

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	East Cobb Middle School
Principal Name:	Dr. Mitchell Askew
Date Submitted:	7.20.26
Revision Date(s):	7.20.26

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	East Cobb Middle School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Dr. Kacie Phipps
<i>Position</i>	Assistant Principal
<i>Email</i>	Kacie.Phipps@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	404-405-2122
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: East Cobb Middle School incorporated feedback from a variety of stakeholders in the development of the School Improvement Plan to ensure that multiple perspectives were considered. Input was gathered from teachers, staff members, and school leaders through collaborative planning meetings, professional learning communities, and leadership team discussions where school data and instructional priorities were reviewed.

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 needs assessment, and the ability to ensure stakeholder involvement. Documentation of team member involvement must be maintained by the school. Multiple meetings should occur, and a sign-in sheet must be maintained for each meeting.

Meeting Dates:	May 26, 2026		
-----------------------	--------------	--	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Mitchell Askew	
Assistant Principal	Kacie Phipps	
Assistant Principal	Alain Blot	
Assistant Principal	Nicole Sheppard-Floyd	
Assistant Principal	James Auld	
Academic Coach	Keisa Ma	
Parent Facilitator	Dariann Fernandez	
Special Education Administrator	Kristi Dixon	

School Technology Specialists	Jennifer Tillman	
Media Specialist	Catherine Barnes	
Lead Counselor	Katoria Williams	
8 th Grade Teacher	Sheila Billingsley	
8 th Grade Teacher	Keshia Terry	

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	May 26, 2026		
-----------------------	--------------	--	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
8 th Grade Teacher	Nana Pearson	
8 th Grade Teacher	Jamiliah Weathersby	
8 th Grade Teacher	Summer Hathcock	
PE Teacher	Emily Reeves	
7 th Grade Teacher	Dustin Owens	
7 th Grade Special Education Teacher	Kristan Tarver	
6 th Grade Teacher	Andrew Salsberry	
6 th Grade Teacher	Thomas Turner	
6 th Grade Teacher	Christian Wood	

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	The percentage of 6 th - 8 th grade students scoring level 2 or above in ELA will increase by at least 5% from the 2024-2025 school year to the 2025-2026 school year as measured by the Georgia Milestones (from 64.5% to at least 69.5%).																																							
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially																																								
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	2026 Milestone data will support the goal. Data has not been received. BEACON <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 5px;"> <tr> <th>FALL</th><th>SN</th><th>NT</th><th>P</th><th>SPRING</th><th>SN</th><th>NT</th><th>P</th></tr> <tr> <td>6th</td><td>34%</td><td>49%</td><td>17%</td><td>6th</td><td>28%</td><td>50%</td><td>22%</td></tr> <tr> <td>7th</td><td>32%</td><td>43%</td><td>24%</td><td>7th</td><td>28%</td><td>44%</td><td>28%</td></tr> <tr> <td>8th</td><td>32%</td><td>42%</td><td>26%</td><td>8th</td><td>24%</td><td>41%</td><td>35%</td></tr> </table>								FALL	SN	NT	P	SPRING	SN	NT	P	6th	34%	49%	17%	6th	28%	50%	22%	7th	32%	43%	24%	7th	28%	44%	28%	8th	32%	42%	26%	8th	24%	41%	35%
FALL	SN	NT	P	SPRING	SN	NT	P																																	
6th	34%	49%	17%	6th	28%	50%	22%																																	
7th	32%	43%	24%	7th	28%	44%	28%																																	
8th	32%	42%	26%	8th	24%	41%	35%																																	
Reflecting on Outcomes																																								
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	- Use assessment data to group students for targeted small-group instruction based on specific reading or writing skill gaps. - Integrate short constructed responses and evidence-based writing in daily instruction. - Inconsistent implementation of academic vocabulary and content-specific words using direct instruction and repeated exposure. - Use exit tickets, quick checks, and short assessments to monitor understanding. - Track student growth regularly to determine if interventions are effective. - Analyze assessment results during CCC (PLC) meetings to adjust instruction - Take part in Learning Walks and provide feedback and share effective instructional practices.																																							
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the																																								

success of the goal?	
----------------------	--

Previous Year's Goal #2	The percentage of 6 th - 8 th grade students scoring level 2 or above in MATH will increase by at least 8% from the 2024-2025 school year to the 2025-2026 school year as measured by the Georgia Milestones (from 72.5% to at least 80.5%).
--------------------------------	--

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

What data supports the outcome of the goal?	BEACON 2026 Milestone Data 6th 7th 8th											
	FALL	SN	NT	P	SPRING	SN	NT	P	Beginning	26%	35%	25%
	6th	62%	36%	1%	6th	46%	44%	10%	Developing	37%	34%	36%
	7th	54%	34%	12%	7th	46%	37%	17%	Proficient	28%	21%	17%
	8th	79%	21%	0.6%	8th	56%	35%	9%	Distinguished	9%	10%	22%

