jones	

Small Group SWD	Rebecca Watson	
IRR SWD	Vivian Huddleston	
EIP Interventionist	Mary Addison	
Specialist Team Lead	Kaitlyn Todaro	

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 in K-2 performing at **PREPARED** quantile levels on the Math Beacon assessment from 7% (8 of 224 students) in August 2024 to 17% of assessed students in March 2025. Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing **PROFICIENT** and **DISTINGUISHED** levels on the Georgia EOG Math assessment from 46% (177 of 380 students) to 56% of assessed students by May 2025.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The percentage of students in grades K-2 who performed in the Prepared category on the Math Beacon assessment was 20% (66 of the 329 students assessed). This exceeds the school year's goal of 17%. KG – 8% (8 of 103 students assessed) 1st – 27% (29 of 110 students assessed) 2nd – 25% (29 of 116 students assessed) Students in grades 3 -5 did not meet their performance goal on the EOG. Therefore, it was only partially met.
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	**2025 EOG Results**
	3rd Grade – 48.7% proficient/distinguished (68 of 143 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 47% proficient/distinguished (18 of 38 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: 27% proficient/distinguished (4 of 15 students assessed)
	
	4th Grade – 43% proficient/distinguished (57 of 131 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 32% proficient/distinguished (12 of 37 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: 25% proficient/distinguished (4 of 16 students assessed)
	
	5th Grade – 34% proficient/distinguished (44 of 128 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 15% proficient/distinguished (3 of 20 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: 21% proficient/distinguished (3 of 14 students assessed)
	
	For grades 3 -5, the goal was to have 56% of our student population perform at the proficient or distinguished level. 46% (160 of 380 students assessed) performed at the proficient or distinguished levels. We did not meet this portion of our school improvement goal.

	When compared to the 2024 EOG results:
	3rd grade: 58.7% proficient or distinguished (74 of 126 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 15.6% (5 of 32 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: Not enough students to measure
	
	4th grade: 38.2% proficient/distinguished (50 of 131 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 14.8% proficient/distinguished (4 of 27 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: 10.5% proficient/distinguished (2 of 19 students assessed)
	
	5th grade: 54.4% proficient/distinguished (68 of 125 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 26.3% proficient/distinguished (5 of 19 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: Not enough students to measure
	
	Our students who were in 3rd grade in 2024 showed a 15.7 percentage point decrease in proficient/distinguished performance in 4th grade 2025. Our students who were in 4th grade in 2024 showed a 4.2 percentage point decrease in proficient/distinguished performance in 5th grade 2025.
	
	There was very little change in the number of students for both grades from 2024 to 2025.
	
	Actionable strategies that could be implemented are:
	• Monitor DreamBox usage and progress
	• Monitor Zearn usage and progress
	• Provide a Deep Dive Professional Learning (PL) for teachers on using the Math Resources.
	• Plan instruction and assessments using both CCSD and GaDOE Learning Plans to ensure engagement and spiral review of math skills and standards.
	• Support math instruction with math talks (situations) and fluency kits.

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	Increase the percentage of students in K-2 performing at **MEETING** and **DEMONSTRATING** mastery levels on the Amira assessment from 47% (140 of 293 students) in April 2024 to 69% of assessed students by March 2025. Increase the percentage of students in 3-5 performing at **PROFICIENT** and **DISTINGUISHED** levels on the Georgia EOG ELA assessment from 41% (152 of 382 students) in May 2024 to 55% of assessed students by May 2025.
Was the goal met?	☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	**Amira** The percentage of students in K-2 performing at Meeting mastery levels on the Amira assessment was at 30% (100 of 330 students) in April 2025. This did not meet the goal we set for our students in the 24-25 school year. **2025 EOG** 3rd Grade 42% (59 of 141 students assessed) 4th Grade 33% (44 of 132 students assessed) 5th Grade 39% (50 of 128 students assessed) The percentage of students in grades 3-5 performing at the Proficient and Distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG ELA assessment was 34% (137 of 402 students assessed) by May 2025. This percentage did not meet the
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	In grades K-2, our goal for Amira proficiency was to increase mastery levels from 47% to 69%. We did not meet this goal.
	
	• On Kindergarten summative common assessments over the school year, students achieved limited mastery (59%) with reading high-frequency words. Their achievement in this area was based on performance with the ELA Standard: ELAGSEKRF4, which requires students to read common high-frequency words and read emergent-reader texts with purpose and understanding.
	
	The percentage of students in grades 3-5 performing at distinguished levels on the Georgia EOG ELA assessment was 34% (137 of 402 students assessed) by May of 2025. We did not meet our goals due to:
	• Students having a limited vocabulary and background, and conventions of standard English, resulting in limited reading comprehension.
	• Interpreting text, making connections, and drawing reasonable conclusions.
	
