

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Garrett Middle School
Principal Name:	Dr. Sonya Cook
Date Submitted:	June 1, 2026
Revision Date(s):	June 22, 2026

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Garrett Middle School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Dr. Sonya Cook
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Sonya.cook@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	770-819-2466
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: Garrett Middle School's SY2027 Title I School Improvement Plan was created through a collaborative effort that included teachers, support staff, parents, administrators, and community partners. Multiple meetings and conversations took place to determine the school's most critical needs and to gather feedback on existing programs and initiatives. The process began with CCC teams reviewing mid-year SY2026 achievement data, using a range of sources such as the Title I Parent Survey, notes from Building Leadership Team meetings, CCC discussions with teacher teams, and both district and school-level assessment data. After analyzing this information, school teams worked together to establish goals and create action steps aimed at improving student success.	

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 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 Facilitator
Content or Grade Level Teachers	Media Specialist –
Local School Academic Coach	Public Safety Officer
District Academic Coach	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)	Social Worker
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leader
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialist
MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)	Community Health Care Provider

	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.



Garrett Middle School
 Building Leadership Team Meeting
 01/28/2026
 RM 911
 Sign in Sheet

Printed Name	Signature	Title/Role
Kayla Davis	<i>Kayla Davis</i>	Academic Coach
Gabrielle Ratliff	<i>Gabrielle Ratliff</i>	Department Chair (Math)
Douglas Gibson	<i>Douglas Gibson</i>	Special Ed Lead
Jemice Dowling	<i>Jemice Dowling</i>	PBIS Coach
Kenya Whiteside	<i>Kenya Whiteside</i>	dept chair (ELA)
Sam Shook	<i>Sam Shook</i>	Science Dept. Head
Jay Knebr	<i>Jay Knebr</i>	Social Studies R.T.
Michelle Burns	<i>Michelle Burns</i>	Gifted Chair
Carlettia Wharton	<i>Carlettia Wharton</i>	Reading
Margaret Perdue	<i>Margaret Perdue</i>	Math
John Vardall	<i>John Vardall</i>	CTAE - Computers lead
Krishe Brown	<i>Krishe Brown</i>	Principal



Garrett Middle School
Building Leadership Team Meeting
02/25/2026

RM 911

Sign in Sheet

Printed Name	Signature	Title/Role
Kayla Davis	Kayla Davis	Academic Coach
Gabrielle Ratliff	Gabrielle Ratliff	Department Chair (Math)
Douglas Gibson	Douglas Gibson	Special Ed Lead
Jemica Dowling	Jemica Dowling	PBIS coach
Kenya Whiteside	Kenya M. Whiteside	DEPT CHAIR (ELA)
James Shook	James Shook	Science Dept. Head
Jay Knebo	Jay Knebo	Science Dept. Head
Michelle Bunn	M. Bunn	Gifted Lead
Carlettia Wharton	Carlettia Wharton	Reading Teacher
Margaret Perdue	Margaret Perdue	Math
John Kendall	John Kendall	Campus Lead
Kristie Braun	Kristie Braun	Principal



Garrett Middle School
Building Leadership Team Meeting
03/25/2026
RM 911
Sign in Sheet

Printed Name	Signature	Title/Role
Kayla Davis	Kayla Davis	Academic Coach
Gabrielle Ratliff	Gabrielle Ratliff	Department Chair (Math)
Douglas Gibson	Douglas Gibson	Special Ed Lead
Jenica Dowlings	Jenica Dowlings	PBIS Coach
Kenya Whiteside	Kenya M. Whiteside	Dept Chair (ELA)
James Shook	James Shook	Science Dept. Head
Trey Knebo	Trey Knebo	Social Studies M.
M. Burns	Michelle Burns	Gifted Lead
Carlethia Wharton	Carlethia Wharton	Reading Teacher
Margaret Perdue	Margaret Perdue	Math
John Kendall	John Kendall	Connections Lead
Kirstie Brown	Kirstie Brown	Principal

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 May 2026, the number of students scoring at Level 2 (Developing Learner) and above on the ELA EOG will increase from 57.4% to 67.4%. - From Spring 2025 to Spring 2026, the average ELA BEACON scale score for each grade level will increase by at least 15 points: 6th Grade- 464 to 479 7th Grade- 498 to 513 8th Grade- 506 to 521																																								
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially																																									
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	**We are still awaiting the EOG results for SY 2025–2026. Scores are expected to be available in the fall.** The ELA BEACON goal was partially achieved as shown by the chart below. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr> <th rowspan="3" style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">Beacon ELA Data – Comparison</th><th colspan="6" style="background-color: #d3d3d3;">ELA Grade Level Scale Scores</th></tr> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="color: red;">SY 25-26</th><th colspan="3" style="color: black;">SY 24-25</th></tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #add8e6;">Fall</th><th style="background-color: #add8e6;">Winter</th><th style="background-color: #add8e6;">Spring</th><th style="background-color: #add8e6;">Fall</th><th style="background-color: #add8e6;">Winter</th><th style="background-color: #add8e6;">Spring</th></tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">6th Grade</td><td>445</td><td>460</td><td>468</td><td>450</td><td>449</td><td>464</td></tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">7th Grade</td><td>467</td><td>480</td><td>502</td><td>479</td><td>482</td><td>498</td></tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #f2f2f2;">8th Grade</td><td>493</td><td>505</td><td>524</td><td>493</td><td>491</td><td>506</td></tr> </table> - The 6th-grade scale score increased by 23 points from fall to spring, compared to a 16-point increase last school year. - The 7th-grade scale score increased by 25 points from fall to spring, compared to a 19-point increase last school year. - The 8th-grade scale score exceeded the goal by reaching 524 from fall to spring, reflecting a 31-point increase compared to a 13-point increase last school year.	Beacon ELA Data – Comparison	ELA Grade Level Scale Scores						SY 25-26			SY 24-25			Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall	Winter	Spring	6th Grade	445	460	468	450	449	464	7th Grade	467	480	502	479	482	498	8th Grade	493	505	524	493	491	506
Beacon ELA Data – Comparison	ELA Grade Level Scale Scores																																								
	SY 25-26			SY 24-25																																					
	Fall	Winter	Spring	Fall	Winter	Spring																																			
6th Grade	445	460	468	450	449	464																																			
7th Grade	467	480	502	479	482	498																																			
8th Grade	493	505	524	493	491	506																																			

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Although the ELA BEACON goal was partially achieved, the following actionable strategies could be implemented to address areas of need and support continued growth across all grade levels: • Strengthen targeted small-group instruction based on BEACON domain data and identified student skill deficits. • Utilize frequent formative assessments to monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. • Conduct grade level ELA and Reading alignment meetings to ensure consistency and progression of ELA standards across both content areas.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	n/a

Previous Year's Goal #2	By May 2026, the number of students scoring at Level 2 (Developing Learner) and above on the Math EOG will increase from 72.7% to 80%.			
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially				
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	To achieve the Math School Improvement Plan goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring at Level 2 and above on the Math EOG from 72.7% in SY 2024–2025 to 80% in SY 2025–2026, we aimed for <u>655 out of 819 students</u> to reach these performance levels on the End-of-Grade Milestone assessment. With 74.6% of students scoring at Level 2 and above, we had a slight percentage increase towards this goal, with <u>611 students</u> reaching these achievement levels.			
	6 th Grade Math			
		25-26%	24-25%	23-24 (%)
	Level 4	3.1	2.8	3.0
	Level 3	23.9	16.7	18.8
	Level 2	39	43	46.9
Level 1	34	37.3	31.3	

Levels 3 + 4	27	19.5	21.8
Levels 2-4	66	62.7	68.7

7th Grade Math

	25-26 (%)	24-25 (%)	23-24 (%)
Level 4	2.9	6.3	1.2
Level 3	24.5	36.2	25.8
Level 2	46.5	39.8	51.3
Level 1	26	17.8	21.7
Levels 3 + 4	27.4	42.5	27.0
Levels 2-4	73.9	82.2	78.3

8th Grade Math

	25-26 (%)	24-25 (%)	23-24 (%)
Level 4	6.8	4.1	9.3
Level 3	28.1	29.9	20.2
Level 2	44.1	39.9	41.8
Level 1	20.9	26.1	28.7
Levels 3 + 4	34.9	34	29.4
Levels 2-4	79	73.9	71.3

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The following processes, action steps, and interventions will be implemented to address the area of need and continue progress toward the Math School Improvement Plan goal: • Provided targeted small-group instruction and intervention based on student performance data and identified standards deficits. • Implemented differentiated instruction and spiral review practices to strengthen prerequisite skills while reinforcing grade-level standards. • Increased opportunities for math discourse, problem-solving tasks, and evidence-based reasoning to deepen conceptual understanding. • Expanded intervention support, tutoring opportunities, and technology-based practice programs to accelerate student achievement and growth.
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	n/a