Reflecting on Outcomes	
-------------------------------	--

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	• Include explicit modeling of how to approach multi-step problems, justify reasoning, and explain solutions. • Encourage students to explain their thinking, critique reasoning, and discuss different problem -solving methods. • Provide structured opportunities for students to apply math concepts in real-world contexts. • A need for teachers regularly reviews assessment data to identify trends, share strategies, and adjust instruction. • Inconsistent use of quick checks, exit tickets, and mini assessments to monitor understanding and adjust instruction. • Implement targeted small-group instruction based on assessment data • Increase the use of formative assessments to monitor student progress • More consistent use of 360 boards and using manipulatives to reteach • Using Move the Needle when planning units
---	---

If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	
---	--

Previous Year's Goal #3	
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

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

ELA DATA			
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	36.5%	45.8%	38.8%
7 th Grade	28.4%	39%	34.4%
8 th Grade	35.2%	27.5%	31.14%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Reading									Interpreting Text:			Constructing: Text											
	Texts: Context/ Structure & Style			Text: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Reading			Text: Context/ Structure & Style/ Technique			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	SN	NT	P
6 th Grade	30%	46%	24%	30%	46%	23%	26%	48%	26%	47%	36%	17%	275	52%	22%	325	47%	21%	34%	45%	22%	35%	47%	19%
7 th Grade	34%	38%	27%	31%	41%	28%	26%	44%	30%	46%	36%	19%	27%	45%	28%	34%	38%	27%	36%	38%	26%	37%	41%	22%
8 th Grade	30%	38%	32%	27%	37%	36%	26%	39%	34%	42%	35%	23%	26%	41%	32%	31%	40%	30%	33%	37%	30%	38%	34%	27%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Milestone scores for 2026 are unknown at this time. EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:

Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): All grade levels showed a reduction in the percentage of students in the <i>Support Needed</i> category from fall to spring, indicating overall academic growth. 6th, 7th and 8th grade showed growth in the Prepared category by spring, suggesting instructional strategies and interventions help students reach proficiency. A large group of students consistently remain in the <i>Near Target</i> category, which indicates many students are close to meeting expectations. SIP goal of increasing by at least 5% was met at all grade levels. Vocabulary (IT: Language: Vocabulary) is the top or near-top domain in all three grades and represents the most stable area of strength schoolwide. Reading Comprehension (Interpreting Texts: Reading) is also a consistent strength in 7th and 8th grade. 8th grade students are outperforming 6th and 7th grade students across nearly every domain often 8 to 12 percentage points higher in Prepared rates. EL: BEACON SPRING 2025 • Support Needed – 67% • Near Target – 33% • Prepared – 0% BEACON SPRING 2026 • Support Needed – 49% • Near Target – 41% • Prepared – 11% SWD: BEACON Spring 2025 • Support Needed – 55% • Near Target 38% • Prepared – 7% BEACON Spring 2026 • Support Needed – 47% • Near Target 46% • Prepared – 9%	Grade Levels (all students): While there is growth, the percentage of students reaching the Prepared level is still lower than desired for strong EOG performance. In some grade levels (like 7th grade), the <i>Support Needed</i> percentage decreased in winter but slightly increased again in spring, suggesting inconsistent progress for some students. Many students are improving but have not yet reached the highest performance level. The domain Interpreting Texts: Listening is the weakest domain in every grade. Sharing 6th (48% SN), 7th (48% SN), and 8th (41% SN). The consistency of this pattern strongly suggests a schoolwide instructional gap in academic listening comprehension. The next domain, CT: Language: Grammar Conventions, is the second-weakest domain in every grade. Sharing 6th (32% SN), 7th (39% SN), and 8th (38% SN). Rather than declining as students' progress, the Support Needed rate increases from 6th grade to 7th grade. This suggests that grammar is not sufficiently reinforced across the grade band. EL: 11% of ECMS students performed in Prepared category on the BEACON assessment SWD: Based on SWD Beacon data, the percentage of Prepared was less than 10
--	---	---