	2025 EOG
	3rd Grade 42% (59 of 141 students assessed)
	   o EL students: 9% (3 of 34 students assessed)
	   o SWD students: 7% (1 of 15 students assessed)
	
	4th Grade 33% (44 of 132 students assessed)
	   o EL students:16% (6 of 38 students assessed)
	   o SWD students: 0% (0 of 13 students assessed)
	
	5th Grade 39% (50 of 128 students assessed)
	   o EL students: 5% (1 of 20 students assessed)

	o SWD students: 0% (0 of 14 students assessed)

	When compared 2024 EOG results:
	3rd grade: 38.1% (48 of 126 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 15.6% (5 of 32 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: Not enough students to measure
	
	4th grade: 27.5% (36 of 131 assessed students)
	    o EL students: 7.4% (2 of 19 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: 0% (0 of 27 students assessed)
	
	5th grade: 54.4% (68 of 125 students assessed)
	    o EL students: 26.3% (5 of 19 students assessed)
	    o SWD students: Not enough students to measure
	
	Our students who were in 3rd grade in 2024 showed a 5.1 percentage point decrease in proficient/distinguished performance in 4th grade 2025. Our students who were in 4th grade in 2024 increased their proficient/distinguished performance in 5th grade 2025 by 5.5 percentage points. While 5th-grade students did increase their performance vertically, the increase was not enough to cover the overall shortfall in scores.
	
	Actionable strategies:
	• Explicit vocabulary instruction - Explicitly teaching new words and their meanings enhances students' language skills and comprehension.
	• Targeted small group instruction tailored to students' literacy needs.
	• Writing instruction – Use data from the EOG, Beacon, and Wonders writing assessments to drive small group intervention and extension for writing to text.

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	**SY22** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY23** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**SY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3rd Grade	31.6%	31%	38.1%	31%
4th Grade	33.7%	34.4%	28%	33%
5th Grade	51.8%	31.1%	54.4%	39%

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	47%	43%	10%	49%	38%	13%	45%	43%	12%	50%	42%	8%	46%	39%	15%
2nd Grade	25%	27%	48%	22%	34%	44%	18%	41%	41%	17%	41%	42%	22%	33%	45%

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	17%	75%	8%	15%	78%	7%	12%	81%	7%	15%	77%	8%	20%	72%	8%	13%	74%	13%	35%	59%	6%	18%	74%	8%
4th Grade	14%	67%	19%	16%	61%	23%	15%	72%	13%	12%	77%	11%	15%	65%	20%	17%	62%	21%	34%	53%	13%	18%	61%	21%
5th Grade	22%	59%	19%	22%	51%	27%	21%	56%	23%	21%	63%	16%	21%	60%	19%	22%	59%	19%	32%	51%	17%	24%	62%	14%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** • In 4th Grade math, EOG scores increased from 38% to 43% (57 of 132 students assessed) • In 4th Grade ELA, EOG scores increased from 28% to 33% (44 of 131 students assessed) **EL:** **SWD:** • In 4th grade 14% (1 of 7 dual-identified students performed at a level 3 on the Math GA Milestones • In 5th grade 25% (1 of 4 dual-identified students) performed at a level 3 on the Math GA Milestones	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** • In 3rd grade, 32.2% (39 of 121 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels • In 5th grade, 39% (50 of 128 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels. **EL:** • In 3rd grade, 8% (3 of 38 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels • In 4th grade, 16% (6 of 38 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels • In 5th grade, 5% (1 of 20 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels **SWD:** • In 3rd grade, 7% (1 of 14 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels • In 4th grade, 0% (0 of 13 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels • In 5th grade, 0% (0 of 14 students assessed) performed at proficient/distinguished levels
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	**Grade Levels (all students):** **1-2 (all students)** • Based on the 1st grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated strengths in Constructing Text, with 54% (59 of 110 students assessed) scoring Near Target or Prepared. • In 2nd grade, the Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated strengths in Interpreting Text, with 83% (98 of 118 students assessed) scoring Near Target or Prepared.	**Grade Levels (all students):** **1 – 2 (all students)** • Based on the 1st grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated weaknesses in Interpreting Texts, with 50% (55 of 110 students assessed) scoring Near Target and Prepared • In the 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated weaknesses in Foundations, with 75% (89 of 118 students assessed) scoring in Near Target and Prepared.