Previous Year's Goal #3	By May 2026, the number of students scoring at Level 2 (Developing Learner) and above on the Science EOG will increase from 52.8% to 60%.																														
Was the goal met? ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially																															
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	To achieve the Science School Improvement Plan goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring at Level 2 and above on the Science EOG from 52.8% in SY 2024–2025 to 60% in SY 2025–2026, we aimed for <u>139 out of 232 students</u> to reach these performance levels on the End-of-Grade Milestone assessment. With 62.8% of students scoring at Level 2 and above, we exceeded this goal, with <u>146 students</u> reaching these achievement levels. 8th Grade Science *Includes HS Physical Science Scores <table border="1" data-bbox="474 548 1203 836"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>25-26* (%)</th> <th>24-25* (%)</th> <th>23-24 (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Level 4</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>4</td> <td>3.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 3</td> <td>28</td> <td>19</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 2</td> <td>28.4</td> <td>29.7</td> <td>24.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Level 1</td> <td>37.1</td> <td>47.2</td> <td>48.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Levels 3 + 4</td> <td>34.4</td> <td>23</td> <td>26.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Levels 2-4</td> <td>62.8</td> <td>52.8</td> <td>51.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				25-26* (%)	24-25* (%)	23-24 (%)	Level 4	6.4	4	3.9	Level 3	28	19	23	Level 2	28.4	29.7	24.8	Level 1	37.1	47.2	48.2	Levels 3 + 4	34.4	23	26.9	Levels 2-4	62.8	52.8	51.8
	25-26* (%)	24-25* (%)	23-24 (%)																												
Level 4	6.4	4	3.9																												
Level 3	28	19	23																												
Level 2	28.4	29.7	24.8																												
Level 1	37.1	47.2	48.2																												
Levels 3 + 4	34.4	23	26.9																												
Levels 2-4	62.8	52.8	51.8																												
Reflecting on Outcomes																															
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	N/A																														

If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	The following processes, action steps, and interventions contributed to exceeding the Science School Improvement Plan goal and will continue to be implemented to sustain progress: • Provided standards-based instruction aligned closely to the Georgia Science Standards and EOG expectations. • Conducted remediation and enrichment opportunities during intervention periods and tutoring sessions. • Incorporated consistent formative assessments and benchmark monitoring to guide instructional adjustments. • Increased opportunities for hands-on, inquiry-based learning experiences to improve student engagement and understanding.
---	--

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
6th Grade	36%	26.1%	
7th Grade	23%	32.2%	
8th Grade	32%	24.3%	

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
6th Grade	30	47	22	33	46	22	32	48	20	47	40	14	38	42	20	36	41	23	36	47	17
7th Grade	23	47	30	24	48	27	23	52	25	39	45	17	25	50	25	25	49	25	36	42	22
8th Grade	30	43	27	28	40	32	29	42	29	44	37	19	29	35	36	26	43	31	31	40	29

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Student Groups)	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): 6th Grade ELA Strengths: - The percentage of students scoring in the Prepared category increased from 5% in the fall to 16% in the spring. - Students needing support decreased from 36% in the fall to 31% in the spring. - Overall scale score growth exceeded last year’s gains, demonstrating improved academic progress. 7th Grade ELA Strengths: - The percentage of students in the Prepared category increased from 12% in the fall to 23% in the spring. - Students needing support decreased significantly from 37% in the fall to 20% in the spring. - The grade level demonstrated strong overall growth with a 25-point increase from fall to spring. 8th Grade ELA Strengths: - The percentage of students classified as “Prepared” increased from 16% in the Fall to 29% in the Spring, while students needing support decreased from 37% to 29%. “Prepared” students increased from 41 to 74 students.	Grade Levels (all students): 6th Grade ELA Weaknesses: - More than half of students remained in the Near Target category in the spring, indicating many students have not yet reached proficiency. - The percentage of students in the Prepared category remains relatively low at 16%. 7th Grade ELA Weaknesses: - More than half of students remained in the Near Target category in the spring, showing a continued need for targeted intervention. - A larger percentage of students still need movement from Near Target to Prepared performance levels. 8th Grade ELA Weaknesses: 43% of students remained “Near Target” in Spring, indicating many students are close to proficiency but have not yet mastered grade-level standards. - Nearly one-third of students (29%) still required support by Spring. EL:

	• “Support Needed” students decreased from 96 to 76 students. EL: English Language Learners (ELL) Strengths ELL students demonstrated growth across the year: • “Prepared” students increased from 4% to 34%. • “Support Needed” decreased from 84% to 62%. This reflects substantial academic progress and suggests that targeted supports for language learners are helping students improve over time. The Spring data also shows that 43 students reached the “Prepared” level compared to only 5 students in the Fall, which is a significant gain. SWD: Students with Disabilities (SWD) Strengths SWD students showed consistent improvement throughout the year: • “Support Needed” decreased from 63% to 47%. • “Prepared” increased from 3% to 5%. • “Near Target” increased from 34% to 48%. The increase in “Near Target” students suggest many students are progressing toward proficiency, even if they have not fully reached the prepared level yet.	English Language Learners (ELL) Weaknesses ELL students remain the subgroup with the highest percentage of students needing support. In Spring: • 62% still required support. • Only 34% were prepared. This indicates persistent achievement gaps and suggests students may still struggle with academic vocabulary, reading comprehension, and language acquisition demands within grade-level texts. SWD: Students with Disabilities (SWD) Weaknesses The biggest concern is that nearly half of SWD students (47%) still required significant support in Spring. Additionally, only 5% reached the “Prepared” category by the end of the year, showing that achievement levels for SWD students remain substantially below overall school performance. SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The Beacon data shows Listening (which includes academic language processing) and Language: Vocabulary and Grammar as consistently weak domains across all three grade levels. • This could be because students have had inconsistent, structured opportunities for academic discourse, vocabulary development, and extended writing practice that is embedded within daily instruction. The result is limited language acquisition needed to access complex texts and respond in writing.	

ACCESS Scores

(Grade Level Reading & Writing)

Garrett Middle School ESOL Data

2026 ACCESS Composite Score Data by Grade

Note. ACCESS data include students with a 2026 ACCESS Test Score.

Grade	Student Count	1.0-1.9 (%)	2.0-2.9 (%)	3.0-3.9 (%)	4.0-4.9 (%)	5.0-6.0 (%)
06	42	14.3	26.2	45.2	14.3	-
07	58	8.6	20.7	37.9	29.3	3.4
08	59	27.1	13.6	33.9	25.4	-
ALL	159	17.0	19.5	38.4	23.9	1.3

Grade Levels (all students):

Historical CCRPI Progress Towards English Language Proficiency Data

Note. ELP data include students with two consecutive ACCESS test scores.

School Year	Student Count	No Positive Movement	Moved Less Than One Band	Moved One Band	Moved More Than One Band	Progress Toward English Language Proficiency
		0 points (%)	0.5 point (%)	1.0 point (%)	1.5 points (%)	
2021	120	68.3	12.5	14.2	5.0	27.95
2022	132	59.8	9.1	11.4	19.7	45.50
2023	154	50.6	11.7	17.5	20.1	53.50
2024	147	49.0	10.9	21.8	18.4	54.85
2025	164	31.1	14.6	22.6	31.7	77.45

ACCESS Low, Typical, and High Growth

	Low	Typical	High	Total
# ELs	32	34	45	111
% ELs	28.8%	30.6%	40.5%	100.0%

Grade Levels (all students):

ACCESS Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) Ranges

	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.2	4.3+	Total
# ELs	11	23	41	11	12	98
% ELs	11.2%	23.5%	41.8%	11.2%	12.2%	100.0%

ACCESS Domain Scores (Currently Enrolled ELs)

Listening	Most students scored in Levels 3-Developing and 2-Emerging
Speaking	Most students scored in Levels 3-Developing and 2-Emerging
Reading	Most students scored in Levels 2-Emerging and 1-Entering
Writing	Most students scored in Levels 3-Developing and 2-Emerging

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

- ☒ Coherent Instruction
- ☒ Professional Capacity
- ☐ Effective Leadership
- ☒ Supportive Learning Environment

Root Cause Explanation:

- ACCESS data shows that for Listening & Speaking and Writing, most students scored in the developing and emerging bands. This could be related to insufficient, structured and consistent opportunities for academic discourse, which impacts vocabulary development and writing.

ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)

Grade Levels (all students):

#	Name	Questions Attempted	Total Points Earned	Total Points Possible	Overall Score	Dot Rank (Click Dot Rank to Assign Remediation)
1	7.T.T.1.a Narrative Techniques	1605	1215	1808	67%	
2	7.T.T.1.b Plot Structures	362	301.31	435	69%	
3	7.T.T.1.c Compare and Contrast Theme Development	479	497.5	647	77%	
4	7.T.T.1.d Compare and Contrast Fiction	652	440	652	67%	
5	7.T.T.2.a Expository Techniques	1709	1697.11	2472	69%	
6	7.T.T.2.b Compare and Contrast Expository Texts	443	277	443	63%	
7	7.T.T.3.a Argumentative Techniques	2721	2716.11	3933	69%	
8	7.T.T.4.a Poetic Techniques	396	190	410	46%	
Domain Totals		8367	7334.03	10800	68 %	

#	Name	Questions Attempted	Total Points Earned	Total Points Possible	Overall Score	Dot Rank (Click Dot Rank to Assign Remediation)
1	8.T.T.1.a Narrative Techniques	17	10	20	50%	
2	8.T.T.1.b Plot Structures	402	355.83	406	88%	
3	8.T.T.1.c Themes	407	463.10	542	85%	
4	8.T.T.1.d Different Time Periods	11	5	11	45%	
5	8.T.T.2.a Expository Techniques	873	1296.31	1553	83%	
6	8.T.T.2.b Compare and Contrast Expository Texts	150	206.05	286	72%	
7	8.T.T.3.a Argumentative Techniques	436	557.78	634	88%	
8	8.T.T.4.a Poetic Techniques	440	379	444	85%	
Domain Totals		2736	3273.07	3896	84 %	

Grade Levels (all students):

#	Name	Questions Attempted	Total Points Earned	Total Points Possible	Overall Score	Dot Rank (Click Dot Rank to Assign Remediation)
1	6.T.T.1.a Narrative Techniques	373	253	394	64%	
2	6.T.T.1.b Plot Structures	83	43	87	49%	
3	6.T.T.1.c Multiple Themes	13	14.67	34	43%	
4	6.T.T.1.d Compare and Contrast Literary Texts	24	19	32	59%	
5	6.T.T.2.a Expository Techniques	1774	1418.5	2485	57%	
6	6.T.T.2.b Compare and Contrast Expository Texts	822	652	1221	53%	
7	6.T.T.3.a Argumentative Techniques	2345	1181.27	2417	49%	
8	6.T.T.4.a Poetic Techniques	341	207.01	345	60%	
Domain Totals		5775	3788.45	7015	54 %	

6th Grade ELA Weaknesses

6th grade demonstrated the greatest area of concern with an overall score of 61%.