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Infrequent formative assessments and checks • Inconsistent instructional rigor across classrooms • Data collected but not analyzed collaboratively • More PL's or training directed toward literacy skills • Student attendance is lacking throughout the school	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): The 2026 ACCESS results indicate a notable portion of students performing in the higher proficiency bands (Bands 5–8), representing approximately 42% of tested students. This reflects a meaningful level of language development and indicates that a segment of students is making strong progress toward English language proficiency. EL: This school year, students exited the ESL program, demonstrating growth in English language proficiency as measured by the 2026 ACCESS assessment.	Grade Levels (all students): The 2026 ACCESS results also reveal a significant proportion of students performing in the lower proficiency bands (Bands 1–2), representing approximately 39% of tested students. This indicates a continued need for targeted language development support to accelerate growth toward proficiency EL: Data indicates that additional focus is needed in the areas of Reading, Writing, and Vocabulary as these domains reflect the lowest performance levels and limits the number of students meeting the proficiency threshold required for program exit.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Lack consistent exposure to the academic vocabulary • Many students have gaps in native language literacy and formal academic experience • Students lack a strong oral language base • EL students may need more exposure to the complex vocabulary and sentence structures	

ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 342 1157 1425"> Grade Levels (all students): - With an overall increased performance of 43% across items, 6th - 8th grade ELA students are showing an emerging understanding of the standards assessed after viewing the Unit 3 test in SAVVAS. EL: - English Learner students are developing foundational comprehension skills, and targeted support with academic vocabulary and language scaffolds will support improved performance on complex ELA tasks. </td><td data-bbox="1157 342 2022 1425"> Grade Levels (all students): 30% of ELA 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 65% of ELA 7th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 75% of ELA 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on common summative assessment in ELA. EL: 10% of ELL 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 18% of ELL 7th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 15% of ELL 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. </td></tr> </table>	Grade Levels (all students): - With an overall increased performance of 43% across items, 6th - 8th grade ELA students are showing an emerging understanding of the standards assessed after viewing the Unit 3 test in SAVVAS. EL: - English Learner students are developing foundational comprehension skills, and targeted support with academic vocabulary and language scaffolds will support improved performance on complex ELA tasks.	Grade Levels (all students): 30% of ELA 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 65% of ELA 7th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 75% of ELA 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on common summative assessment in ELA. EL: 10% of ELL 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 18% of ELL 7th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 15% of ELL 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA.
Grade Levels (all students): - With an overall increased performance of 43% across items, 6th - 8th grade ELA students are showing an emerging understanding of the standards assessed after viewing the Unit 3 test in SAVVAS. EL: - English Learner students are developing foundational comprehension skills, and targeted support with academic vocabulary and language scaffolds will support improved performance on complex ELA tasks.	Grade Levels (all students): 30% of ELA 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 65% of ELA 7th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 75% of ELA 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on common summative assessment in ELA. EL: 10% of ELL 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 18% of ELL 7th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA. 15% of ELL 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in ELA.		
	Root Cause Explanation:		

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	• New ELA standards and resources were introduced this school year • The new ELA curriculum shared more complex reading passages • The new curriculum included constructed-response questions students are not yet accustomed to. • Gaps may have occurred in foundational literacy skills due to COVID • An adjustment to middle school academic expectations may have occurred from 5th grade to 6th grade • Instruction not adjusted based on student performance data	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) 6 - 8	239 instructional observations were conducted across grades 6–8, with 47% of observations occurring in 6th grade classrooms and most frequently in ELA and science content areas. 47% of the observations took place during the work session portion of the lesson, while very few lesson closings were observed. 78% of instruction was largely aligned to the learning target, and 79% of daily board agendas were consistently visible across classrooms. Teachers frequently used strategies such as providing feedback to students, direct instruction, and questioning techniques to facilitate student discourse.	Students were most often engaged in reading or practicing skills, with fewer opportunities observed for hands-on learning; only 23% of differentiated small group instruction was viewed, or station rotations. Moving forward, instructional focus will include strengthening lesson closings, increase small group and differentiate instruction, and expanding the use of inquiry-based and hands-on learning strategies to support student engagement and understanding.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • More training and support in differentiated and small group instructional practices. • Limited access to or familiarity with inquiry-based and hands-on instructional strategies. • Additional support in embedding Ellevation language development and structured academic discourse into instruction. • A prioritization is given to the work session portion of the lesson due to pacing demands or curriculum coverage, resulting in limited time for structured openings and lesson closures • Limited training or reinforcement on how to effectively incorporate all parts of the instructional framework within the allotted class time.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☒ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey	After reviewing the 67 responses and 24 questions asked, there are some trends: ECMS runs well operationally. These had the highest averages. Attend parent/teacher conferences 4.6	Many parents feel that many parents are not involved in decision making, volunteer opportunities may be limited, and student recognition can be improved. These had the lowest averages. Parent involvement in decision making 3.1