	3 -5 (all students) • Based on the 3rd grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated strengths in Key Ideas and Details, with 88% (125 of 142 students assessed) scoring Near Target or Prepared. • Based on the 4th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated strengths in Informational reading, with 85% (111 of 131 students assessed) scoring Near Target or Prepared. • Based on the 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated strengths in Informational Text, with 79% (92 of 116 students assessed) scoring Near Targets or Prepared **EL:** • In 1st grade, Beacon score results in ELA show that 62% (13 of 21 students assessed) performed in the Near Target category. • In 2nd grade, Beacon score results in ELA show that 72% (18 of 25 students assessed) performed at the Near Target category. **SWD:** • In 1st grade, Beacon score results in ELA show that 71% (10 of 14 students assessed) performed in the Near Target category. • In 2nd grade, Beacon score results in ELA show that 47% (7 of 15 students assessed) performed in the Near Target category.	**3-5 (all students)** • Based on the 3rd grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated a weakness in Conventions, with 65% (92 of 142 students assessed) scoring Near Target or Prepared. • Based on the 4th Grade Beason results in ELA, our students demonstrated a weakness in Conventions, with 66% (86 of 131 students assessed) scoring Near Target or Prepared. • Based on the 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated a weakness in Conventions, with 68% (79 of 116 students assessed) scoring Near Target or Prepared. **EL:** • In grades 3 – 5, 0% (0 of 96 students assessed) of our ELL students performed in the Prepared category. **SWD:** • In grades 3 -5, 0% (0 of 42 students assessed) performed in the Prepared category.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Teachers needed additional professional learning support in the application of phonics and morphology instruction for building reading comprehension. • Students needed additional instructional support in interpreting the meaning of text, expanding vocabulary, making connections to text, and drawing reasonable conclusions.	
ACCESS Scores **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** **EL:**	**Grade Levels (all students):** **EL:**

- In 1st grade, 35% (8 of 23 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **reading** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 2nd grade, 61% (19 of 31 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **reading** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 4th grade, 74% (20 of 27 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **reading** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 5th grade, 47% (9 of 19 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **reading** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 5th grade, 47% (9 of 19 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **writing** portion of the Access assessment.

SWD:

- In 4th grade, 29% of dual-identified students (2 of 7 students) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **Reading** portion of the Access assessment

- In 4th grade, 43% of dual-identified students (3 of 7) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **Writing** portion of the Access assessment

- In 5th grade, 50% of dual-identified students (2 of 4 students) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **Reading** portion of the Access assessment

- In kindergarten, 0% (0 of 17 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **reading** portion of the Access assessment.

- In kindergarten, 0% (0 of 17 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **writing** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 1st grade, 0% (0 of 23 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **writing** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 2nd grade, 3% (1 of 31 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **writing** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 3rd grade, 37% (11 of 30 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **reading** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 3rd grade, 3% (1 of 29 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on their **writing** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 4th grade, 44% (12 of 27 students assessed) performed at level 4.0 or more on the **writing** portion of the Access assessment.

SWD:

- In 3rd grade, 100% of dual-identified students (1 student) scored below proficient levels on the **Reading and Writing** portion of the Access assessment.

- In 4th grade, 71% of the dual-identified students (5 of 7 students) scored below proficient levels on the **Reading** portion of the Access assessment

		• In 5th grade, 100% of dual-identified students (4 of 4 students) scored below 4.0 or more on the **Writing** portion of the Access assessment.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Providing additional support for the ELL teachers in supporting differentiated instruction for ELL students • Limited opportunities for students to practice speaking with peers in English using academic language. • Writing instruction does not follow a common structure across grade levels. Teachers need additional PL on teaching writing. • Limited opportunities for ESOL teachers to engage in professional learning about best practices for teaching the craft of writing (i.e., modeling, small group instruction, conferring, providing feedback, etc.)	
ELA Common Assessments **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** • In 1st grade, the grade average on the ELF assessment was at 38% (36 of 96 students assessed) at the beginning of the year. By the end of the year, the grade-level average for proficiency was 74% (81 of 110 students assessed).	**Grade Levels (all students):** • In 5th grade, 64% (74 of 116 students assessed) performed below a grade of 69 on spring ELA grade-level created common assessments.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Questioning during reading comprehension instructional time does not allow students to think critically. • Limited understanding/comprehension of informational texts. • Limited application of phonic skills to reading comprehension. • Additional support for teachers in building, using, and analyzing the data of common assessments. • Teacher-made assessments are not aligned with the rigor of the standards.	
School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	• Phonics instruction is consistently found during instructional walks in 30 out of 37 classrooms. Most classrooms in grades 3-5 are departmentalized (2-person team: 1 ELA teacher, 1 Math, Science, and Social Studies teacher) • District-provided resources are consistently used during phonics/morphology lessons.	• As observed in 16 of 27 classrooms, teachers were spending a lot of time teaching phonics and not leaving enough time for the application of the skills connected to text. • Writing didn't always follow these lessons and tie the two areas together.