Lowest-performing standards included:

- **Multiple Themes (43%)**
- **Plot Structures (49%)**
- **Argumentative Techniques (49%)**
- **Compare and Contrast Expository Texts (53%)**
- **Expository Techniques (57%)**

Nearly all standards fell within the pink remediation range, indicating significant instructional gaps and the need for targeted intervention.

Cross-Grade Weakness Trends

Students across multiple grade levels struggled most with:

- **Compare and contrast skills**
- **Analyzing multiple themes**
- **Argumentative text analysis**
- **Complex literary analysis**

	<u>7th Grade ELA Strengths</u> Students demonstrated stronger performance in: • Compare and Contrast Theme Development (77%) • Plot Structures (69%) • Expository Techniques (69%) • Argumentative Techniques (69%) Overall domain performance in “Constructing Texts” showed students are developing foundational comprehension and organizational skills. Most standards fell within the yellow performance range, indicating students are approaching proficiency across several standards areas. <u>8th Grade ELA Strengths</u> 8th grade showed the strongest overall performance among the grade levels with an overall score of 81%. Highest-performing areas included: • Plot Structures (88%) • Argumentative Techniques (88%) • Themes (85%) • Poetic Techniques (85%) • Expository Techniques (83%) Students demonstrated strong comprehension of literary elements, author’s techniques, and informational text structures. Most standards ranked in the green performance range, indicating mastery or near mastery of grade-level expectations.	Students appear to perform better with identifying basic literary elements than with higher-order analysis and synthesis tasks. There may be gaps in students’ ability to explain reasoning, analyze author’s purpose, and evaluate how ideas develop across texts.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: From the Common Assessment Data compare-and-contrast skills, analyzing multiple themes, argumentative text analysis, and complex literary analysis were the four areas where students struggled most school-wide. • The root cause could be that students need consistent, structured strategies and practice, to help them to explain their reasoning evaluate how an author’s ideas develop across texts, then construct written responses that justify their thinking. • Teachers need instructional training on how to consistently sequence instruction using a specific process, so that identifying and explaining literary elements, come before tasks that require analysis and synthesis. • Common assessments may not be measuring the same skills at the same level of rigor. Data shows that most 8th grade students perform well on internal assessments but struggle on standardized ones, so the assessment design is part of the problem.	

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?	• Teachers consistently utilize district-provided instructional resources and Cobb County School District Curriculum Maps to guide instruction and emphasize priority standards. • Learning targets aligned to grade-level standards are visible and implemented in at least 90% of observed classrooms. • Classroom instruction generally reflects alignment to standards-based teaching and established curriculum expectations.	• Teachers inconsistently implement exit tickets or other formative assessments to measure student understanding at the conclusion of lessons. • Instructional walk data indicates that only approximately 50% of observed classrooms provide rigorous learning tasks that promote higher-order thinking and extended learning opportunities. • Opportunities for students to engage in deeper analysis, critical thinking, and academically challenging tasks are not consistently evident across classrooms.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: From the Walkthrough data we note that: • 50% of classrooms do not provide higher-order tasks; • Exit tickets and other end-of-lesson checks are inconsistently implemented across ELA classrooms. Without that feedback loop in place, teachers cannot identify which students are ready for the next level of complexity and which students need re-teaching. Root causes could be: • Instructional tasks inconsistently require higher-order thinking, close reading, and text analysis, limiting students' exposure to the level of cognitive demand required by grade-level and Milestone standards • The absence of consistent formative checkpoints means instructional gaps are going undetected in real time and then compounding across the year. Formative assessment data needs to be used consistently, to determine whether students have mastered a skill before instruction moves forward. (6th grade common assessment scored 61% overall with most standards in the "pink" remediation range)	
Other Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☒ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Teacher Survey • Common assessments alignment • An increase in academic ownership • Weekly checks for understanding of learning targets Integration of cross-curricular content is underway (e.g., novel studies, reading in non-core subjects).	Teacher Survey • Level of rigor on Savvas assessments • Flexibility with Assessment plans • Utilization of online platforms Parent Survey • A desire for more supplemental learning opportunities that include hands-on experiences. • Request for clearer information about Milestone testing, including grading practices and preparation

		strategies. - Increased interest in meetings focused on the safe use of social media and technology. - Concern about low attendance at parent meetings and a perceived lack of effective communication. Recommendation for teachers to place greater emphasis on building community and intentionally fostering strong relationships between the school and families.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	- Teachers may need additional professional learning and support to effectively implement rigorous instruction, utilize Savvas assessments, and align instruction to the rigor of Milestone expectations. - Limited flexibility within assessment plans and inconsistent use of online instructional platforms may hinder differentiation, student engagement, and consistent instructional practices across classrooms. - Families expressed a desire for more supplemental and hands-on learning opportunities to increase student engagement and real-world application of learning. - Communication regarding Milestone testing, grading practices, school expectations, and parent meeting opportunities may not be clear, consistent, or accessible for all families, contributing to low parent participation.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	From Spring 2026 to Spring 2027, the average ELA BEACON scale score for each grade level will increase by at least 15 points 6th Grade- 468 to 483 7th Grade- 502 to 517 8th Grade- 524 to 539		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- The root cause could be that there needs to be structured strategies for student discourse to help students explain their reasoning - Instruction needs to focus on consistently sequencing strategies using a specific process (ex. Identifying and explaining literary elements, come before tasks that require analysis and synthesis). - Instructional tasks do not consistently require higher-order thinking, close reading, and text analysis, limiting students' exposure to the level of cognitive demand required by grade-level and Milestone standard - The absence of consistent formative checkpoints means instructional gaps are going undetected in "real time" and then compounding across the year. Formative assessment data needs to be used consistently, to determine whether students have mastered a skill before instruction moves forward.		
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 Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: By November 2026, instructional walkthrough data will show that 100% of observed classrooms consistently implement at least one structured student discourse strategy and at least one formative checkpoint (such as an exit ticket, written response, or mid-lesson check) during each lesson, aligned to the lesson's standards-based learning target.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, instructional walkthrough data will show that at least 80% of observed classrooms consistently implement differentiated instructional strategies and scaffolding techniques aligned to students' learning needs during instruction. By May 2027, instructional walkthrough data will show that at least 70% of observed classrooms consistently implement differentiated instructional strategies and scaffolding techniques aligned to EL and SWD learning needs during instruction.	CTLS Assess CCSD Teaching and Learning Framework GaDOE DRC BEACON Title I Coach District Personnel
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	Implementation Plan: By September 30, 2026: Provide professional learning on structured discourse strategies and formative checkpoint design aligned to ELA standards-based planning. Teachers will select at least two discourse protocols and two formative checkpoint formats to implement consistently during the first semester, documented in their lesson	Evaluation Tool(s): Formative and Summative Assessments	
ELA Action Step #1 <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Implement daily, structured opportunities for student discourse, with formative checkpoints during instruction, that is aligned to teachers' standards-based planning.	plans. August-September: Teachers begin implementing daily structured discourse opportunities and formative checkpoints during ELA instruction. Lesson plans are reviewed to confirm alignment between discourse tasks, checkpoints, and the lesson's learning target. Initial walkthroughs are conducted to establish a baseline of implementation. October-December: Conduct focused instructional walkthroughs to observe frequency and quality of student discourse and formative checkpoint use. Provide targeted feedback, modeling, and coaching based on walkthrough data. CCC teams review formative checkpoint data to identify students needing intervention or enrichment. January-February: Review midyear walkthrough trends and student performance data to determine whether student discourse and formative checkpoint implementation is improving student mastery of ELA standards. Adjust coaching and professional learning support based on data findings. March-April: Continue walkthroughs with focus on whether formative checkpoint data is driving instructional decisions in real time. Support teachers in using student discourse to specifically address the weaknesses in higher-order analysis, argumentation, and text comparison identified in previous common assessment data. May: Conduct end-of-year review of walkthrough data and student performance outcomes to evaluate whether consistent implementation of student discourse and formative checkpoints contributed to growth in ELA BEACON scale scores and common assessment performance. Artifacts to be Collected: - Walkthrough data and observation notes that capture frequency and quality of student discourse and formative checkpoints - Formative checkpoint samples and student work collected during CCC data reviews	- ELA Common Assessment Data - Instructional Focus Walks - Lesson/Unit Plans Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Weekly Data Analysis Plan: - Establish a grade-level CCC schedule with a consistent template for reviewing formative checkpoint data tied to specific lessons that have a lot of student discourse. - During CCC meetings, teachers bring exit ticket and written response data to identify which students demonstrated understanding and which need re-teaching before instruction advances. - Common assessment results are reviewed at the end of each unit to determine whether the targeted standards (especially analysis, argumentation, and theme) are trending upward. - Academic coach will collect walkthrough data each semester and share trends with the instructional leadership team to inform coaching priorities and professional learning planning. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	• CCC meeting notes and data discussion documentation • Coaching documentation and feedback records Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coach/Instructional Support Specialist Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly during August-September; bi-weekly during October-December; monthly January through May.		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Instruction has not consistently incorporated the targeted, individualized language and literacy supports these students require during the literacy 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 Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, 100% of ELA teachers will demonstrate, through lesson plans and instructional walkthrough data, that daily literacy block instruction includes at least one ELlevation strategy and at least one IEP-aligned scaffold, selected based on each teacher's review of their students' current ACCESS proficiency levels and IEP goals.		
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
ELA Action Step #2 <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. Teachers will implement targeted ELlevation strategies, IEP-aligned scaffolds, and structured language support during the literacy block to address the academic vocabulary, reading comprehension, and written response needs of EL and SWD students, (based on analysis of individual student data, including, EL proficiency levels, and IEP goals).	Implementation Plan: Preplanning-Beginning of August: Provide professional learning on how to use ACCESS domain scores (specifically Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing bands) to differentiate instruction and set realistic language growth targets for individual students. Teachers review ACCESS scores and EL proficiency level data for each of their EL students and IEP goals for each of their SWD students. Each teacher selects a minimum of two (2) ELlevation strategies and two (2) IEP-aligned scaffolds appropriate to their class makeup. August-September: Teachers implement ELlevation strategies and IEP-aligned scaffolds daily during the literacy block. Lesson plans are submitted for review to verify that strategies are documented and connected to specific student proficiency data. Initial walkthroughs establish a baseline of implementation quality and fidelity. The ESOL teacher and academic coach begin co-planning and co-teaching cycles with ELA teachers who have significant EL populations. October-December: Conduct walkthroughs to observe the quality and consistency of language support strategies and IEP scaffold implementation during the literacy block.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, at least 70% of EL students will move out of the Support Needed category on the Beacon ELA spring administration (down from 62% in SY26), with at least 40% reaching Near Target or Prepared. By May 2027, at least 60% of SWD students will be in the Near Target or Prepared category on the Beacon ELA spring administration, reflecting continued movement from the 53% combined Near Target and Prepared rate recorded in SY26 Spring. Additionally, instructional walkthrough data will show that at least 85% of observed literacy block lessons include documented ELlevation strategies and IEP-aligned scaffolds aligned to individual student proficiency data. Evaluation Tool(s): • Beacon ELA Subgroup Data • ACCESS Scores • Instructional Focus Walks • Formative and Summative Assessments • Student Work Samples Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	

