

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Austell Elementary School
Principal Name:	Dr. Kahliah C. Rachel
Date Submitted:	June 1, 2026
Revision Date(s):	

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

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>
School Response: Our Schoolwide Improvement Plan was built as a team effort, with input from everyone responsible for its implementation. Stakeholders included the principal, assistant principal, instructional support specialist, teacher representatives, and parents through the PTA and Principal's Advisory Board. Together, we held three work sessions on April 14, April 21, and April 28, 2026, where teachers and staff reviewed schoolwide assessment data, identified root causes behind current performance trends, and selected interventions to address our priority areas. During these sessions, stakeholders reviewed current academic data, reflected on progress toward last year's goals, and provided feedback that shaped the development of our 2026–27 goals. The process was grounded in collaboration and shared ownership, ensuring that the voices and expertise of those closest to our students were at the center of our planning.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are 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 for participating in 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 need for 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:	4/14/2026	4/21/2026	4/28/2026
Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature	Signature
Dr. Kahliah Rachel / Principal	Dr. Kahliah Rachel	Dr. Kahliah Rachel	Dr. Kahliah Rachel
Dr. Lashonda Smith / Asst. Principal	Dr. Lashonda Smith	Dr. Lashonda Smith	Dr. Lashonda Smith
Ms. Ashley Trice / SSA	Ashley Trice	Ashley Trice	Ashley Trice
Dr. Benjamin Green / Academic Coach	Dr. Benjamin Green	Dr. Benjamin Green	Dr. Benjamin Green
Dr. Gretchen Kea / Guidance Counselor	Dr. Gretchen Kea	Dr. Gretchen Kea	Dr. Gretchen Kea
Mrs. Noel O'Brien / Media Specialist	Noel O'Brien	Noel O'Brien	Noel O'Brien
LaTosha Smithers – Hall / Parent Facilitator	LaTosha Smithers - Hall	LaTosha Smithers - Hall	LaTosha Smithers - Hall
Megan Barton / Music Specialist	Megan Barton	Megan Barton	Megan Barton
Darilynn Bernard / SPED	Darilynn Bernard	Darilynn Bernard	Darilynn Bernard
Heather Chancellor / Kindergarten	Heather Chancellor	Heather Chancellor	Heather Chancellor
Tanisha Allen / First Grade	Tanisha Allen	Tanisha Allen	Tanisha Allen
Ashlee Abley / Second Grade	Ashlee Abley	Ashlee Abley	Ashlee Abley
Cynthia Bazille / Third Grade	Cynthia Bazille	Cynthia Bazille	Cynthia Bazille
Melissa Grigdesby / Fourth Grade	Melissa Grigdesby	Melissa Grigdesby	Melissa Grigdesby
Tanya Lodge / Fifth Grade	Tanya Lodge	Tanya Lodge	Tanya Lodge

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the average Reading Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades 1–2 will increase by at least 20 points from the Fall 2025 baseline administration to the Spring 2026 administration, with targeted support for students performing below grade level to accelerate growth. By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 performing at proficient or above, as measured by the EOG ELA Milestones assessment will increase from 38% (67 out of 177 students) in the Spring of 2025 to 43% in the Spring of 2026.																																							
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially																																								
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr> <th colspan="5" style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">DRC BEACON ELA SCALE SCORE GROWTH</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">Grade Level</th><th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">Fall Scale Score Average</th><th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">Winter Scale Score Average</th><th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">Spring Scale Score Average</th><th style="background-color: #e1f5fe;">Scale Score Growth (Fall – Spring)</th></tr> <tr> <td>1st</td><td>433</td><td>471</td><td>488</td><td>+55</td></tr> <tr> <td>2nd</td><td>462</td><td>502</td><td>526</td><td>+64</td></tr> <tr> <td>3rd</td><td>374</td><td>367</td><td>396</td><td>+22</td></tr> <tr> <td>4th</td><td>417</td><td>434</td><td>452</td><td>+35</td></tr> <tr> <td>5th</td><td>432</td><td>452</td><td>465</td><td>+33</td></tr> </table>					DRC BEACON ELA SCALE SCORE GROWTH					Grade Level	Fall Scale Score Average	Winter Scale Score Average	Spring Scale Score Average	Scale Score Growth (Fall – Spring)	1 st	433	471	488	+55	2 nd	462	502	526	+64	3 rd	374	367	396	+22	4 th	417	434	452	+35	5 th	432	452	465	+33
DRC BEACON ELA SCALE SCORE GROWTH																																								
Grade Level	Fall Scale Score Average	Winter Scale Score Average	Spring Scale Score Average	Scale Score Growth (Fall – Spring)																																				
1 st	433	471	488	+55																																				
2 nd	462	502	526	+64																																				
3 rd	374	367	396	+22																																				
4 th	417	434	452	+35																																				
5 th	432	452	465	+33																																				
Reflecting on Outcomes																																								
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Our goal was met in grades 1 and 2, however, Milestones ELA scores were not available for grades 3-5. Data in Grades 3 through 5 indicate that scale score growth exceeded 20 points in each grade.																																							