		• Questioning gave too much background knowledge, not allowing students to think critically.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Walk-throughs did not provide enough details to support the application of phonics to building reading comprehension • Writing instruction was limited to using the RACE strategy and the craft of genre writing. Students needed more time to write about their reading • Questioning did not support creating opportunities for students to think critically.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	Increase the number of students in grades 1 -2 performing at **PREPARED** levels on the Beacon assessment from 37% (84 of 228 students assessed) in March 2025 to 44% of students assessed in March 2026.
	Increase the number of students in grades 3 -5 performing at **PROFICIENT** and **DISTINGUISHED** levels on the EOG from 33% (133 of 402 students assessed) in May 2025 to 40% of students assessed in May 2026.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Writing instruction was limited to using the RACE strategy and the craft of genre writing. Students needed more time to write about their reading • Writing instruction does not follow a common structure across grade levels.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

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

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
 	
☒ All Students
☐ EL
☐ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
 	
1. Teachers will implement daily, targeted small-group instruction focused on writing connected to text.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of teachers will implement targeted small-group instruction focused on writing connected to text daily, as evidenced by instructional walks and lesson plans.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• Preplanning:
	  ○ Professional Learning: Small group expectations.
	  ○ Tiered PL: (by grade level and level of support) training on writing connected to text components (with modeling)
	• August-September:
	  ○ Implement small group writing instruction
	  ○ Initial walks are performed to determine baseline data
	  ○ Baseline data from the initial walk is used to create a targeted series of professional learning based on grade-level needs.
	• October-December:
	  ○ CCCs' collaborative planning focused on small group writing connected to text.
	  ○ Teachers use the district-provided checklist for reflection on small group writing time.
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		70% of students will score proficient or higher on the common summative ELA assessments.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• Common Summative Assessments (genre-specific prompts and text-dependent questions)
		• Common Formative Assessment Writing Rubric
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☒ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☐ _____
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		
		CCCs:
		  ○ Collaborative scoring using writing rubrics bi-weekly during CCC meetings to address student
			Academic Coach
			
			Title 1 district coaches

	- o Walks are performed in November to determine a new data set and provide additional PL were needed. - January-February: - o Building Leadership Team reevaluates the current reality for implementing writing based on walk data and CCC notes. - o Teachers self-reflect and identify an area for one-on-one coaching. - o Performance target is evaluated for implementation progress (Mid-year monitoring) - March-April: - o Implementation of small group writing continues - o Teacher survey and self-assessment are conducted to determine the next steps needed. - May: **Artifacts to be Collected:** - o Walk-through forms - o Collaborative scoring data - o Small group lesson plans **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** - o Monthly	needs or changes in whole/small group instruction to support data collected. Leadership Team: o Review CCC assessment data monthly to determine progress toward this goal and provide additional professional learning (PL) as needed. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Phonics and morphology application to develop vocabulary and Reading Comprehension.	
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:	Evaluation Performance Target:	Academic Coach
	100% of Tutors will use baseline assessment data to provide targeted instruction for literacy.	80% of students served by tutors will increase their Lexile scores as measured by benchmark assessments such as the Beacon.	

Target Student Group

☒ Gen Ed
☐ EL
☐ SWD

Action Step

SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)

2. Grades K-5 tutors will implement targeted literacy instruction 3 times per week with small groups.

Implementation Plan:

- August-September:
  - Meet with tutors in September to provide professional learning (PL) regarding resources and materials available to support student learning.

  - Students scoring within the 26th to 50th percentile on the Beacon assessment (grades K–5) will be ranked based on performance data scores and grouped by similar needs in reading.

  - Begin weekly tutoring sessions with targeted students.

- October-December:
  - Collaborate with Tutors to review winter data and determine the performance progress of the identified students. Regroup as needed.

- January-February:
  - Continue to tutor and monitor student progress

- March-April:
  - Continue to tutor and monitor student progress

Artifacts to be Collected:
  - Progress monitoring data report
  - Tutoring schedule with student groups

Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
☐ Principal
☐ Assistant Principals
☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists

Frequency of Monitoring:
  - Every 6 weeks

Evaluation Tool(s):
- Benchmark assessment (i.e., Beacon)

Evaluation Plan:
Students will be assessed:
☐ Every 2 weeks
☐ Monthly
☐ Every other month
☒ 3 times per year
☐ _____

Data Analysis Plan:
  - Students' progress will be monitored every 6 weeks using individualized assessment goals
  - Lexile scores will be measured 3 times per year (beginning, middle and end of year)

Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
☐ Principal
☐ Assistant Principals
☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
☐ CCC Leads

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Providing additional support for the ESOL endorsed teachers in supporting differentiated instruction for ELL students • Limited opportunities for students to practice speaking with peers in English using academic language.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

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

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
 	
☐ Gen Ed
☒ EL
☐ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
 	
3. K-5 ESOL endorsed teachers will implement ELLevation strategies daily in the literacy block, emphasizing the reading and writing domains to support English Learners.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of K-5 ESOL endorsed teachers will use ELLevation strategies daily during the literacy block to support English Learners, as evidenced by instructional walks and lesson plans.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• Preplanning:
	  o PL on ELLevation strategies to support reading and writing domains, led by the ESOL department.
	  o PL focused on creating a literacy-rich learning environment that is conducive to supporting ELL learners.
	• August-May:
	  o ESOL endorsed teachers will meet monthly as a collaborative learning community to analyze student data and explore ELLevation strategies to support student needs.
	
	  o Teachers will include ELLevation strategies in daily lessons.
	