	Targeted feedback, modeling, and coaching are provided based on observation data. During CCC meetings, teachers bring EL and SWD student work samples and formative assessment results to analyze which students are showing growth (in academic vocabulary, explaining reasoning and written response) and which need adjusted supports. January-February: Review Midyear ACCESS growth data and Beacon ELA subgroup results to assess whether EL and SWD students are making measurable progress. Coaching and professional learning will be adjusted based on subgroup performance trends. March-April: Teachers incorporate structured writing routines, and vocabulary support strategies from ELlevation and explicitly tied to the higher-order ELA standards where gaps are most pronounced (including argumentative techniques, comparing and contrasting texts, and analyzing multiple themes). May: Conduct end-of-year review of walkthrough data, student work samples, and Beacon ELA subgroup performance to evaluate the impact of ELlevation and IEP-aligned instruction on EL and SWD student growth. Artifacts to be Collected: • Lesson plans documenting ELlevation strategy and IEP scaffold selection tied to student proficiency data • ACCESS score review and teacher planning notes • Walkthrough data and observation notes focused on literacy block support for EL and SWD students • Formative assessment results by subgroup • CCC meeting notes and co-planning notes for subgroup discussions	Data Analysis Plan: • Develop an assessment calendar with specific dates. • At each CCC meeting, teachers bring EL and SWD student formative assessment data and written response samples to analyze growth patterns and adjust scaffolds as needed. • Beacon ELA subgroup results from each administration are disaggregated by EL proficiency band and disability category and reviewed to identify which students are progressing and which require more intensive support. • Walkthrough trends are compiled and shared with the instructional leadership team each semester. • At midyear, ACCESS growth data is cross-referenced with Beacon performance to assess whether language development gains are translating to ELA literacy outcomes. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coach/Instructional Support Specialist Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly during August-September; bi-weekly during October-December; monthly January through May.		
--	---	--	--

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	22%	19.5%	28.1%
7 th Grade	27%	41.4%	28.4%
8 th Grade	29%	34%	34.8%

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	67	31	2	54	37	9	53	41	6	52	40	8
7 th Grade	53	40	7	47	43	10	47	46	7	42	41	17
8 th Grade	65	23	12	50	32	18	46	38	16	55	33	12

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Grade Levels & Student Groups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <u>Grade 6 Mathematics Strengths</u> A combined 69 students scored at the Proficient or Distinguished Learner levels. Students performed strongest in: • Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Area, Surface Area, and Volume, with 84 students meeting the target. • Operations with Positive Rational Numbers, with 60 students meeting the target. • Compare Rational Numbers, with 53 students meeting the target.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <u>Grade 6 Mathematics Weaknesses</u> The majority of students scored in the Beginning or Developing Learner categories. Significant weaknesses were evident in: • Ratios and Rates, with 165 students below target. • Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning, with 162 students below target. • Numerical and Algebraic Expressions, with 164 students below target.

	Many students are approaching proficiency in: • Operations with Data Problems • Coordinate Plane and Polygons • Compare Rational Numbers <u>Grade 7 Mathematics Strengths</u> A combined 74 students scored at the Proficient or Distinguished Learner levels. Relative strengths included: • Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning, with 63 students meeting target. • Operations with Rational Numbers, with 56 students meeting target. • Expressions, Equations, and Inequalities, with 55 students meeting target. Large numbers of students scored in the Approaching Target range in: • Geometric & Spatial Reasoning • Probability Reasoning • Proportional Relationships <u>Grade 8 Mathematics Strengths</u> Grade 8 showed the highest number of students scoring at the Proficient or Distinguished Learner levels (108 students combined). Stronger performance areas included: • Linear Problem Solving, with 94 students meeting target. • Systems of Equations, with 63 students meeting target. • Irrational Numbers, Radicals, and Integer Exponents, with 72 students meeting target. Many students are approaching mastery in: • Systems of Equations • Properties and Uses of Functions • Linear Relationships	Students continue to struggle with algebraic reasoning and applying mathematical relationships. <u>Grade 7 Mathematics Weaknesses</u> Most students remain below target across all domains. Major weaknesses include: • Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning, with 170 students below target. • Operations with Rational Numbers, with 156 students below target. • Proportional Relationships, with 149 students below target. Students demonstrate difficulty applying algebraic concepts and reasoning through multi-step mathematical tasks. <u>Grade 8 Mathematics Weaknesses</u> Students struggled most with higher-level algebraic and functional reasoning skills. Major areas of concern include: • Properties and Uses of Functions, with 184 students below target. • Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning, with 181 students below target. • Linear Relationships, with 179 students below target. • Pythagorean Theorem and Volume, with 174 students below target. Students continue to demonstrate gaps in conceptual understanding and mathematical application involving functions and algebraic reasoning. EL: • 33% of ELL students remained at the Beginning Learner level on the Math EOG. • Numerical reasoning and foundational computation skills remained major areas of weakness.
--	---	--

	EL: • ELL students demonstrated stronger overall performance on the Math EOG, with 24% scoring at the Proficient or Distinguished levels (Levels 3 and 4 combined). • ELL students showed evidence of academic growth, with 43% performing at the Developing Learner level (Level 2), indicating movement toward proficiency. • ELL students showed stronger performance in conceptual and visual mathematics domains compared to computation-heavy areas. • Intervention supports, scaffolds, and small-group instruction contributed to measurable student growth across grade levels. • Students demonstrated growth in mathematical understanding through supported instruction and targeted intervention opportunities. SWD: • SWD students demonstrated some success in progressing toward proficiency, with 43% scoring at Level 2 or higher on the Math EOG. • SWD students showed stronger performance in conceptual and visual mathematics domains compared to computation-heavy areas. • Small-group instruction, scaffolded supports, and intervention services contributed to measurable student growth. • Students demonstrated improvement in foundational mathematical understanding throughout the school year. • Structured supports and accommodations helped students access grade-level mathematical content more effectively.	• ELL students continued to struggle with academic vocabulary, language comprehension, and interpreting multi-step word problems. • Students experienced difficulty independently applying mathematical concepts in rigorous problem-solving tasks. • ELL students continued to require differentiated instruction, vocabulary supports, scaffolds, and repeated opportunities for practice to master grade-level standards. SWD: • 52% of SWD students remained at the Beginning Learner level on the Math EOG. • SWD students had limited proficiency levels, with only 5% scoring at the Proficient level and no students scoring at the Distinguished level. • Numerical reasoning and foundational computation skills remained significant areas of weakness. • Students continued to struggle with multi-step problem solving, mathematical reasoning, and independent application of skills. • SWD students continued to require differentiated instruction, targeted interventions, accommodations, scaffolds, and repeated opportunities for practice to achieve mastery of grade-level standards.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Levels & Student Groups)	Grade Levels: <u>Grade 6 Mathematics Strengths</u> • Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning showed the strongest growth, increasing from 412 to 452 (+40 points). This indicates students made strong gains in understanding algebraic concepts and patterns.	Grade Levels: <u>Grade 6 Mathematics Weaknesses</u> • Measurement and Data Reasoning declined from 453 to 444 (-9 points), making it the only reporting category with negative growth. This suggests a need for stronger instruction and intervention in data analysis, measurement, and application skills.