☐ _____	School building well maintained 4.6 Classrooms clean and organized 4.5 Instructional materials up to date 4.4 Clear rules for behavior 4.25	Parent volunteer opportunities 3.2 Students treated fairly 3.5 Students recognized for behavior 3.6 Teachers recognize good behavior 3.7
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Fewer formal systems (committees, surveys, advisory groups) that allow families to provide input on school decisions, which may lead to lower perceptions of involvement. • Communication gaps regarding volunteer opportunities and school involvement. • Recognition systems may focus more on academic outcomes than positive behavior or character.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	The percentage of 6 th - 8 th grade students scoring a Near Target or Proficient Level on the ELA BEACON will increase by at least 5% from the 2025-2026 school year to the 2026-2027 school year as measured by the Spring BEACON Assessment (from 73.5% to at least 78.5%).		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Inconsistent instructional rigor across classrooms • Instruction not adjusted based on student performance data • More training and support in differentiated and small group instructional practices. • Limited access to or familiarity with inquiry-based and hands-on instructional strategies. • A prioritization is given to the work session portion of the lesson due to pacing demands or curriculum coverage, resulting in limited time for structured openings and lesson closures		
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 ELA, Science, and Social Studies teachers will implement small group literacy-focused instruction within their content area. Implementation Plan: Preplanning and during School year: The Academic Coach and Teacher Leaders will facilitate professional learning focused on: • Using formative assessment data to identify student needs and plan targeted small group instruction • Implementing effective small group instructional strategies including hands-on instructional strategies.	Evaluation Performance Target: • 70% of students in Grades 6–8 will score 75% or higher on Common Summative Assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): • Formative assessment data • Summative assessment data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☒ Every other month	Progress Learning Wayground District resources
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>			

1. Sixth through eighth grade ELA, Science, and Social Studies teachers will implement targeted small groups to differentiate instruction based on student data as evidenced by walkthrough data.	• Conducting individual student conferences to monitor progress and provide feedback • Unpacking standards to ensure alignment between instruction and learning goals • Creating physical movement in and out of small groups August-September: • The Academic Coach and Teacher Leaders will collaborate with teachers to plan and model small group lessons and share strategies needed. • ELA, Science, and Social Studies teachers will implement small group instruction within their content area to address content misconceptions and targeted student needs. Instruction will support the development of literacy skills within the content areas and include opportunities to: • Strengthening reading comprehension in the content area • Preview and review key concepts and vocabulary • Provide targeted support based on formative assessment data Classroom walkthroughs and informal observations will be conducted intentionally during various times of the day to monitor implementation and provide feedback. September-December: • Teachers will consistently implement small group instruction within the workshop model based on formative assessment results and student work analysis. • Collaborative planning during team meetings will focus on: ○ Analyzing student data ○ Identifying instructional adjustments	☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: • Students will complete formative assessments throughout each unit of study in ELA, Science, and Social Studies • Grades 6 – 8 students will complete Fall, Winter and Spring BEACON assessments. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	○ Designing targeted small group lessons • The Academic Coach will provide ongoing coaching support through lesson modeling, co-planning, and coaching cycles. • Classroom walkthroughs and informal observations will be conducted to monitor implementation and provide feedback. January-February: • Teachers will refine and adjust small group instruction to address gaps identified through common assessments, Winter BEACON data, benchmark data, and student work. • CCC teams will engage in structured data discussions to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional strategies and determine next instructional steps. • The Academic Coach will continue to provide differentiated coaching and support based on teacher needs and implementation data. • Teachers will incorporate additional literacy strategies within content instruction to support deeper comprehension and vocabulary development. March-May: • Teachers will continue to implement literacy-focused small group instructions to reinforce key standards and address remaining student learning needs. • CCC teams will analyze student performance data to evaluate the impact of small group instruction on student learning. • Reflection on instructional practices will occur during CCC meetings to identify successes, challenges, and next steps for the following school year. • Academic Coach and administration will review learning walk data and determine adjustments to		
--	--	--	--

	support continued growth in literacy instruction across content areas.: Artifacts to be Collected: • Walk through forms • CCC Notes • BLT Notes • Subject Area Meeting Minutes • Surveys Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: • Every other Month		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Instruction not adjusted based on student performance data • Infrequent formative assessments and checks • Inconsistent instructional rigor across classrooms • Data collected but not analyzed collaboratively			
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 sixth through eighth grade ELA, Science, and Social Studies teachers will engage in collaborative planning resulting in the development and implementation of common summative assessments aligned to grade-level standards, learning targets, and DOK Levels.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students in Grades 6–8 will score 75% or higher on Common Summative Assessments	District Resources CTLS Assess Ellevation	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning and during School year: The Academic Coach and Teacher Leaders will facilitate professional learning focused on: • unpacking grade-level standards and identifying priority learning targets • designing rigorous assessment questions aligned to DOK Levels • developing common formative assessments to measure student understanding • establishing collaborative planning protocols for reviewing assessment data (Atlas)	Evaluation Tool(s): • Formative assessment data • Summative assessment data		
☒ 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>				
2. Sixth through eighth grade ELA, Science, and Social Studies teachers will collaborate during CCC/PLC meetings to design and implement rigorous common summative assessments aligned to grade-level standards, learning targets, and Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Levels.	August-September: • Collaborative teams will design common formative assessments aligned to standards and learning targets. • Teachers will administer formative assessments and collect student work samples. • CCC teams will begin reviewing student data to identify misconceptions and instructional needs. October-December:	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads		