	Artifacts to be Collected:
	  o Walkthrough data
	  o Lesson plans
	
	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
	☐ Principal
	☐ Assistant Principals
	☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
	
	Frequency of Monitoring:
	  o Monthly
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		At least 70% of EL students will score proficient or higher on the ELA Common Formative Assessments.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• Common Formative Assessments (genre-specific prompts and text-dependent questions)
		• Common Formative Assessment Writing Rubric
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☒ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☐ _____
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		  o Collaborative scoring using writing rubrics monthly during CCC meetings to address student needs or changes in whole/small group instruction to support data collected.
		
		Leadership Team:
		  o Review CCC assessment data monthly to determine progress toward this goal and provide additional professional learning (PL) as needed.
		
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
		☐ Principal
		☐ Assistant Principals
		☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
			Coaches

		☐ CCC Leads	

Clarkdale Elementary   FY26 Title I School Improvement Plan   20

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
3rd Grade	52.1%	49.1%	58.7%	48.7%
4th Grade	43.1%	31.3%	38.2%	43%
5th Grade	46%	32.1%	54.4%	35%

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)	40%	48%	12%	58%	25%	17%	43%	44%	13%	43%	41%	17%
1st Grade	31%	49%	21%	19%	29%	52%	13%	36%	51%	16%	57%	27%
2nd Grade	49%	28%	23%	25%	46%	29%	33%	32%	35%	20%	43%	38%
3rd Grade	6%	91%	4%	0%	100%	0%	13%	84%	4%	16%	83%	1%
4th Grade	36%	57%	7%	33%	62%	5%	36%	61%	3%	45%	50%	5%
5th Grade	47%	47%	6%	52%	46%	2%	40%	52%	8%	62%	36%	2%

Source	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
SY25 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	**Grade Levels (all students):** • In 4th grade, the performance percentage of proficient and distinguished has increased from 38.2% to 43% on the 4th Grade Math EOG. This represents a 4.8 percentage point increase. **EL:** • In 4th grade, 32% (12 of 37 students assessed) of our ELL students performed proficient on the Math EOG.	**Grade Levels (all students):** • In 3rd grade, the performance percentage proficient and distinguished has decreased from 58.7% to 48.7%. This represents a 10 percentage point decrease. • In 5th grade, the performance percentage of proficient and distinguished decreased from 54.4% to 35%. This represents a 19.4 percentage point decrease. **EL:**

SWD:		• 65% of our ELL students in grades 3 -5 are performing at the beginning (level 1) or developing (level 2) learners, as shown on the Math EOG Assessment. **SWD:** • 76% of our SWD students in grades 3-5 are performing at the beginning (level 1) or developing (level 2) learners, as shown on the Math EOG Assessment. • In 3rd grade, our SWD students performed at 27% (4 of 15 students assessed) proficiency on the Math EOG assessment. • In 5th grade, 21% (3 of 14 students assessed) of our ELL students performed at proficient levels on the Math EOG.
Beacon Assessment – Math **(Grade Level & Subgroups)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** • On the 1st grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated strengths in Measurement & Data Reasoning, with 87% (97 of 112 students assessed) performing at Near Target and Prepared. • On the 2nd grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated strengths in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning, with 80% (95 of 119 students assessed) performing at Near Target or Prepared. • On the 3rd grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated strengths in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning, with 100% performing at the Near Target. **EL:** • In 3rd grade, 95% (35 of 37 students assessed) of our ELL students performed in the Near Target category. **SWD:** • In 1st grade, 18% (3 of 17 students assessed) performed in the Prepared category.	**Grade Levels (all students):** • In grades K-5, based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 10% (73 of 732 students assessed) performed in the prepared category. • In 3rd grade, 0% (1 of 142 students assessed) performed in the prepared category. **EL:** • In grades 3 - 5, 0% (0 of 38 students assessed) performed in the prepared category. • In 4th grade, 54% (20 of 37 students assessed) performed in the Near Target category. **SWD:** • In 2nd grade, 8% (1 of 13 students assessed) performed in the prepared category. • In grades 3 – 5, 0% (0 of 29 students assessed) performed in the prepared category.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:	Root Cause Explanation:
☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	• Students K-5 are challenged with fluent numeracy skills in all operations (addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division).