	• Geometric and Spatial Reasoning also demonstrated significant improvement, increasing from 418 to 453 (+35 points). • By spring, Geometric and Spatial Reasoning had the highest average scale score (453), showing improved conceptual understanding in geometry-related standards. • The percentage of students identified as “Prepared” increased across all domains from fall to spring, showing overall academic growth. <u>Grade 7 Mathematics Strengths</u> • 7th grade demonstrated strong growth across every reporting category. • Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning showed the highest growth, increasing from 434 to 482 (+48 points), reflecting strong progress in algebraic thinking and problem solving. • Geometric and Spatial Reasoning achieved the highest spring average scale score (508) and increased by 43 points, indicating mastery growth in geometry concepts. • The percentage of students classified as “Prepared” was highest in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning (17%), showing stronger readiness levels in this domain. • Support Needed percentages decreased considerably from fall to spring in all reporting categories. <u>Grade 8 Mathematics Strengths</u> • 8th grade showed the strongest overall growth among all grade levels. • Measurement and Data Reasoning increased dramatically from 456 to 531 (+75 points), becoming the highest-performing reporting category. • Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning also demonstrated exceptional growth, increasing from 451 to 523 (+72 points). • Numerical Reasoning improved significantly by 65 points, indicating major gains in foundational number concepts. • Prepared percentages were highest in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning (18%) and Measurement and Data Reasoning (16%), showing increased student readiness and proficiency.	• Numerical Reasoning remained the lowest-performing area in spring with an average scale score of 417. • More than half of students remained in the “Support Needed” category across all domains, especially in Numerical Reasoning (67%), indicating continued foundational skill gaps. <u>Grade 7 Mathematics Weaknesses</u> • Although growth occurred in all areas, Numerical Reasoning remained the lowest-performing category with a spring average scale score of 469. • Nearly half of students still required support in Numerical Reasoning (53%), Measurement and Data Reasoning (47%), and Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning (47%). • Prepared percentages outside of Geometry remained relatively low, suggesting students are improving but have not yet reached mastery consistently. <u>Grade 8 Mathematics Weaknesses</u> • Despite large gains, Numerical Reasoning continued to have the highest percentage of students needing support (65%), indicating ongoing struggles with foundational computation and number sense skills. • Geometric and Spatial Reasoning had lower performance compared to other 8th grade domains, with 55% of students still requiring support. • While growth was substantial, the large percentage of students still identified as “Support Needed” suggests a continued need for differentiated instruction and targeted intervention. EL: • Despite growth, the majority of ELL students across all grade levels remained in the “Support Needed” category: ○ 6th Grade: 93% ○ 7th Grade: 76% ○ 8th Grade: 77% • 6th grade ELL students demonstrated the least growth, increasing only 9 points from fall to spring.
--	--	---

	• All reporting categories exceeded 485 by spring, reflecting substantial academic improvement across the grade level. EL: • All grade levels demonstrated growth from fall to spring in average scale scores. • 8th grade ELL students showed the strongest growth, increasing from 390 to 450 (+60 points), indicating substantial academic progress over the course of the year. • 7th grade ELL students also demonstrated strong growth, increasing from 390 to 436 (+46 points). • The percentage of students classified as “Near Target” increased in every grade level: ○ 6th Grade: 0% → 7% ○ 7th Grade: 13% → 24% ○ 8th Grade: 4% → 17% • 8th grade ELL students were the only ELL subgroup to have students reach the “Prepared” category in spring (6%), showing emerging proficiency and readiness. • Overall reductions in the “Support Needed” category across all grades indicate positive movement toward proficiency. SWD: • Students with disabilities demonstrated measurable growth across all grade levels from fall to spring. • 8th grade SWD students showed the strongest improvement, increasing from 422 to 484 (+62 points), reflecting significant academic gains. • 7th grade SWD students also demonstrated strong growth, increasing from 415 to 448 (+33 points). • The percentage of students classified as “Near Target” increased substantially across all grade levels: ○ 6th Grade: 7% → 19% ○ 7th Grade: 19% → 35% ○ 8th Grade: 5% → 30% • Both 7th and 8th grade SWD groups had students reach the “Prepared” category in spring: ○ 7th Grade: 3%	• Prepared percentages remained very low overall, with 0% of 6th and 7th grade ELL students reaching the Prepared category. • The data suggests ongoing challenges with foundational math vocabulary, language comprehension, and academic problem-solving skills for ELL students. SWD: • Although improvement occurred, a large percentage of SWD students still remained in the “Support Needed” category: ○ 6th Grade: 81% ○ 7th Grade: 62% ○ 8th Grade: 65% • 6th grade SWD students showed the smallest amount of growth, increasing only 11 points from fall to spring. • Prepared percentages remained low overall, indicating that many SWD students continue to struggle to reach proficiency. • The data suggests continued needs for targeted interventions, scaffolded instruction, small-group support, and differentiated strategies to address foundational mathematical skill deficits.
--	--	--

	8th Grade: 5% - Support Needed percentages decreased significantly in every grade level, especially in: 7th Grade: 81% → 62% 8th Grade: 95% → 65%																																																													
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Intervention structures, differentiation, and progress monitoring have not been intensive or individualized enough to address the unfinished learning students carry into each grade level. As a result, a large percentage of students across grades 6-8 have remained in the Support Needed category despite year-over-year instruction. - Academic language instruction, vocabulary development, and scaffolded access to mathematical discourse have not been consistently embedded within daily math lessons, leaving ELL students without the language tools needed to demonstrate conceptual understanding on grade-level and standardized tasks. - SWD students need more frequent and intensive opportunities during core math instruction to practice foundational skills, build reasoning, and access grade-level content through targeted scaffolds and flexible grouping structures.																																																													
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD <table><thead><tr><th>Name</th><th>"MA.6.NR.3.3"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.3.6"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.1.1"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.1.1"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.2.5"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.3.5"</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Descriptions</td><td>Recognize and explain that opposite signs of integers indicate locations on opposite sides of zero on the number line; recognize and explain that the opposite of the opposite of a number is the number.</td><td>Distinguish comparisons of absolute value from statements about order.</td><td>Solve relevant mathematical problems involving operations with whole numbers, fractions, and decimal numbers.</td><td>Fluently add and subtract any combination of fractions to solve problems.</td><td>Relate the choice of center and variability to the shape of the data distribution and the context in which the data were gathered.</td><td>Explain the absolute value of a rational number as its distance from zero on the number line; interpret absolute value as distance for a positive or negative number.</td></tr><tr><td>Grade Level</td><td>88.89%</td><td>85.90%</td><td>84.23%</td><td>79.70%</td><td>79.35%</td><td>73.94%</td></tr><tr><td>ELL</td><td>87.10%</td><td>83.58%</td><td>62.50%</td><td>63.51%</td><td>73.33%</td><td>66.35%</td></tr><tr><td>SWD</td><td>86.15%</td><td>82.81%</td><td>76.63%</td><td>75.08%</td><td>76.67%</td><td>72.45%</td></tr></tbody></table>	Name	"MA.6.NR.3.3"	"MA.6.NR.3.6"	"MA.6.NR.1.1"	"MA.6.NR.1.1"	"MA.6.NR.2.5"	"MA.6.NR.3.5"	Descriptions	Recognize and explain that opposite signs of integers indicate locations on opposite sides of zero on the number line; recognize and explain that the opposite of the opposite of a number is the number.	Distinguish comparisons of absolute value from statements about order.	Solve relevant mathematical problems involving operations with whole numbers, fractions, and decimal numbers.	Fluently add and subtract any combination of fractions to solve problems.	Relate the choice of center and variability to the shape of the data distribution and the context in which the data were gathered.	Explain the absolute value of a rational number as its distance from zero on the number line; interpret absolute value as distance for a positive or negative number.	Grade Level	88.89%	85.90%	84.23%	79.70%	79.35%	73.94%	ELL	87.10%	83.58%	62.50%	63.51%	73.33%	66.35%	SWD	86.15%	82.81%	76.63%	75.08%	76.67%	72.45%	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD <table><thead><tr><th>Name</th><th>"MA.6.NR.2.1"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.2.2"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.2.3"</th><th>"MA.6.NR.1.2"</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Descriptions</td><td>Describe and interpret the center of the distribution by the equal share value (mean).</td><td>Summarize categorical and quantitative (numerical) data sets in relation to the context: display the distributions of quantitative (numerical) data in plots on a number line, including dot plots, histograms, and box plots and display the distribution of categorical data using bar graphs.</td><td>Interpret numerical data to answer a statistical investigative question created. Describe the distribution of a quantitative (numerical) variable collected, including its center, variability, and overall shape.</td><td>Multiply and divide any combination of whole numbers, fractions, and mixed numbers using a student-selected strategy. Interpret products and quotients of fractions and solve word problems.</td></tr><tr><td>Grade Level</td><td>72.12%</td><td>71.88%</td><td>71.24%</td><td>62.27%</td></tr><tr><td>ELL</td><td>61.15%</td><td>56.25%</td><td>53.77%</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>SWD</td><td>65.74%</td><td>60.65%</td><td>62.04%</td><td>60%</td></tr></tbody></table>	Name	"MA.6.NR.2.1"	"MA.6.NR.2.2"	"MA.6.NR.2.3"	"MA.6.NR.1.2"	Descriptions	Describe and interpret the center of the distribution by the equal share value (mean).	Summarize categorical and quantitative (numerical) data sets in relation to the context: display the distributions of quantitative (numerical) data in plots on a number line, including dot plots, histograms, and box plots and display the distribution of categorical data using bar graphs.	Interpret numerical data to answer a statistical investigative question created. Describe the distribution of a quantitative (numerical) variable collected, including its center, variability, and overall shape.	Multiply and divide any combination of whole numbers, fractions, and mixed numbers using a student-selected strategy. Interpret products and quotients of fractions and solve word problems.	Grade Level	72.12%	71.88%	71.24%	62.27%	ELL	61.15%	56.25%	53.77%	50%	SWD	65.74%	60.65%	62.04%	60%
	Name	"MA.6.NR.3.3"	"MA.6.NR.3.6"	"MA.6.NR.1.1"	"MA.6.NR.1.1"	"MA.6.NR.2.5"	"MA.6.NR.3.5"																																																							
Descriptions	Recognize and explain that opposite signs of integers indicate locations on opposite sides of zero on the number line; recognize and explain that the opposite of the opposite of a number is the number.	Distinguish comparisons of absolute value from statements about order.	Solve relevant mathematical problems involving operations with whole numbers, fractions, and decimal numbers.	Fluently add and subtract any combination of fractions to solve problems.	Relate the choice of center and variability to the shape of the data distribution and the context in which the data were gathered.	Explain the absolute value of a rational number as its distance from zero on the number line; interpret absolute value as distance for a positive or negative number.																																																								
Grade Level	88.89%	85.90%	84.23%	79.70%	79.35%	73.94%																																																								
ELL	87.10%	83.58%	62.50%	63.51%	73.33%	66.35%																																																								
SWD	86.15%	82.81%	76.63%	75.08%	76.67%	72.45%																																																								
Name	"MA.6.NR.2.1"	"MA.6.NR.2.2"	"MA.6.NR.2.3"	"MA.6.NR.1.2"																																																										
Descriptions	Describe and interpret the center of the distribution by the equal share value (mean).	Summarize categorical and quantitative (numerical) data sets in relation to the context: display the distributions of quantitative (numerical) data in plots on a number line, including dot plots, histograms, and box plots and display the distribution of categorical data using bar graphs.	Interpret numerical data to answer a statistical investigative question created. Describe the distribution of a quantitative (numerical) variable collected, including its center, variability, and overall shape.	Multiply and divide any combination of whole numbers, fractions, and mixed numbers using a student-selected strategy. Interpret products and quotients of fractions and solve word problems.																																																										
Grade Level	72.12%	71.88%	71.24%	62.27%																																																										
ELL	61.15%	56.25%	53.77%	50%																																																										
SWD	65.74%	60.65%	62.04%	60%																																																										