	- Teachers will continue to implement formative assessments aligned to DOK Levels. - Collaborative teams will analyze assessment data during CCC meetings to: - identify student strengths and learning gaps - adjust instructional strategies - plan targeted small-group instruction - Academic coaches and administrators will support teachers through modeling, coaching, and feedback during classroom walkthroughs. January-February: - CCC teams will revise and refine common formative assessments based on student performance data. - CCC meetings will focus on item analysis of assessment questions to determine which standards need reteaching or enrichment. March-April: - Teams will continue to develop and administer rigorous formative assessments aligned to priority standards. - Teachers will analyze trends in student performance across classes and grade levels. - Collaborative teams will share effective instructional strategies and best practices to address areas of need. - Instruction will include higher-order thinking opportunities aligned to DOK Levels. May: - Teams will review student growth data and assessment results to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional strategies and common assessments. - Teachers will reflect on assessment practices and instructional rigor to identify adjustments for the following school year.		
--	---	--	--

	Artifacts to be Collected: CCC Leads will collect artifacts including: • common formative assessments • CCC meeting notes • student work samples • data analysis documentation Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Every other Month		
--	--	--	--

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	35.5%	29.9%	36.4%	37%
7 th Grade	24.2%	26.3%	27.5%	31%
8 th Grade	32.7%	41.8%	37.5%	39%

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
6 th Grade	59%	33%	8%	53%	40%	7%	47%	38%	15%	53%	41%	7%
7 th Grade	52%	36%	13%	48%	37%	15%	45%	39%	16%	39%	42%	19%
8 th Grade	47%	35%	18%	42%	37%	22%	44%	36%	20%	37%	38%	25%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Spring 2026 Milestone Math data shares Levels 2 – 4 for 6th grade - 74%, 7th grade – 65%, 8th grade – 75%. From SY 24 – SY 26 the 6th grade Developing – Distinguished percentage increased from 71% to 74% and 7th grade increased from 64% to 65% on the Math EOG EL : According to 6th - 8th grade 2026 GADOE EOG information the following subgroup for Math – English Learners students showed 58% students received Developing – Distinguished. 5% of ECMS students received Proficient.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): According to the 2026 EOG results, there is a continued need to maintain rigorous instruction in order to increase the percentage of students performing at Levels 3 and 4. From 2025 to 2026 school years, 6th grade Level 3 and 4 performance remained unchanged at 37%, indicating a need for targeted instructional strategies and continued academic support to improve student achievement. Overall, 6th – 8th grade displayed a 2% increase in Level 3 & 4. (34% – 36%).

	SWD: According to 6th - 8th grade 2026 GADOE EOG information, the following subgroup for Math – SWD students showed 49% students received Developing – Distinguished. 6% of ECMS students received Proficient.	EL: According to the 2026 EOG results, ESOL Active and Monitored students demonstrated a need for increased academic support and targeted instruction, as 80% of students performed within the Beginning and Developing Learner levels, while only 19% achieved Proficient or Distinguished Learner status. SWD: According to the 2026 EOG results, Students with Disabilities (SWD) demonstrated a need for continued differentiated instruction and intervention support, as 86% of students performed within the Beginning and Developing Learner levels, while only 14% achieved Proficient or Distinguished Learner status.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	Beacon Spring data shares a gradual increase in the percentage of students classified as “Prepared” from 6th to 8th grade across all math domains, suggesting cumulative instructional impact over time. Eighth grade students demonstrate relative strength in algebraic reasoning and geometric/spatial reasoning, with higher percentages of students reaching the <i>Prepared</i> level compared to 6th and 7th grades. A significant portion of students across grade levels fall within the “Near Target” category, indicating that many students are approaching proficiency and may respond positively to targeted instruction	Across all grade levels and math domains, support remains a significant need, with approximately 45–60% of students categorized as “Support Needed.” Numerical Reasoning and Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning are the weakest domains, particularly for 6th and 7th grade students. The relatively low percentage of students classified as <i>Prepared</i> indicates limited conceptual mastery, particularly in applying mathematical reasoning and problem-solving skills.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Inconsistent implementation of concept-focused math instruction across grade levels. • Limited use of manipulatives and mathematical modeling to support conceptual understanding. • Instruction often emphasizes procedural fluency over problem-solving and reasoning. • Small-group instruction is not consistently leveraged to address identified learning gaps. • Differentiation and scaffolding for English Learners and Students with Disabilities vary by classroom. • Formative assessment data is collected but not consistently used to adjust instruction. • Teachers need additional professional learning to strengthen Tier I math instruction and intervention practices .	

MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): • A significant majority of students in 6th and 7th grade Math are meeting or exceeding expectations on common summative assessments, with 82% of 6th grade students and 71% of 7th grade students scoring 75% or higher. • These results indicate strong Tier 1 instruction, effective use of common assessments, and consistent alignment to grade-level standards, particularly in 6th grade, where more than four out of five students demonstrate mastery. • Regarding Spring 2026 data, all three grade levels of students performed relatively well in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning. Measurement and Data Reasoning also showed relative strength compared to the other domains in 6th and 8th grade. In 7th grade, Geometric and Spatial Reasoning was the highest-performing domain. EL: Although overall proficiency rates for EL students are low, the presence of EL students meeting the 75% benchmark across all three grade levels demonstrates that instructional strategies and accommodations are enabling access to grade-level math content for some learners.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): • 61% of Math 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in Math. • In 6th and 8th grade, Numerical Reasoning was the weakest area. Geometric and Spatial Reasoning also showed lower performance and may need additional spiral review and intervention support. • In 7th grade, Measurement and Data Reasoning was the lowest-performing domain and should be an area of focus for remediation and targeted instruction. EL: • 7% of ELL 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in Math. • 7% of ELL 7th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in Math. • 6% of ELL 8th grade students scored 75% or higher on each common summative assessment in Math.
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	• Insufficient use of formative assessment data to inform differentiation and intervention • A need to increase content complexity and rigor • Inconsistent implementation of targeted instructional supports and scaffold • Limited academic language development in math for EL students • Disconnect with math common assessment data and BEACON scores	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	239 instructional observations were conducted across grades 6–8, with 47% of observations occurring in 6th grade classrooms and most frequently in ELA and science content areas. 47% of the observations took place during the work session portion of the lesson, while very few lesson closings were observed. 78% of instruction was largely aligned to the learning target, and 79% of daily board agendas were consistently visible across classrooms. Teachers frequently used strategies such as providing feedback to students, direct instruction, and questioning techniques to facilitate student discourse.	Few opportunities observed for hands-on learning and use of 360 boards, only 23% of differentiated small group instruction was viewed, or station rotations. Moving forward, instructional focus will include strengthening lesson closings, increase small group and differentiate instruction, and expanding the use of inquiry-based and hands-on learning strategies to support student engagement and understanding.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • More training and support in differentiated and small group instructional practices. • Limited access to or familiarity with inquiry-based and hands-on instructional strategies. • Additional support in embedding Ellevation language development and structured academic discourse into instruction. • A prioritization is given to the work session portion of the lesson due to pacing demands or curriculum coverage, resulting in limited time for structured openings and lesson closures • Limited training or reinforcement on how to effectively incorporate all parts of the instructional framework within the allotted class time.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☒ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	After reviewing the 67 responses and 24 questions asked, there are some trends: ECMS runs well operationally. These had the highest averages. Attend parent/teacher conferences 4.6 School building well maintained 4.6 Classrooms clean and organized 4.5	Many parents feel that many parents are not involved in decision making, volunteer opportunities may be limited, and student recognition can be improved. These had the lowest averages. Parent involvement in decision making 3.1 Parent volunteer opportunities 3.2 Students treated fairly 3.5

	Instructional materials up to date 4.4 Clear rules for behavior 4.25	Students recognized for behavior 3.6 Teachers recognize good behavior 3.7
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	- Fewer formal systems (committees, surveys, advisory groups) that allow families to provide input on school decisions, which may lead to lower perceptions of involvement. - Communication gaps regarding volunteer opportunities and school involvement. - Recognition systems may focus more on academic outcomes than positive behavior or character.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	The percentage of 6 th - 8 th grade students scoring level 2 or above in MATH will increase by at least 5% from the 2025-2026 school year to the 2026-2027 school year as measured by the Georgia Milestones (from 72% to at least 77%).		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• More training and support in differentiated and small group instructional practices • A prioritization is given to the work session portion of the lesson due to pacing demands or curriculum coverage, resulting in limited time for structured openings and lesson closures • Disconnect with math common assessment data and BEACON scores • Insufficient use of formative assessment data to inform differentiation and intervention • A need to increase content complexity and rigor • Limited use of manipulatives and mathematical modeling to support conceptual understanding.		
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 Math teachers will implement small group instruction. Implementation Plan: Preplanning and during School year: The Academic Coach and Teacher Leaders will facilitate professional learning focused on: • Using formative assessment data to identify student needs and plan targeted small group instruction • Implementing effective small group instructional strategies	Evaluation Performance Target: • 70% of students in Grades 6–8 will score 75% or higher on Common Summative Assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): • Formative assessment data • Summative assessment data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly	IXL Progress Learning Wayground District 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>			