If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	This year, our school implemented the Wonders reading series in grades K-5 and U.F.L.I. for phonics in grades K-2, both grounded in the Science of Reading, to strengthen literacy instruction across all grade levels. Teachers provided explicit, structured instruction in reading, writing, vocabulary, and phonics, ensuring students received consistent, research-backed lessons every day. To further support our readers, we hired Title I tutors to provide additional one-on-one and small-group support, and students in grades K–1 received dedicated small-group pullout sessions focused on phonics to build their foundational reading skills. Our 21 st Century World Changers program provided extended day tutoring to identified students in reading four days per week.
---	---

Previous Year's Goal #2	A. By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the average Math Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades K–2 will increase by at least 50 points from the Fall 2025 benchmark to the Spring 2026 benchmark, with particular focus on subgroups performing below the 40th percentile. B. By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of students in Grades 3-5 performing proficient or above in Mathematics as measured by the EOG Math Milestones assessment will increase from 41% (72 out of 176 students) in the Spring of 2025 to 46% in the Spring of 2026.
--------------------------------	--

Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially				
---	--	--	--	--

What data supports the outcome of the goal?	DRC BEACON SCALE SCORE GROWTH – MATH				
	Grade Level	Fall Scale Score Average	Winter Scale Score Average	Spring Scale Score Average	Growth
	Kindergarten			423	-
	1 st	433	470	508	+75
	2 nd	453	502	526	+73
	3 rd	334	362	371	+37
	4 th	375	398	410	+35
	5 th	407	430	446	+39

Reflecting on Outcomes
--

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Our goal was met in grades 1 and 2, however, Milestones math scores will not be available unit Summer 2026. Data in Grades 3 through 5 indicate that scale score growth exceeded 20 points in each grade.
---	---

If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	In math, teachers emphasized the use of hands-on manipulatives and real-world problem solving to help students develop a deeper understanding of mathematical concepts. Title I tutors were also utilized in math to provide additional support to students who needed it most. Students in grades 2–5 participated in small-group pullout sessions targeting key math skills, and a Math Lab was established for students in grades 3–5 to provide focused, intensive practice in math skills and problem solving. Our 21st Century World Changers program provided extended day tutoring to identify students in math four days per week.
---	---

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

ELA DATA			
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	30.7	37.5	
4 th Grade	42.0	42.0	
5 th Grade	39.3	45.8	

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Foundations			Language			Texts			Interpreting Texts			Constructing Texts		
	Support Needed (Add Bands)	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	17	20	25	23	22	17	16	27	19	14	31	17	27	15	20
2 nd Grade	10	36	28	17	15	23	18	22	15	15	16	24	15	27	13

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade	18	34	7	5	39	11	8	51	8	25	36	7	13	47	7	11	33	8	12	42	8
4 th Grade	13	37	12	10	39	13	9	40	13	18	35	9	13	36	13	8	43	11	14	40	8
5 th Grade	15	32	17	11	41	12	13	37	14	16	40	8	11	44	9	12	44	8	10	42	12

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Student Groups) Data will not be available until Fall 2026	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Student groups)	Grade Levels (all students): • 2nd Grade Foundations – High Near Target (36) shows a strong pipeline of students close to proficiency. • 3rd–5th Grade Interpreting Texts: Techniques – Strong Near Target numbers (39, 41) indicate many upper grades students are nearly meeting standard. • 2nd Grade Language – Highest Prepared count (23) in K-2 shows relative strength in language skills. EL: • 2nd Grade Foundations – EL students likely benefiting from foundational literacy routines, showing developing decoding skills with growth potential toward Prepared.	Grade Levels (all students): • 1st Grade Interpreting Texts – High Near Target (31) but low Prepared (17) suggests students are stalling just below proficiency. • 3rd Grade Language: Vocabulary – Near Target of 51 is the highest single value in the dataset, flagging vocabulary as a major school-wide concern. • 4th & 5th Grade Constructing Texts: Grammar Conventions – Near Target counts of 40 and 42 paired with very low Prepared (8 and 12) indicate widespread difficulty reaching mastery in writing conventions. EL: • 3rd Grade Language: Vocabulary – EL students likely overrepresented in Near Target (51); academic vocabulary across content areas is a priority.