Math Common Assessments	Grade Levels (all students):	Grade Levels (all students):
	• In kindergarten, common assessment data reflects that students performed at or above grade level in the following areas: Numerical Reasoning 58% (61 of 106 students assessed) Geometric and special reasoning 58% (61 of 106 students assessed) and Measurement and data (60% (64 of 106 students assessed). • In 1st grade, students performed well in measurement, patterning, comparing numbers, and addition within 10 with partitioning. • In 3rd grade, students performed well in numerical reasoning. Students either met or exceeded expectations. **EL:** **SWD:**	• In Kindergarten, students faced challenges in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning on their common summative assessments. 42% (55 of 106 students assessed) met the expected standard of proficiency. • In 2nd grade, students experienced ongoing challenges with numerical reasoning. Specifically in the areas of addition, subtraction, and understanding place value (particularly in the reading and writing of numbers in different forms). • In 3rd grade, common assessment data reflected that students needed further support in understanding patterning and algebraic reasoning. • In 4th grade, common assessment data reflected that students needed further support in navigating word problems, mastery of multiplication facts, division, and measurement skills. **EL:** • In grades K-5, common assessment data reflected challenges with vocabulary development being a major component for students not performing proficiently in grade-level common assessments. **SWD:**

	- In grades K-5, common assessment data reflected challenges with vocabulary development being a major component for students not performing proficiently in grade-level common assessments.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** - Common assessments may not have addressed the entirety of the standard expectation. - We need to build more professional capacity in utilizing standards-based tools to develop effective lesson plans. - Limited proficiency in numeracy comprehension. - Application of vocabulary to navigating word problems.
School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	Increase the number of students in **grades 1-2** performing at **Prepared** levels on the Beacon from 25% (58 of 228 students assessed) in March 2025 to 30% of students assessed in March 2026. Increase the number of students in **grades 3 -5** performing at **PROFICIENT** and **DISTINGUISHED** levels on the EOG from 42% (169 of 404 students assessed) in May 2025 to 47% of students assessed in May 2026.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Common assessments are not aligned to the rigor / DOK level of the standards.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* • K-5 teachers will use Common Formative Assessments to inform small group instruction weekly.	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of K-5 teachers will use Common Formative Assessments to inform small-group instruction weekly, as evidenced by instructional walks and lesson plans. **Implementation Plan:** Preplanning: 　o Provide professional learning on small group expectations. August-September: 　o Teachers participate in CCSD Assessment Department Modules about how to build effective common assessments that align with the rigor of the standard. August-December 　o Teachers use common assessments to provide student performance data to inform flexible group instruction January-March 　o Teachers participate in four CCSD Assessment Department in-person, PL sessions to examine and improve professional practice with common	**Evaluation Performance Target:** At least 80% of students will score 75% or higher on common summative assessments. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Common Summative Assessments **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ End of each unit **Data Analysis Plan:** CCCs: 　o Conduct item analysis of common assessments weekly during CCC meetings to identify student needs and make changes in whole/small group instruction. Leadership Team:	

assessment creation, usage, and data analysis.

January – May:
- o Teachers will use common assessment data to inform flexible small-group instruction.

Artifacts to be Collected:
- o Instructional walk-through forms
- o Small group lesson plans

Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
☐ Principal
☐ Assistant Principals
☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists

Frequency of Monitoring:
- o Monthly

- o Review CCC assessment data monthly to determine progress toward this goal and provide additional professional learning (PL) as needed.

Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
☐ Principal
☐ Assistant Principals
☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
☐ CCC Leads

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	We need to build more professional capacity in utilizing standards-based tools to develop effective lesson plans.		
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		

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

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
 	
☒ Gen Ed
☐ EL
☐ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
 	
2. Teachers will use the Georgia Learning Plans along with CCSD resources weekly for engagement in math instruction and exploration.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of K-5 teachers will use the Georgia DOE Learning Plans along with CCSD resources weekly for engagement in Math instruction and exploration, as evidenced by instructional walkthroughs.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	
	August
	  o Review the components of the CORE Package for mathematics, specifically the GADOE learning plans.
	
	September/October:
	  o Collaborative planning/Metro RESA – exploration tasks (real-world situations, hands-on problem solving), spiral reviews, and daily number sense routines
	
	November/December:
	  o Collaborative planning/Metro RESA
	
	February/March
	  o Collaborative planning/Metro RESA
	
	Artifacts to be Collected:
	  • Instructional walk-through forms
	  • Small group lesson plans
	
	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
	☐ Principal
	☐ Assistant Principals
	☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		At least 80% of students will score 75% or higher on common summative assessments.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		  • Common Summative Assessments
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☒ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☐ _____
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		
		CCCs:
		  o Conduct item analysis of common assessments weekly during CCC meetings to identify student needs and make changes in whole/small group instruction.
		
		Leadership Team:
		  o Review CCC assessment data monthly to determine progress toward this goal and provide additional professional learning (PL) as needed.
		