Name	"MA.7.PAR.4.2"	"MA.7.PAR.3.2"	"MA.7.PAR.2.1"	"MA.7.PAR.3.1"	"MA.7.PAR.3.2"	"MA.7.PAR.4.5"	"MA.7.PAR.4.4"
Descriptions	Determine the unit rate (constant of proportionality) in tables, graphs (1, δY), equations, diagrams, and verbal descriptions of proportional relationships to solve realistic problems.	Construct algebraic inequalities to solve problems, leading to inequalities of the form δY are specific rational numbers. Graph and interpret the solution based on the realistic situation that the inequalities represent.	Apply properties of operations as strategies to add, subtract, factor, and expand linear expressions with rational coefficients.	Construct algebraic equations to solve practical problems leading to equations of the form $\delta Y = \delta X + \delta Z$, where δ , δZ , and δY are specific rational numbers. Interpret the solution based on the situation.	Represent authentic situations using equations and inequalities with variables; solve equations and inequalities symbolically, using the properties of equality.	Use context to explain what a point (δX , δY) on the graph of a proportional relationship means in terms of the situation, with special attention to the points (0, 0) and (1, δY) where δY is the unit rate.	Identify, represent, and use proportional relationships.
Grade Level	85.15%	83.95%	83.10%	83.10%	83.10%	82.05%	78.62%
ELL	82.35%	73.33%	81.40%	81.40%	81.40%	82%	75.33%
SWD	79.31%	83.67%	83.33%	83.33%	83.33%	79.31%	68.97%

Name	"MA.8.FGR.7.3"	"MA.8.FGR.7.4"	"MA.8.FGR.7.5"	"MA.8.FGR.6.1"	"MA.8.FGR.5.1"	"MA.8.FGR.7.1"	"MA.8.FGR.7.5"
Descriptions	Approximate solutions of two linear equations in two variables by graphing the equations and solving simple cases by inspection.	Analyze and solve systems of two linear equations in two variables algebraically to find exact solutions.	Explain the meaning of the rate of change and initial value of a linear function in terms of the situation it models, and its graph or a table of values.	Show that straight lines are widely used to model relationships between two quantitative variables. For scatter plots that suggest a linear association, visually fit a straight line, and informally assess the model fit by judging the closeness of the data points to the line.	Show and explain that a solve relevant rule that assigns to each input exactly one output.	Interpret and solve relevant mathematical problems leading to two linear equations in two variables.	Write a linear function defined by an expression in different but equivalent forms to reveal and explain different properties of the function.
Grade Level	89.91%	83.12%	81.99%	80.40%	77.43%	71.83%	70.20%
ELL	88.68%	79.84%	75%	76.97%	70%	71.11%	61.54%
SWD	81.82%	84.62%	64.71%	77.94%	80.77%	83.33%	68.48%

6th Grade Strengths

6th grade students performed strongest in:

- Recognizing and explaining opposite integers and absolute value
- Solving real-world problems involving all four operations with whole numbers, fractions, and decimals
- Understanding measures of center and interpreting data distributions
- Applying ratios and percentages in real-world contexts
- Writing and evaluating algebraic expressions and equations

Name	"MA.7.PAR.4.6"	"MA.7.PAR.4.10"	"MA.7.PAR.2.2"
Descriptions	Solve everyday problems involving scale drawings of geometric figures, including computing actual lengths and areas from a scale drawing and reproducing a scale drawing at a different scale.	Predict characteristics of a population by examining the characteristics of a representative sample. Recognize the potential limitations and scope of the sample to the population.	Rewrite an expression in different forms from a contextual problem to clarify the problem and show how the quantities in it are related.

Grade Level	72.88%	62.05%	61.97%
ELL	61.96%	43.21%	51.16%
SWD	61.36%	44.26%	41.67%

Name	"MA.8.FGR.5.7"	"MA.8.FGR.5.5"	"MA.8.FGR.5.9"	"MA.8.FGR.5.2"
Descriptions	Construct a function to model a linear relationship between two quantities. Determine the rate of change and initial value of the function from a description of a relationship or from two values, including reading these from a table or from a graph.	Write and explain the equations (slope-intercept form), (standard form), and (point-slope form) as defining a linear function whose graph is a straight line to reveal and explain different properties of the function.	Graph and analyze linear functions expressed in various algebraic forms and show characteristics of the graph to describe applicable situations.	Within realistic situations, identify and describe examples of functions that are linear or nonlinear. Sketch a graph that exhibits the qualitative features of a function that has been described verbally.

Grade Level	59.44%	56.78%	55.34%	70.06%
ELL	36%	46.72%	50%	58.67%
SWD	46.15%	57.36%	41.94%	62.82%

6th Grade Weaknesses

6th grade students struggled most with:

- Interpreting and describing statistical distributions
- Summarizing categorical and numerical data
- Statistical questioning and variability

	Overall, 6th grade students demonstrated stronger performance in foundational number sense, operations, and introductory algebraic reasoning. 7th Grade Strengths 7th grade students showed strengths in: • Solving equations and inequalities • Applying proportional relationships • Understanding slope and unit rate • Comparing linear relationships represented in different ways • Solving percent increase/decrease and tax/tip problems Students appear more successful when working with procedural algebraic concepts and proportional reasoning. 8th Grade Strengths 8th grade students performed best in: • Analyzing scatter plots and patterns • Interpreting linear relationships • Identifying functions • Comparing functions represented in graphs, tables, and equations • Understanding transformations and properties of functions This suggests students are developing stronger conceptual understanding of functions and algebraic relationships. ELL Strengths ELL students showed relative strengths in: • Basic operations and number sense • Solving routine procedural problems • Ratios, proportions, and percent applications • Identifying relationships in graphs and tables • Algebraic procedures with structured support ELL performance was generally stronger on standards with: • Clear procedures • Visual representations • Multiple-step routines • Consistent mathematical structures SWD Strengths SWD students demonstrated strengths in:	• Multiplying/dividing fractions and mixed numbers in contextual problems The data suggests a need for stronger conceptual understanding in statistics and fraction operations. 7th Grade Weaknesses 7th grade weaknesses included: • Scale drawings and geometric problem solving • Using samples to make population predictions • Rewriting expressions in equivalent forms from contextual situations Students may need additional support connecting abstract mathematical reasoning to real-world application and statistical inference. 8th Grade Weaknesses 8th grade students struggled with: • Constructing and interpreting functions from real-world situations • Writing and analyzing linear equations • Distinguishing between linear and nonlinear relationships • Describing function behavior qualitatively The data indicates students need more support with deeper conceptual understanding of functions and algebraic modeling. ELL Weaknesses ELL students struggled most with: • Statistics vocabulary and interpreting distributions • Word problems requiring heavy academic language • Constructed-response and explanation tasks • Real-world application problems requiring interpretation • Function analysis and abstract reasoning The data suggests language demands significantly impact ELL performance, especially on standards requiring justification, interpretation, and academic vocabulary. SWD Weaknesses SWD students struggled most with: • Multi-step application problems • Statistical analysis and interpretation • Abstract algebraic reasoning
--	--	---