	• 2nd Grade Language – Relative strength in language skills suggests EL students are responding well to contextual vocabulary and language instruction. SWD: • 2nd Grade Foundations – Strong Near Target pipeline indicates SWD are accessing foundational instruction and making progress toward proficiency. • 2nd Grade Language – Highest Prepared count in K–2 suggests SWD are demonstrating measurable language skill gains.	SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Students need explicit instruction in reading comprehension skills and strategies to fill instructional gaps in Wonders reading curriculum. Students need extended opportunities to apply the writing process, techniques, grammar skills, and research skills when constructive texts. Students need ongoing opportunities to practice and apply early literacy skills in grades K-2 (phonemic awareness, blending, Segmenting, encoding) and morphology in grades 3-5.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: • Students performed well overall despite the redesigned 2025-26 ACCESS assessment, which WIDA has designated as a new baseline (prior year scores are not comparable) • 13 students successfully exited the ESOL program this year through reclassification and the regular exiting process • Last year, 17 students exited — while the number is slightly lower this year, the	Grade Levels (all students): EL: • 23% of students scored between 1.5–2.4 in the Speaking domain, placing them at the Entering or Emerging proficiency levels • 38% of students scored between 1.0–1.9 in the Writing domain, also categorized as Entering or Emerging proficiency levels • Implementation of ELLEVATION strategies is recommended and believed to significantly reduce the number of students performing at the lowest proficiency levels in both Speaking and Writing

	redesigned assessment and new baseline context makes this a strong outcome SWD:	SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers need ongoing professional development on use of ELlevation strategies to support speaking, writing, and acquisition of vocabulary for EL learners. - EL learners must have intentional opportunities to engage with academic language through speaking, listening, and vocabulary development, supported by scaffolds and structured protocols that build both language acquisition and content mastery.	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten: 70% of kindergarten students scored proficient or advanced on <i>Wonders</i> Unit 6 assessment (Vocabulary – Standard KLV3b) 75% of kindergarten students scored proficient in identifying high-frequency words on <i>Wonders</i> Unit 5 assessment 1st Grade: 63% of 1st Grade students scored proficient or advanced on story elements and predicting on <i>Wonders</i> Progress Monitoring Weeks 1 and 2. - First grade teachers observe that students are increasing their ability to look back in the text during assessments. 2nd Grade 2nd grade students had an average score of 72% on <i>Wonders</i> Progress Monitoring Unit 4, Week 2 (vocabulary/setting/plot/compare and contrast/cause-and-effect). 3rd Grade 3rd grade students had an average score of 69% on Units 3, Week 4 Progress Monitoring Assessment (character’s perspective)	Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten: 70% of students scored below proficiency on <i>Wonders</i> Unit 6 Assessment (Standard KTT2a – Main Topic) 1st Grade: 33% of 1st grade students have difficulty applying phonics patterns and sounds when encoding on UFLI assessments 2nd Grade 2nd grade students had an average score of 46% on <i>Wonder</i> Progress Monitoring Unit 2, Week 2 (vocabulary, compare/contrast, text features) 3rd Grade 4th Grade: 33% of fourth graders need support in identifying Authors Perspective 51% of 5th grade students scored below proficiency on <i>Wonders</i> Unit 4, Week 5 Progress Monitoring Assessment (poetic techniques/theme/figurative language) EL:

	3rd grade students had an average score of 70% on comparing/contrasting skill on Week 4 Progress Monitoring Assessment 4th Grade: 90% of 4th grade students scored proficient in vocabulary (Greek and Latin Roots) according to Wonders assessments. 5th Grade: 84% of 5th grade students scored proficient on <i>Wonders</i> Unit 5, Week 3 Progress Monitoring Assessment (predictions; inferences; analyze narrative elements and how they contribute to plot; compare/contrast stories of same genre) EL: SWD:	1st Grade EL students have difficulty applying phonics patterns and sounds when encoding on UFLI assessments 4th Grade EL students need support in comprehension and vocabulary (Greek and Latin roots) SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers need to extend Wonders vocabulary beyond the ELA block; students need repeated exposure to academic language across subjects. - Comprehension strategies (especially inference) not consistently scaffolded - Teachers may need additional support in structured literacy and explicit writing instruction - Teachers need to incorporate regular dictation protocols to reinforce phonics skills through encoding; students need more structured time to apply phonics knowledge through writing words and sentences from dictation.	