1. Sixth through eighth grade Math teachers will implement targeted small group instruction to differentiate instruction based on student data as evidenced by walkthrough data.	• Conducting individual student conferences to monitor progress and provide feedback • Unpacking standards to ensure alignment between instruction and learning goals August-September: • The Academic Coach and Teacher Leaders will collaborate with teachers to plan and model small group lessons. • Math teachers will implement small group instruction within the workshop model to address content misconceptions and targeted student needs. Instruction will support the development of mathematical skills within the content areas and include opportunities to: • Strengthening reading comprehension in the content area • Preview and review key concepts and vocabulary • Provide targeted support based on formative assessment data Classroom walkthroughs and informal observations will be conducted to monitor implementation and provide feedback. October-December: • Teachers will consistently implement small group instruction within the workshop model based on formative assessment results and student work analysis. • Collaborative planning during team meetings will focus on: ○ Analyzing student data ○ Identifying instructional adjustments ○ Designing targeted small group lessons	☒ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: • Students will complete formative assessments throughout each unit of study in Math Grades 6 – 8 students will complete Fall and winter BEACON assessment Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	---	--

	• The Academic Coach will provide ongoing coaching support through lesson modeling, co-planning, and coaching cycles. • Classroom walkthroughs and informal observations will be conducted to monitor implementation and provide feedback. January-February: • Teachers will refine and adjust small group instruction to address gaps identified through common assessments, benchmark data, and student work. • CCC teams will engage in structured data discussions to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional strategies and determine next instructional steps. • The Academic Coach will continue to provide differentiated coaching and support based on teacher needs and implementation data. • Teachers will incorporate additional literacy strategies within content instruction to support deeper comprehension and vocabulary development. March-May: • Teachers will continue to implement literacy-focused small group instructions to reinforce key standards and address remaining student learning needs. • CCC teams will analyze student performance data to evaluate the impact of small group instruction on student learning. • Reflection on instructional practices will occur during CCC meetings to identify successes, challenges, and next steps for the following school year. • Academic Coach and administration will review learning walk data and determine adjustments to		
--	--	--	--

	support continued growth in literacy instruction across content areas.: Artifacts to be Collected: • Walk through forms • CCC Notes • BLT Notes • Surveys Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Every other Month		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of math teachers will incorporate mathematical modeling tasks and the use of manipulatives to support conceptual understanding of grade-level standards.	Evaluation Performance Target: By March 2027, 70% of students will score 75% or higher on the Common Formative Assessments.	District Resources CTLS Assess
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Instructional leaders and math teacher leaders will facilitate professional learning focused on: • implementing mathematical modeling tasks aligned to grade-level standards • effective use of manipulatives to support conceptual understanding of mathematical concepts • strategies to scaffold learning for English Learners and Students with Disabilities • incorporating visual representations and hands-on activities into daily math instruction	Evaluation Tool(s): • Formative assessment data • Summative assessment data	
☒ 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: Students will complete formative assessments throughout each unit of study in Math Grades 6 – 8 students will complete	
2. Math teachers will implement hands-on learning opportunities through the use of manipulatives and mathematical modeling tasks to support conceptual understanding and problem-solving during Tier I instruction	August-September: • Math teachers begin implementing manipulative-based lessons to introduce new concepts. • Teachers incorporate at least one mathematical modeling task per unit. • CCC/PLC meetings focus on: ○ Lesson planning using modeling tasks ○ Anticipating misconceptions	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	

	○ Planning scaffolds for EL and SWD students • Instructional leaders conduct walkthroughs with a focus on: ○ Use of manipulatives ○ Student discourse and reasoning ○ Alignment to learning targets October-December: Teachers refine the use of modeling tasks to include: • Real-world problem contexts • Opportunities for students to explain and justify reasoning • Small-group instruction is used to reteach concepts using manipulatives based on formative assessment results. CCC teams analyze: • Common formative assessment data • Student work samples • Performance trends for ELs and SWD Coaching support includes: • Modeling lessons • Co-planning • Targeted feedback following walkthroughs January-February: Teachers adjust instructional practices based on midyear data: • Increase complexity of modeling tasks • Emphasize multiple representations (concrete, visual, symbolic) Focus on student mathematical discourse: • Sentence stems • Structured partner talk • Visual supports for EL students CCC meetings include: • Item analysis of assessments • Identification of standards needing re-teaching		
--	--	--	--