	• Basic computation and procedural tasks • Structured algebraic routines • Identifying patterns • Solving scaffolded equations • Visual and concrete mathematical representations Performance improved when tasks included: • Clear steps • Repeated routines • Visual supports • Explicit modeling	• Function modeling and nonlinear relationships • Mathematical explanations and justification The largest performance gaps appeared on standards requiring: • Higher-order reasoning • Problem solving in unfamiliar contexts • Multiple representations • Written mathematical communication
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	• Instruction has not consistently moved students from procedural competence to conceptual application, particularly in statistics and algebraic reasoning. ○ 6th graders struggled most with interpreting statistical distributions and summarizing data. 7th graders showed weakness in connecting algebraic reasoning to real-world contexts. 8th graders struggled to construct and interpret functions from real-world situations and distinguish linear from nonlinear relationships. • ELL students have not received consistent, embedded academic language instruction within math content. ○ Despite showing strength on procedural tasks with visual supports, ELL students struggled most on standards requiring academic vocabulary, interpretation of word problems, and constructed-response tasks. • SWD students have not received intervention and scaffolded instruction intensive enough to move them to proficiency. Gaps were largest on the standards that require higher-order reasoning, multi-step problem solving, and written mathematical justification.	

School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) • What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during Math walks? • What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during Math walks?	• Teachers consistently utilize district-provided instructional resources and Cobb County School District Curriculum Maps aligned to priority standards. • Learning targets are clearly posted and aligned to grade-level standards in at least 95% of observed classrooms. • Instructional tasks and lesson objectives generally reflect standards-based instruction and pacing expectations. • Teachers demonstrate consistent implementation of curriculum-aligned instruction during math lessons.	• Exit tickets and other formative assessment practices are inconsistently implemented to monitor student understanding and guide instruction. • Only 60% of observed classrooms consistently incorporate rigorous tasks that promote deeper learning and higher-order thinking. • Students are not consistently engaged in productive struggle, mathematical reasoning, or extended problem-solving opportunities. • Opportunities for students to explain, justify, and apply mathematical thinking are limited across classrooms. • Instructional practices do not consistently provide differentiated supports and rigorous learning experiences for all learners.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Teachers have not consistently implemented formative assessment practices or rigorous tasks that promote higher-order thinking during math instruction. ○ Walk data shows that only 60% of observed classrooms incorporate tasks that promote deeper learning, exit tickets are inconsistently used, and opportunities for students to explain, justify, and apply mathematical thinking are limited across classrooms.	

Other Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☒ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Teacher Survey • Math: Instructional delivery and resources were highlighted as effective. • Professional Learning: Teachers are already engaging in shared teaching and seeking professional growth. Parent Survey • Learning opportunities are enriched through field trips to destinations like the Aquarium and Ruby Falls. • Teachers share weekly instructional updates via CTLS Learn. • Family engagement is fostered through PTA meetings and events such as the Kick-off, International Night, and Spring Festival.	Teacher Survey • Math: Struggles persist in word problems, academic vocabulary, and critical thinking. • Professional Learning: Gaps in training on using new resources, data analysis, and student engagement strategies. • Student Recognition: Current recognition systems may not fully motivate or include all deserving students. Parent Survey • A strong interest in additional supplemental learning opportunities that incorporate hands-on, experiential activities. • A request for clearer and more detailed information about Milestone testing, including grading policies and preparation strategies. • Growing interest in sessions addressing the safe use of social media and technology. • Concerns about low participation in parent meetings and a perceived need for improved communication channels. • Suggestions for teachers to prioritize building community and fostering stronger, more intentional relationships between the school and families.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Teachers need additional professional learning to effectively address student struggles with word problems, academic vocabulary, and critical thinking, and to build capacity with new instructional resources and data analysis practices.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	By May 2027, the number of students scoring at Level 2 (Developing Learner) and above on the Math EOG will increase from 74.6% to 80%.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Instruction has not consistently moved students from procedural competence to conceptual application, particularly in statistics and algebraic reasoning. • Teachers have not consistently implemented formative assessment practices or rigorous tasks that promote higher-order thinking during math instruction. • Student discourse about math concepts and reason is limited and inconsistent		
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 Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, instructional walkthrough data will show that 100% of observed math classrooms consistently implement student discourse routines and structured formative checkpoints.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, Math formative and summative assessment data will show an increase in student proficiency and growth, with at least 80% of students in each grade level demonstrating improved performance in higher-order problem solving, mathematical reasoning, and application of grade-level standards across all subgroups.	CTLS Assess CCSD Teaching and Learning Framework GaDOE DRC BEACON
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning • Analyze Math Milestones, common assessment, walkthrough, and subgroup data to identify instructional gaps and priority standards. • Develop standards-based unit plans that include	Evaluation Tool(s): • Formative and Summative Assessments • Instructional Focus Walks	Title I Coach
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Math Action Step 1 <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Implement daily rigorous math tasks and structured formative checkpoints that require students to apply conceptual understanding, explain their reasoning (student discourse), and demonstrate mastery of grade-level standards beyond procedural execution.	differentiated instructional strategies, scaffolds, and rigorous learning tasks. • Provide professional learning on higher-order questioning, mathematical discourse (create a structured student discourse routine), productive struggle, and rigor in assignments and assessments. August–September • Teachers analyze student data, including assessment data, EL proficiency levels, and IEP goals, to plan targeted instructional supports. • Teacher teams create a structured framework for student discourse & expectations for implementing formative checkpoints (ex: exit tickets) • Begin consistent use of differentiated instructional strategies and scaffolding techniques during daily math instruction. • Incorporate rigorous mathematical tasks that require reasoning, problem solving, and student justification. • Utilize formative assessments, including exit tickets, to monitor student understanding and guide instructional adjustments in real time. • Conduct instructional walkthroughs and provide feedback focused on rigor, student discourse and differentiation October–December • Analyze student assessment data during collaborative planning to adjust instruction and targeted interventions. • Increase opportunities for students to engage in mathematical discourse, productive struggle, and higher-order thinking tasks. • Monitor implementation of rigorous assignments and assessments through walkthroughs and PLC discussions. • Provide ongoing professional learning and	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Create a grade-level CCC schedule along with a template for analyzing data and planning interventions or enrichment. Student data will be reviewed during CCC meetings to inform small group instruction and guide any necessary adjustments to whole group teaching. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

	coaching on differentiation, scaffolding, and standards-based instructional practices. January–February • Continue progress monitoring of student subgroup performance and instructional effectiveness. • Facilitate peer observations and collaborative planning focused on rigorous instructional practices. • Ensure consistent use of formative assessment data to drive reteaching and intervention decisions. March–April • Continue implementing rigorous tasks that require analysis, justification, and application of mathematical concepts. • Monitor student growth through common assessments, walkthrough data, and formative assessment practices. May • Review end-of-year assessment, walkthrough, and implementation data to evaluate effectiveness of instructional practices. Artifacts to be Collected: • Progress monitoring reports, walkthrough trend data, and implementation summaries Data analysis documents, lesson plans, and PLC notes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly monitoring during August–September, bi-weekly monitoring during October–December, and monthly monitoring from January through May		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Intervention structures, differentiation, and progress monitoring have not been intensive or individualized enough to address the unfinished learning students carry into each grade level. As a result, a large percentage of students across grades 6-8 have remained in the Support Needed category despite year-over-year instruction. - Academic language instruction, vocabulary development, and scaffolded access to mathematical discourse have not been consistently embedded within daily math lessons, leaving ELL students without the language tools needed to demonstrate conceptual understanding on grade-level and standardized tasks. - SWD students need more frequent and intensive opportunities during core math instruction to practice foundational skills, build reasoning, and access grade-level content through targeted scaffolds and flexible grouping structures.		
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 Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, 100% of math teachers will demonstrate that daily core math instruction includes at least one ELlevation strategy aligned to current ACCESS proficiency levels, at least one IEP-aligned scaffold connected to IEP goals, explicit academic vocabulary instruction tied to the lesson's priority standard, and flexible grouping used a minimum of three times per week for EL and SWD students. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Teachers review Math subgroup data, ACCESS domain scores, and IEP goals to identify the standards and skill gaps requiring the most intensive support. Each teacher selects a minimum of two ELlevation strategies and two IEP-aligned scaffolds appropriate to their class composition. Math teachers and ESOL staff establish a co-planning schedule.	Evaluation Performance Targets: - By December 2026, <i>EL and SWD students</i> will decrease in "Support Needed" across all Beacon domains: 6th Grade through 8th Grade will decrease by 10% across all domains - By December 2026, <i>EL and SWD students</i> will decrease in "Support Needed" across all Beacon domains: 6th Grade through 8th Grade will decrease by 10% across all domains - By May 2027, at least 80% of <i>EL & SWD students</i> in Grades 6-8 will score at least 8% higher than baseline on Priority Standards (statistical reasoning in 6th, proportional and	CTLS Assess CCSD Teaching and Learning Framework GaDOE Math resources DRC BEACON Title I Coach District Personnel
Target Student Group ☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Math Action Step 2 SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)			