School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) • What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during ELA walks? • What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during ELA walks?	• 100% Tier 1 resource fidelity — Wonders and UFLI used correctly in every observed lesson • Most classrooms (8/13) showed strong student talk time at 50–100% • Close reading routines evident school-wide — annotation, text evidence, and higher-order questioning observed • K-1 phonics instruction on track with hands-on UFLI encoding activities	• Critical block components under-observed — only 1 walk each for writing and small group instruction • 3 classrooms had minimal student talk (0–25%), indicating teacher-dominated instruction
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Wonders curriculum has many components, and it is challenging for teachers to fit all components into the literacy block. • Some teachers lack clarity on how to structure student talk and small group instruction within the block, suggesting a need for more targeted coaching and modeling. • Revise walkthrough calendar that ensures equitable coverage across all grade levels and block components to produce reliable, actionable instructional data.	
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	By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the average Reading Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades 1–3 will increase by at least 20 points from the Fall 2026 baseline administration to the Spring 2027 administration, with targeted support for students performing below grade level to accelerate growth. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the percentage of students in grades 3-5 performing at proficient or above, as measured by the EOG ELA Milestones assessment will increase from _____ (____ out of ____ students) in the Spring of 2026 to ____% in the Spring of 2027.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need ongoing opportunities to practice and apply early literacy skills in grades K-2 (phonemic awareness, blending, Segmenting, encoding) and morphology in grades 3-5. Teachers need to incorporate regular dictation protocols to reinforce phonics skills through encoding; students need more structured time to apply phonics knowledge through writing words and sentences from dictation.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of K-2 Teachers will implement high-leverage instructional routines in phonemic awareness and phonics during the 120-minute literacy block. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Teachers will receive training on Foundations domain of ELA Standards and UFLI Resources. August-September: Professional Development on High-Leverage Instructional Routines for Word Learning		Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of K-2 students will score proficient or above on Wonders/UFLI unit assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): District Assessments OR Amira Assessment Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☒ Every other month
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>			
	Wonders Instructional Routines Book UFLI		

1. Teachers in grades K-2 will implement high-leverage instructional routines in phonemic awareness and phonics during 120-minute ELA Block.	• October-May: Full implementation of high-leverage word recognition strategies and walk-throughs. Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson Plans, Pacing Guides Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Quarterly	☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: K-2 teachers and administration will analyze data during Cobb Collaborative Communities using the 4 Guiding Questions. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need ongoing opportunities to practice and apply early literacy skills in grades K-2 (phonemic awareness, blending, Segmenting, encoding) and morphology in grades 3-5. Teachers need to extend Wonders vocabulary beyond the ELA block; students need repeated exposure to academic language across subjects.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 3-5 Teachers will implement high-leverage, morphology instructional routines for developing academic vocabulary daily as evidenced by lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: Grade levels will demonstrate an average of 75% or higher on Wonders Common Assessments.	Wonders Instructional Routines Handbooks
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Teachers will receive training on Shifting the Balance high-leverage morphology instructional routines and Wonders Reading Curriculum. August-September: Professional Development on Wonders High-Leverage Instructional Routines for Word Learning. October- May: Full implementation of high-leverage instructional routines to build background knowledge and vocabulary.	Evaluation Tool(s): Wonders Common Assessments	CTLS Vocabulary Resources
☒ 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>			
2. Teachers in grades 3-5 will use high-leverage instructional routines to develop students' academic vocabulary daily across subjects during the 120-minute literary block.	Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson Plans, Pacing Guides Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Daily	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	District Pacing Guides

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need extended opportunities to apply the writing process, techniques, grammar skills, and research skills when constructive texts.		
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 Analytical Writing Routine to provide explicit writing instruction as evidenced by lesson plans and/or instructional walks.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of K-5 students will score proficient on quarterly writing tasks as measured by teacher-created/district-provided rubrics.	Wonders Curriculum Resources The Writing Rope Framework
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Teachers will receive training on ELA Standards, Wonders and UFLI Resources. August-September: Academic Coach will provide professional learning on Wonders Instructional Routines for Writing. October-May: Teachers will plan units for narrative, expository, opinion, and research using the Writing Framework and CTLS Resources.	Evaluation Tool(s): Wonders Writing Rubrics	
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☒ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: Grade Level teams will analyze student writing pieces for each unit using the CCC Process and adjust whole/small group writing instruction, as needed.	
3. K-5 teachers will implement the Analytical Writing Routine in writing instruction 3-5 times weekly.	Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students need explicit instruction in reading comprehension skills and strategies to fill instructional gaps in Wonders reading curriculum.			
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 and support staff will provide small group instruction at least three times per week in reading.	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 small groups will demonstrate growth on the DRC BEACON diagnostic by end of year.	DRC Beacon i-Ready Diagnostic Title I Tutors 21st Century Tutors	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: Admin CCC will identify baseline BEACON data, establish small group scheduling structures, and prepare teacher professional development on data analysis and small group instructional routines. • August-September: Administer beginning-of-year DRC BEACON diagnostic. Teachers analyze results with coaches during CCCs, form flexible small groups by skill strand, and begin small group instruction routines. • October-December: Teachers deliver small group reading instruction a minimum of three times per week. Coach conduct classroom observations and provide feedback. Teams monitor progress and adjust groups during monthly CCC data meetings. • January-February: Administer mid-year DRC BEACON diagnostics. Teachers and coaches review growth data, regroup students as needed, and intensify support for students showing minimal growth. • March-April: Continue small group instruction with refined groupings. Coaches increase observation frequency for teachers needing additional support. Teams identify students at risk of not meeting end-of-year benchmarks and adjust interventions accordingly. • May: Administer end-of-year DRC BEACON diagnostic. Teachers and coach analyze growth data to measure	Evaluation Tool(s): • DRC BEACON Diagnostic Assessment • Classroom observation walk-through forms • CCC data meeting notes and grouping rosters		
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____		
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: Teachers and instructional coach will review BEACON score reports during scheduled CCC meetings following each diagnostic window. Data will be used to regroup students, adjust instructional focus by skill strand, and identify students requiring intensified Tier 3 support.		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads
(4) Teachers and support staff in grades K–5 will provide differentiated small group reading instruction at a minimum of three times per week, using common assessments, DRC BEACON ELA and i-Ready data to guide instruction.				