	Administrators and coaches monitor consistency across classrooms. March-April: - Teachers continue consistent use of manipulatives and modeling tasks to reinforce priority standards. Instruction includes: - Performance-based tasks - Cumulative modeling problems CCC teams: - Compare growth across classrooms - Adjust instruction for students still demonstrating conceptual gaps Walkthrough data is reviewed to determine fidelity of implementation. May: CCC Teams analyze: - End-of-year formative and summative data - Student growth by subgroup (Gen Ed, EL, SWD) Teachers reflect during CCC meetings on: - Effectiveness of modeling and manipulatives - Instructional strategies to continue or revise Instructional leaders use data and walkthrough trends to inform: - Summer professional learning priorities - Resource needs for the following year Artifacts to be Collected: - Lesson plans showing use of manipulatives and modeling tasks - Student work samples - CCC meeting notes - Classroom walkthrough data - Common formative assessment results Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal		
--	--	--	--

	☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Every other month		
--	--	--	--

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA/OTHER DATA		
Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
(Name of Assessment) (Data by grade & subgroup)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

(Name of assessment) (Grade Level Reading & Writing)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
(Name of assessment) (Grade Level Reading & Writing)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)		
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA / OTHER DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: OTHER			
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year	
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>			

1. (Insert action step here)	• May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: 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.	August 27, 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, 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.	March 9, 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 17, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5
	February 4, 2027		☒ 3 ☐ 6
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 6 th grade parents are invited to middle school to meet teachers; learn academic expectations and ways the school can support the transition to middle school. 8 th grade students will visit local high school and parents will attend a high school orientation meeting.	Rising 6 th Grade – March 18, 2027 Meet and greet – July 30, 2026 Rising 6 th Grade Academy – July 16, 2026 8 th Grade transition – January 21, 2027		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

6. Required: <u>Provide translated information</u> related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> Family Compact Input Surveys (Fall and Spring) Parent and Family Engagement Policy Family and Community Engagement Policy Informational Flyers for school events and invitations to Title I events	☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3	☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☐ 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) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
Academic Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4		Title 1	September 3, 2026	Informational Flyers CTLS Messages to families Sign In Sheets	Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
Data Family Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4		Title 1	March 4, 2027	Informational Flyers CTLS Messages to families Sign In Sheets	Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4					

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. (#14 in list of "shalls" and "mays")

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

The Schoolwide Plan (SWP) has been developed collaboratively and intentionally to align with and integrate various federal, state, and local services, ensuring a holistic approach to student achievement and well-being. Professional development and instructional resources are funded to ensure teachers are equipped to deliver high-quality, standard-aligned instruction that promotes critical thinking, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension. Title, I support curriculum materials, teacher collaboration sessions, and data analysis tools.

Using 20-day funds, teachers will be given the opportunity to work extended day opportunities serving students beyond the regular class day to provide remediation and/or acceleration based on identified needs.

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)*

On a monthly or bimonthly basis, the school will perform walk throughs, observations, surveys to monitor goals.

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)*

Student performance is continuously monitored using a combination of formative and summative assessment data, including State assessments (e.g., EOGs), interim/benchmark assessments (e.g., Beacon, IXL diagnostics), and progress monitoring tools aligned to grade-level standards

Growth data is analyzed to be evaluated and shared. The school leadership team conducts classroom observations, instructional walks, and implementation checklists to ensure that schoolwide instructional strategies, such as differentiation, small group instruction

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)*

While monitoring the plan, data will be collected and shared to provide revisions.

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)*
Teachers receive training on research-based strategies to support Students with Disabilities, ensuring equitable access to rigorous instruction.

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)*

Teachers engage in weekly CCCs to analyze student work, unpack standards, plan lessons collaboratively, and reflect on instructional practices. Academic coach will provide support through model lessons, observation/feedback cycles, and data analysis support tailored to individual teacher needs. New teachers participate in a structured induction program with assigned mentors, regular check-ins, and targeted PD to build capacity and confidence. Monthly PD sessions are offered by focusing on best practices for literacy and math instruction, including the use of strategies such as differentiated instruction, scaffolding, and formative assessment integration.

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)*

Students and parents are invited to a transition meeting in the Winter/Spring. Those attending will learn academic expectations and ways the school can support the transition to Middle School or High School. During the winter a parent meeting will be held for *8th graders attending 9th grade the following year and a meeting in the Spring will be held for 5th graders coming to 6th grade.

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)*

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?
ELA Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	By directly impacting student achievement, literacy development, and instructional quality such as instructional strategies that are aligned with the academic achievement goals outlined in the SIP and increasing reading proficiency or improving literacy rate
Academic Coach(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	By directly impacting student achievement, literacy development, and instructional quality such as instructional strategies that are aligned with the academic achievement goals outlined in the SIP and increasing reading proficiency or improving literacy rates.
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	

School Improvement Goals <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy</i>	
Goal #1	
Goal #2	
Goal #3	

Goal #4	
----------------	--