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
		☐ Principal
		☐ Assistant Principals
		☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
			Academic Coach

	Frequency of Monitoring: • Monthly	☐ CCC Leads	

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement *(Required Components)*			
Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	**Date(s) Scheduled**	**Date Completed**	**"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed**
1. *Required* Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline: September 30, 2025 Parents will learn about Title I, including how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, descriptions of the curriculum and assessments used, our school's compacts and policies, the professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement, such as the use of the family resource center.	**9/4/25**		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. *Required* Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline: November 3, 2025 Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	**Conference Week 10/13- 10/17**		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3 *Required* Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline: April 30, 2026 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.	**4/1/26**		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. *Required* TWO Building Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) – Deadlines: September 26, 2025, and February 16, 2026 Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of parents' contributions, including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between parents and the school.	**9/9/25** **2/10/26**		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
5.*Required* Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. **Briefly describe the transition activities here:** **Transition to Clarkdale:** On the fourth day of KinderCamp, parents are invited to attend a special presentation that showcases what their children have learned and experienced during the week, helping to prepare both students and their families for a successful start to the school year. Clarkdale has a Spring orientation for families of upcoming kindergarten students. At this orientation, we share information about the school (beginning time, lunches, policies, etc.). The counselor and support staff are available to offer suggestions on how to make the transition to elementary school. **Transition to Cooper or Garrett Middle Schools**: The counselors escort rising 6th graders on field trips to visit the schools.	Kindergarten Transition: 7/24/25; April 2026 5th Grade Transition March 2026; April 2026; May 2026		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

Clarkdale advertises rising 6th-grade events sponsored by the middle schools. A representative from our school attends the events. Clarkdale advertises rising 6th-grade summer camps sponsored by the middle schools.		
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d*	**List documents translated for parents:** Family Compacts School Policy	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities *(Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)*							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	**"Shall" Addressed**	**Goal(s) Addressed**	**Resources**	**Funding Source(s)** *SWP Checklist 5.e*	**Date**	**How is the activity monitored and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.**	**Team Lead**
Math Night- Families will meet at a local grocery store (Location to be determined). This event highlights the connection between math literacy and the real world. We will have a standards-based activity for each family to complete based on the grade level of each student participant. Teachers will attend and facilitate learning.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office Supplies (Paper, Folders, Pencils, clipboards…)_	Title I	Nov. 6, 2025	Math Night will be monitored using attendance sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Parent Facilitator Academic Coach Academic Committee Members
Literacy Night- Families will meet at the South Cobb Regional Library to participate in engaging activities. Library staff and Clarkdale Teachers will lead small group presentations to acclimate families to all the literacy resources the library has to offer.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office Supplies (Paper, Folders, Pencils, clipboards…)_	Title I	TBD	Literacy Night will be monitored using attendance sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Parent Facilitator Academic Coach Academic Committee Members
STEAM Night- Families come to the school to participate in a night of engagement and fun. Each of the letters in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Math) is represented through hands-on learning activities.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office Supplies (Paper, Folders, Pencils, clipboards…)_	Title I Partners in Education CCSD: STEM-STEAM Innovation Dept. Science Depart.	May 7, 2026	STEAM Night will be monitored through attendance sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Parent Facilitator Academic Coach Academic Committee Members

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 remain 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 mid-year 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 posts the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages.** *SWP Checklist 5(d)*

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

- **Title II provides professional learning support to our teachers. The resources provide educators with tools to learn and implement current, evidence-based practices.**

- **Title III funds support language proficiency through resources, including teacher and student materials, digital learning programs, and professional learning for Teachers of English Language Learners. It also provides resources and substitute teachers, enabling educators to engage in job-embedded professional learning to acquire Arts Integration and STEAM strategies and deepen student learning.**

- **CCSD supports Clarkdale's plan to utilize Extended Day funds to provide specific interventions (i.e., after-school tutoring) for students striving to meet and exceed state standards.**

- **The Office of Student Assistance supports the school's implementation of the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support Program (PBIS).**

- **Partners in Education provide resources (human and financial) to support family engagement, student encouragement, and literacy and math initiatives.**

- **Title I supports Clarkdale's participation in the following CCSD initiatives: Effective implementation of the 120-minute Literacy Block, Teacher participation in the 2-year literacy training: Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS), and i-Ready, a digital literacy resource.**

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

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

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

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Teachers actively participate in Collaborative Teams (CTs) on a weekly basis to regularly monitor student progress toward meeting state standards. In addition to this ongoing collaboration, the school conducts quarterly data analyses to examine key indicators, including Beacon results, common formative assessments, and i-Ready data, to monitor student progress.