	action step outcomes and document lessons learned to inform next year's planning. Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson Plans, Instructional Walk thru Data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly		
--	---	--	--

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	33.8	44.0	
4 th Grade	50.8	35.0	
5 th Grade		47.0	

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kindergarten (Winter Administration)	19	38	9	28	25	9	41	18	7	35	25	6
1 st Grade	16	25	20	16	29	16	4	24	33	15	25	21
2 nd Grade	13	13	27	14	28	11	19	20	14	3	20	31
3 rd Grade	6	59	2	9	53	3	16	48	1	12	51	2
4 th Grade	20	40	2	9	40	3	23	36	3	22	38	2
5 th Grade	31	29	4	33	28	3	26	36	2	28	30	6

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Grade Level & Student Groups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Achievement Levels 2-4: 3rd Grade – 74.2% 4th Grade – 79.0% 5th Grade – 73.8%	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 5th grade: - Slight increase from 71.2%, still below 79.0% in 2023-2024 3rd Grade: - Achievement score dropped from 66.1 to 59.1. - Levels 2-4 dropped from 82.1% to 74.2%

	Math 3rd Grade Level 4s increased from 4.8% to 12.1% over two years. Combined Math 3rd-5th Level 4s rose from 8.0% to 11.9%. EL: SWD:	- More students shifted into level 1. EL: - Students need multiple representations for mathematical concepts and content area vocabulary strategies SWD: - Students need multiple representations for mathematical concepts and content area vocabulary strategies
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Student Groups)	2nd grade shows the strongest "Prepared" numbers across all four domains, particularly in Geometric & Spatial Reasoning (31) 5th grade has the highest "Prepared" count in Numerical Reasoning (4) among upper grades and shows growth in Geometric & Spatial (6) 1st grade shows a solid distribution with meaningful "Prepared" numbers across all domains (16–33)	- Kindergarten has critically high "Support Needed" numbers across all domains (highlighted in yellow/green), with Measurement & Data at 41 and Geometric & Spatial at 35 3rd–5th grades have very low "Prepared" counts (mostly 2–4 students), signaling a significant proficiency gap in upper grades 3rd grade has large "Near Target" clusters (48–59) but almost no students reaching "Prepared," suggesting students are stalling just below mastery 5th grade has 31 students in "Support Needed" for Numerical Reasoning
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	- Unfinished learning from earlier grades is compounding over time, with K-2 foundational gaps surfacing as deficits in upper grade numerical and algebraic reasoning. - Teachers need to provide students with additional opportunities to practice, apply, and reinforce math skills through spiral review. - Students lack consistent and structured opportunities to practice and develop the Standards for Mathematical Practice, particularly in the areas of problem solving and mathematical reasoning, across daily instructional routines.	
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten 88% of students scored proficient or advanced on Unit 5 test (counting forward to 100 and backward from 20) 75% of students scored proficient or advanced on Unit 5 test (composing and decomposing tens/ones). 1st Grade 53% of students scored proficient or advanced on Unit 5 Pre-Assessment (Addition and Subtraction) 3rd Grade 96% of students scored proficient on using place value to compare numbers (Unit 4 Post Test) 70% average on Unit 2 Post Test (exploring multiplication) 2nd Grade 2nd grade students had an average of 79% on Unit 8 Post Test (numerical patterns and growing patterns) 4th Grade: 76.81% average on Unit 4B Post (Decimals and fractions) - Represent, read, and write fractions with denominators of 10 and 100 using decimal notation (Unit4B Post 87% average) - Using four operations to solve problems involving metric measurement to the nearest minute (Unit 4B post 79% average score) 5th Grade:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten 65% of students scored below proficiency on coin values (pennies nickels, and dimes - Unit 5 test) 1st Grade - Teachers observe that students have difficulty attempting to apply math strategies on common assessments. 2nd Grade 2nd students had an average score of 65% on Unit 6 Post Test (2-D shapes, partitioning, equal shares, growing/shrinking patterns) 4th Grade: - Equivalent Fractions and Addition of Fractions with 10 and 100 (68% average score) - Compare two decimal numbers to the hundredths place (70% average score) 5th Grade 66% average on Unit 5 Mid (Fractions – adding/subtracting fractions and mixed numbers with unlike denominators; comparing and ordering fractions) EL: 69% of EL students scored below grade level on Unit4B Post Test (Decimals and Fractions)

	80% average on Unit 5 Post (Fractions – adding/subtracting fractions and mixed numbers with unlike denominators; comparing and ordering fractions) EL: SWD: 4th grade SWD's scored 72% compared to students without disabilities on Unit 4B Post	SWD: Kindergarten teachers observe that students have difficulty retaining important information in a question to solve a mathematical problem.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers need to provide students with additional opportunities to engage with rigorous math tasks that promote mathematical practices. - Instruction may be prioritizing coverage over depth, leaving many students at "Near Target" without the intentional push needed to reach "Prepared"	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during walks? What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during walks?	- The K–5 math block is well-managed, structured, and aligned, with strong use of small groups and ample time for practice. However, it currently leans more toward procedural fluency and task completion than deep conceptual understanding and mathematical discourse. - Learning targets are consistently communicated — 100% of classrooms had targets either posted, referenced, or both - Most observations (13/17) showed instruction fully aligned to the standard	- No reflection observed in any classroom — zero out of 17 walks captured the closing/reflection component of the lesson - Increasing the use of high-leverage teaching practices, such as building procedural fluency from conceptual understanding, presents a strong opportunity to deepen student mathematical thinking and accelerate growth across all grade levels

	• Student mathematical practices are evident — problem-solving and precision were the most observed practices • A few standout classrooms showed strong discourse, hands-on strategies, and vocabulary-rich instruction (noted in comments)	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Establishing a structured walkthrough schedule that targets all phases of the instructional block will ensure leadership captures a complete and accurate picture of instruction across every classroom. • Increase time and quality of the Explore and Reflection phases schoolwide. • Students need more opportunities to strengthen hands-on, conceptual learning in small groups • Embed student discourse throughout the entire lesson, not just at the beginning • Expand use of multiple representations and manipulatives during the math block.	
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	A. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the average Math Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades K–3 will increase by at least 50 points from the Fall 2026 benchmark to the Spring 2027 benchmark, with particular focus on subgroups performing below the 40th percentile. B. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the percentage of students in Grades 4th-5th performing proficient or above in Mathematics, as measured by the EOG Math Milestone assessment, will increase from 39.1% (50 out of 128 students) in the Spring to 42.2% in the Spring of 2027 (54 out of 128). *4 more students		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students lack consistent and structured opportunities to practice and develop the Standards for Mathematical Practice, particularly in the areas of problem solving and mathematical reasoning, across daily instructional routines.		
Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26	Evaluation Plan SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By May, 100% of K–5 teachers will consistently implement the Three Reads problem-solving routine during daily math instruction, Implementation Plan: August–September: Introduce Three Reads routine through grade-level PD and CCC modeling. Teachers begin embedding the routine into daily math instruction with coaching support. Coach model lessons and co-teach as needed. October–December: Teachers implement Three Reads daily during math instruction. Coaches conduct regular	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of students will demonstrate proficiency in math problem-solving as measured by Cobb Core assessments and teacher-collected work samples by end of year. Evaluation Tool(s): - Cobb Core Math Package assessments - Student work samples from Three Reads tasks - Classroom observation walk-through forms - PLC meeting notes and data logs	Routines for Reasoning SWIV’L Video DRC Beacon i-Ready Diagnostic
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)			