The Cobb Teaching and Learning System (CTLS), particularly CTLS Assess, is utilized for continuous monitoring of student performance and achievement. I-Ready assessments are administered to ESOL students. Results from various district assessments, including i-Ready, formative, and summative evaluations, are regularly reviewed. Our local School Academic Coach will meet with the Administrative Team and periodically collaborate with Title I Supervisors and District Title I Coaches to assess progress toward achieving school improvement goals outlined in the plan.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: **The school utilizes the GaDOE CCRPI indicators (Content Mastery, Progress, and Closing the Gap) measurable tools to monitor academic progress. These metrics enable us to establish performance targets for the upcoming year. Additionally, EOG scores and domain data, ACCESS scores, and performance on common formative and summative assessments provide valuable data for Collaborative Teams (CTs) to identify and address the content-specific needs of students.**

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: **Each year, the Title I Supervisor conducts a mid-year monitoring meeting to review the progress of implementation and monitoring plans. At the school level, Collaborative Teams (CTs) meet regularly to assess student progress, discuss instructional strategies, and determine appropriate next steps. Weekly meetings between the Administrative Team and the Academic Coach will support ongoing monitoring and alignment. As we implement each action step, we will evaluate its effectiveness and make adjustments as needed to ensure continued progress.**

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

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

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

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

For students who continue to perform below grade-level expectations after moving through all tiers of service, our CSOS Specialist collaborates with the Parent/Guardian, Tutors, Teachers, the Student Support Specialist, and the Psychologist to determine the next steps. This committee determines whether the data suggests that students should undergo professional assessments to determine eligibility for instructional support through an Individualized Education Program (IEP). If the consensus is no to a request for diagnostic testing, the committee discusses ways to support the student through CSOS. If the testing proceeds, the committee reconvenes with the results to decide the student's next steps. If the data shows the student is eligible for special education services, a new committee is formed under the leadership of the Student Support Specialist Administrator. That committee, which includes the child's Parent/Guardian, will decide the next steps. If they agree that an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) is necessary, they will collaborate to develop it, and a Special Education Teacher will provide instructional support for the student.

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: At Clarkdale Elementary, professional learning is designed to meet the needs of all teachers across grade levels and content areas. With the support of one Academic Coach, along with administrators and teacher leaders, we work collaboratively to plan, deliver, assess, and reflect on high-quality instruction. Our Academic Coach uses teacher feedback and instructional data to guide professional learning topics and provide targeted support. Teachers also have opportunities to attend conferences and workshops aligned to their professional goals, supported through District, Title I, Title II, and local funding. Learning sessions were offered on Digital Learning Days, covering CTLS, Ellevation, Progress Learning, and PBIS. Targeted support was also provided to IRR teachers, ELA teachers using i-Ready. New teacher support is tailored to individual experience. First-year teachers and teachers new to their role attended monthly professional learning sessions. Schoolwide professional learning topics are identified during the summer leadership retreat through collaboration

between administration and the BLT. Clarkdale works closely with District Title I staff to support our school improvement goals, deliver professional learning, model strategies, analyze data, and ensure curriculum, instruction, and assessments are aligned.

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: Clarkdale Elementary School offers a Kindergarten Camp the week before pre-planning to help ease the transition into school for incoming Kindergarten students. This four-day camp offers students a half-day experience led by kindergarten teachers, enabling them to become familiar with the school environment, routines, and learning activities. On the fourth day, parents are invited to attend a special presentation that showcases what their children have learned and experienced during the week, helping to prepare both students and their families for a successful start to the school year. 5th-grade students attend a field trip to our feeder middle schools (Cooper and Garrett Middle School) and participate in the activities created by the middle school for them. We use our communication platform to share information about any middle school activities being offered during the summer to support the transition.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:
N/A

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

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

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals
SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)

Position	Supports Goal(s)	Supports which system(s)	How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?
Cheryl Bush	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The Parent Facilitator will deliver professional learning opportunities for faculty focused on effectively engaging families to support and enhance student achievement. Additionally, the Parent Facilitator will maintain all documentation required for Title I Family Engagement compliance
Katy Laine	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The Academic Coach will support teachers across content areas by providing professional learning, modeling effective instructional strategies, and offering timely and constructive feedback to enhance classroom practice.
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	

	School Improvement Goals *Include goals on the parent compacts and policy*
Goal #1	Increase the number of students in grades 1 -2 performing at **PREPARED** levels on the Beacon assessment from 37% (84 of 228 students assessed) in March 2025 to 44% of students assessed in March 2026. Increase the number of students in grades 3 -5 performing at **PROFICIENT** and **DISTINGUISHED** levels on the EOG from 33% (133 of 402 students assessed) in May 2025 to 40% of students assessed in May 2026.
Goal #2	Increase the number of students in **grades 1-2** performing at **Prepared** levels on the Beacon from 25% (58 of 228 students assessed) in March 2025 to 30% of students assessed in March 2026. Increase the number of students in **grades 3 -5** performing at **PROFICIENT** and **DISTINGUISHED** levels on the EOG from 42% (169 of 404 students assessed) in May 2025 to 47% of students assessed in May 2026.
Goal #3	
Goal #4	