1. K-5 Teachers will implement Three Reads problem-solving routines during daily math instruction in conjunction with Cobb Core Math Package Resources.	observations and provide feedback. Grade-level teams share student work samples and reflect on routine fidelity during PLCs. January–February: Mid-year review of implementation data and student performance. Coaches identify teachers needing additional support and provide targeted coaching cycles. Teams refine their use of Cobb Core Math Package resources alongside the routine. March–April: Continue daily implementation with increased student independence in the routine. Teams analyze math assessment data to measure impact on problem-solving proficiency and adjust instructional approaches as needed. May: End-of-year reflection on routine implementation and student outcome data. Document best practices and plan for sustainment and refinement in the following school year. Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson Plans, Pacing Guides, Instructional Walk Data, SWIV’L Video Artifacts Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Teachers and coaches will review assessment data and work samples during scheduled PLC meetings. Data will be used to monitor routine fidelity, adjust instructional pacing, and identify students needing additional problem-solving support. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Unfinished learning from earlier grades is compounding over time, with K-2 foundational gaps surfacing as deficits in upper grade numerical and algebraic reasoning. • Teachers need to provide students with additional opportunities to practice, apply, and reinforce math skills through spiral review.		
Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26	Evaluation Plan SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By May, 100% of K–5 teachers will consistently implement a daily spiral review routine during math instruction, as evidenced by a minimum score of 3 out of 4 on the classroom observation walk-through tool aligned to the spiral review protocol.		DRC Beacon Math i-Ready Diagnostic Assessment
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:		
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD	Preplanning: Administrators and coach create a classroom look-for observation tool to monitor implementation fidelity.		
Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(iii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)	August–September: Introduce spiral review routine through grade-level PD and CCC modeling. Teachers begin embedding the daily routine into math instruction. Coach model and co-teach to support launch and ensure consistent implementation across all grade levels.		
2. K–5 teachers will implement a daily spiral review routine during math instruction using to reinforce previously taught standards and maintain student retention of grade-level math concepts.	October–May: Teachers implement spiral review daily throughout the remainder of the school year. Coach conduct ongoing observations and provide feedback on pacing, standard selection, and student engagement. Grade-level teams review student performance trends during CCCs and adjust review focus based on assessment data and identified skill gaps. In the final weeks of May, teams reflect on implementation fidelity and student outcome data, document best practices, and plan for sustainment and alignment with the following year's scope and sequence. Artifacts to be Collected:		Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of students will demonstrate improved retention of previously taught math standards as measured by Cobb Core assessments and spiral review data by end of year. Evaluation Tool(s): • Cobb Core Math Package assessments • Daily spiral review student performance data • Classroom observation walk-through forms • CCCC meeting notes and data logs Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Teachers and coach will review DRC Math performance data and assessment results during scheduled CCC meetings. Data will be used to adjust which standards are prioritized in the routine, monitor fidelity, and identify students needing additional support. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Students need more opportunities to strengthen hands-on, conceptual learning in small groups - Embed student discourse throughout the entire lesson, not just at the beginning - Expand use of multiple representations and manipulatives during the math block.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By May, 100% of K–5 teachers will consistently provide differentiated small group math instruction daily with intentional use of manipulatives,	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of students will demonstrate measurable growth in math conceptual understanding as measured by Cobb Core assessments and small group observational data by end of year	Swiv'l Title I Tutors Instructional Resource Room Materials DRC Beacon i-Ready Resources
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
3. K–5 teachers and support staff will provide differentiated small group math instruction daily, utilizing manipulatives to build conceptual understanding and address individual student learning needs.	- Preplanning: Provide PL on small group instruction best practices and math differentiated instruction. - August -September: Administer diagnostics and formative math assessments to identify student needs and create flexible student groups to begin small group instruction. - October-May: Continue to monitor student performance on common assessments, adjust student groups, and plan differentiated small group instruction during CCC process. Utilize SWIV'l to document teacher implementation of manipulatives during small group instruction.	Evaluation Tool(s): - Cobb Core Math Package assessments - Classroom observation walk-through forms - Small group instructional records and grouping rosters - Student work samples from manipulative-based tasks - CCC meeting notes and data logs	
	Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson Plans, Pacing Guides, SWIV'l Video Recordings	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches	Data Analysis Plan: Teachers and coach will review assessment data, student work samples, and grouping rosters during scheduled PLC meetings following each diagnostic window. Data will be used to regroup students, adjust manipulative selection by concept, and identify students requiring intensified support.	
	Frequency of Monitoring:		

		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<i>*Must be listed in the school policy</i>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required: * Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	September 24, 2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026) Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	October 13- 17, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	April 15, 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	September 15, 2026 (Fall)		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	February 2, 2027 (Spring)		
5. Required: * Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visiting the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. Briefly describe the transition activities here: • Rising 6th Grade Parent Meeting – May 12, 2027 • Incoming Kindergarten Parent Meeting – May 13, 2027	May 12, 2207 (Rising 6th Grade Meeting) May 13, 2027 (Incoming Kindergarten Parent Meeting)		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide translated information related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	List documents translated for parents: Title I School-Parent Compact Title I Parent and Family Engagement Policy Family Engagement Event Flyers/Communication		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

<u>Academic-Related</u> School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)							
Academic-Related and 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.	Staff Responsible
Curriculum in Action Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Grade Level Literacy and Math	Title I FACE Funds	September 3, 2026 6:00 – 8:00 pm	Parent sign in sheets, agenda, parent materials, and survey data	Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Grade Level Teachers
STEM and Literacy Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	K-5 Literacy and Math Parent Resources STEM Night Kit	Title I FACE Funds	November 12, 2026 6:00 – 8:00 pm	Parent sign in sheets, agenda, parent materials, and survey data	Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
Family Data Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	i-Ready/BEACON Parent Reports	Title I FACE Funds	March 12, 2026 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.	Parent sign in sheets, agenda, parent materials, and survey data	Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher

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's input.

School Improvement Plan Required Questions	
Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)	
1. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)	
2. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)	
3. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school’s participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)	
4. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school’s website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)	
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. SWP Checklist 5(e) <u>Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)</u>	
SCHOOL RESPONSE:	
The school will coordinate the following resources:	
• The school will use FTE Funds to provide instructional staff (teachers and paraprofessionals) to create appropriate class sizes to meet the academic needs of students. • Title I, Part A Funds will be used to provide class size reduction, instructional staff, consumable supplies, technology, expendable equipment, professional learning, and academic coaches.	

- Title II, Part A Funds will be used to provide professional learning.
- Title III Funds will be used to provide ELL instructional support.
- Additional state 20-day Funds will be used to provide tutoring services for students in reading and math

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

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

SWP Checklist 4

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - 34 CFR § 200.26

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

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

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

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

The Building Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor the continuous improvement process.

Schoolwide Plan Reform Strategies – Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)

10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all student groups 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.). <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: The RTI/MTSS team meets monthly to follow the RTI Tiers of Intervention for students in all grade levels. Special education teachers will be trained in using specialized instruction strategies consistently with the students in the inclusion classrooms.
14. <u>Describe professional development</u> and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, <u>and to recruit and retain effective teachers</u>, particularly in high need subjects. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Teachers and paraprofessionals are provided training at the beginning of the year through their CCC subject areas at the district level. The local school provides training on using and interpreting data and using resources provided by the school district. Cobb County School District provides school administrators the opportunity to interview candidates and select from a “pool” of highly qualified candidates. Candidates are also screened through Human Resources. This helps principals and schools with the initial hiring process in the selection of “Highly Qualified” teachers. Periodically throughout the school year principals are provided a Highly Qualified Report and school roster which indicates any certification deficiencies that need to be addressed. If there are any deficiencies the principal directs the teacher to the proper channel to remove deficiency from the teacher’s record. The academic coach works with new teachers on staff to provide them with the support they need to provide effective instruction.
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: Austell Elementary School partners with Garrett and Cooper Middle Schools to provide rising 6th grade orientation or parents and student. Parents of rising kindergarten students are invited to a kindergarten informational meeting in the Spring. Additionally, the school offers incoming kindergartners a week-long kindergarten camp during the summer prior to the start of the school year. This helps incoming kindergartners and their parents become acclimated with the kindergarten grade level teachers, school procedures, and routines.

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?
Classroom Teacher(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	1.0 Title I General Education Teacher to provide core instruction to students.
Academic Coach(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	N/A
Parent Facilitator(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	Family Engagement and Communication: The Parent Facilitator will establish strong communication channels with families, ensuring they are informed about school goals, programs, and student progress, which fosters a collaborative school-home partnership. Workshops and Support for Parents: The facilitator will coordinate with teachers and staff, to organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies to support their children's academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. Increased Parental Involvement: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. Connecting Families with Resources: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.

Instructional Paraprofessional(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	• N/A
--------------------------------------	--	--	---

School Improvement Goals
Include goals on the parent compact and policy

Goal #1	A. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the average Reading Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades 1–3 will increase by at least 20 points from the Fall 2026 baseline administration to the Spring 2027 administration, with targeted support for students performing below grade level to accelerate growth. B. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the percentage of students in grades 4-5 performing at proficient or above, as measured by the EOG ELA Milestones assessment will increase from _____ (____ out of ____ students) in the Spring of 2026 to ____% in the Spring of 2027.
Goal #2	A. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the average Math Scale Score on the Georgia DRC BEACON for students in grades K–3 will increase by at least 50 points from the Fall 2026 benchmark to the Spring 2027 benchmark, with particular focus on subgroups performing below the 40th percentile. B. By the end of the 2026-2027 school year, the percentage of students in Grades 4-5 performing proficient or above in Mathematics, as measured by the EOG Math Milestone assessment, will increase from 39.1% (50 out of 128 students) in the Spring to 42.2% in the Spring of 2027 (54 out of 128).