Using ACCESS proficiency levels, IEP goals, and Math subgroup data, implement ELlevation strategies, IEP-aligned scaffolds, embedded academic vocabulary instruction, and flexible grouping to address the skill gaps and language barriers keeping EL and SWD students in the Support Needed category across grades 6-8.	Professional learning is provided on using ACCESS domain scores to differentiate math instruction and design language-rich tasks that allow ELL students to demonstrate conceptual understanding. August-September: - Teachers implement ELlevation strategies, IEP-aligned scaffolds, and explicit academic vocabulary instruction daily. - Vocabulary instruction focuses on academic language tied to each grade's priority standards (statistical reasoning in 6th, proportional and algebraic reasoning in 7th, and functional and graphical reasoning in 8th). - Flexible grouping is used at least three times per week. - Initial walkthroughs will establish a baseline of implementation fidelity. October-December: - Walkthroughs focus on the consistency and quality of language supports, scaffolds, vocabulary instruction, and flexible grouping. - Coaching and feedback are provided based on observation data. - CCC meetings include review of EL and SWD student work samples and formative data to identify which students need adjusted supports. - Progress monitoring data for SWD students is reviewed against IEP goals. January-February: - Midyear Beacon Math subgroup data and progress monitoring results are reviewed to assess movement out of "Support Needed". - For ELL students with ACCESS weaknesses in Reading and Writing, instruction increases structured written response opportunities using sentence frames and discourse supports. - For SWD students showing limited IEP goal progress, flexible grouping is adjusted to increase the intensity of small-group foundational skill practice. March-April: - Instruction targets the specific standards where EL and SWD students showed the largest common	algebraic reasoning in 7th, and functional and graphical reasoning in 8th). Teacher teams will choose the best assessment that will give them applicable data. Evaluation Tool(s): - Beacon ELA Subgroup Data - ACCESS Scores - Instructional Focus Walks - Formative and Summative Assessments - Student Work Samples Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: - Develop an assessment calendar with specific dates. - At each CCC meeting, teachers bring EL and SWD student formative assessment data and written response samples to analyze growth patterns and adjust scaffolds as needed. - Beacon ELA subgroup results from each administration are disaggregated by EL proficiency band and disability category and reviewed to identify which students are progressing and which require more intensive support. - Walkthrough trends are compiled and shared with the instructional leadership team each semester. - At midyear, ACCESS growth data is cross-referenced with Beacon performance to assess whether language development gains are translating to ELA literacy outcomes. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals	
--	---	---	--

	assessment gaps in the CNA (word problems requiring academic language, constructed-response tasks, multi-step problem solving, and written justification). Sentence frames, visual representations, and vocabulary supports are explicitly tied to those standards. May: • Review walkthrough data at end-of-year, Beacon Math subgroup results, common assessment performance, and SWD progress monitoring data • Evaluate the impact of scaffolds, language supports and flexible grouping on student growth. Artifacts to be Collected: • Lesson plans documenting ELLevation strategy and IEP scaffold selection tied to student proficiency data • ACCESS score review and teacher planning notes • Walkthrough data and observation notes focused on literacy block support for EL and SWD students • Formative assessment results by subgroup • CCC meeting notes and co-planning notes for subgroup discussions Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coach/Instructional Support Specialist Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly during August-September; bi-weekly during October-December; monthly January through May.	☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

SCIENCE DATA

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

**SY26 Science
Milestones**
(Data by grade &
subgroup)

High School Physical Science Course

8th Grade Physical Science

	25-26 (%)	24-25%
Level 4	32.3	12.5
Level 3	51.6	62.5
Level 2	12.9	22
Level 1	3.2	3
Levels 3 + 4	83.9	75
Levels 2-4	96.8	97

8th Grade Science

*Includes HS Physical Science Scores

	25-26* (%)	24-25* (%)	23-24 (%)
Level 4	6.4	4	3.9
Level 3	28	19	23
Level 2	28.4	29.7	24.8
Level 1	37.1	47.2	48.2
Levels 3 + 4	34.4	23	26.9
Levels 2-4	62.8	52.8	51.8

All students:

- Overall science performance demonstrated positive growth, with students showing increased proficiency in scientific reasoning and content knowledge.
- Students performed strongest on standards involving hands-on investigation, data analysis, and application-based science concepts.
- 8th grade students demonstrated the strongest overall achievement and growth among all science grade levels.
- Increased exposure to inquiry-based instruction and science vocabulary contributed to improved student understanding.

All students:

- A significant percentage of students still struggled with higher-order scientific reasoning and application of concepts across multiple domains.
- Students demonstrated difficulty analyzing complex informational text, interpreting scientific vocabulary, and explaining evidence-based conclusions.
- Foundational reading comprehension skills negatively impacted performance on scenario-based and multi-step science questions.
- Students struggled with scientific writing, constructed responses, and justifying answers using evidence.
- Gaps in prerequisite science knowledge and inconsistent mastery of standards contributed to uneven performance across domains.

SWD Students:

- A large percentage of SWD students continued to perform below proficiency levels and required ongoing academic support.
- Students struggled with reading-intensive science tasks, scientific vocabulary, and multi-step reasoning questions.
- Difficulty transferring learned concepts independently to assessments limited overall achievement.
- Students required additional accommodations, chunked instruction, and repeated practice opportunities to master standards.
- Processing and comprehension challenges impacted students' ability to explain scientific concepts using evidence and reasoning.

	• More students moved into the “Developing Learner” and “Proficient Learner” categories compared to prior performance measures. SWD Students: • SWD students demonstrated measurable growth in science achievement over the course of the year. • Students showed stronger performance on visual, hands-on, and inquiry-based science activities. • Scaffolded instruction, graphic organizers, and small-group support contributed to improved engagement and understanding. • Students responded positively to repeated exposure to science vocabulary and structured learning routines. • Some students demonstrated growth in interpreting charts, graphs, and experimental data. EL Students: • ELL students demonstrated growth in science achievement, particularly in hands-on and collaborative learning environments. • Visual supports, demonstrations, and inquiry-based instruction helped students access science content more effectively. • Students showed stronger understanding when scientific concepts were connected to real-world applications and experiments. • Collaborative discussions and structured classroom supports improved student participation and engagement. • Students demonstrated gradual improvement in scientific vocabulary acquisition over time.	EL Students: • Academic language and reading comprehension barriers significantly impacted performance on science assessments. • Students struggled to interpret complex scientific texts, vocabulary, and multi-step questions. • Many ELL students had difficulty explaining scientific reasoning and evidence in written responses. • Limited English proficiency impacted students’ ability to fully demonstrate content knowledge despite conceptual understanding. • Students continued to require vocabulary development, sentence stems, visual scaffolds, and language-rich instruction to achieve proficiency consistently.
--	---	---

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Gaps in foundational science knowledge and reading comprehension are limiting students’ ability to master grade-level standards. Students struggle with higher-order reasoning, scientific vocabulary, and explaining evidence-based conclusions. Weaknesses in scientific writing and multi-step problem solving impact assessment performance. SWD and EL students require additional scaffolds, accommodations, vocabulary support, and differentiated instruction to access rigorous science content. Limited opportunities for independent application of scientific concepts and reasoning contribute to inconsistent student performance.																																				
Science Common Assessments (Grade Level-Structure and Properties of Matter **Domain chosen due to low achievement on the SY25 Milestone Data)	Structure and Properties of Matter assessments indicate that grade level students scored 70% or more on the following standards in each grade level: 8th grade: P1.c (Compare and Contrast Chemical and Physical properties), P1.d (Construct an Argument), and P1.e (Patterns within the Periodic Table) <table><tr><td>Name Descriptions</td><td>"S8P1.c"</td><td>"S8P1.e"</td><td>"S8P1.d"</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Plan and carry out investigations to compare and contrast chemical (i.e., reactivity, combustibility) and physical (i.e., density, melting point, boiling point) properties of matter.</td><td>Develop models (e.g., atomic-level models, including drawings, and computer representations) by analyzing patterns within the periodic table that illustrate the structure, composition, and characteristics of atoms (protons, neutrons, and electrons) and simple molecules.</td><td>Construct an argument based on observational evidence to support the claim that when a change in a substance occurs, it can be classified as either chemical or physical.</td></tr><tr><td>Grade Level</td><td>76.50%</td><td>76.17%</td><td>74.58%</td></tr><tr><td>ELL</td><td>62.33%</td><td>60.33%</td><td>63%</td></tr><tr><td>SWD</td><td>72.38%</td><td>66.41%</td><td>71.02%</td></tr></table>	Name Descriptions	"S8P1.c"	"S8P1.e"	"S8P1.d"		Plan and carry out investigations to compare and contrast chemical (i.e., reactivity, combustibility) and physical (i.e., density, melting point, boiling point) properties of matter.	Develop models (e.g., atomic-level models, including drawings, and computer representations) by analyzing patterns within the periodic table that illustrate the structure, composition, and characteristics of atoms (protons, neutrons, and electrons) and simple molecules.	Construct an argument based on observational evidence to support the claim that when a change in a substance occurs, it can be classified as either chemical or physical.	Grade Level	76.50%	76.17%	74.58%	ELL	62.33%	60.33%	63%	SWD	72.38%	66.41%	71.02%	Structure and Properties of Matter assessments indicate that grade level students scored lower than 70% or more on the following standards in each grade level: 8th grade: P1.a (Compare and Contrast Pure Substances and Mixtures) <table><tr><td>Name Descriptions</td><td>"S8P1"</td><td>"S8P1.a"</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Obtain, evaluate, and communicate information about the structure and properties of matter.</td><td>Develop and use a model to compare and contrast pure substances (elements and compounds) and mixtures.</td></tr><tr><td>Grade Level</td><td>71.07%</td><td>64.62%</td></tr><tr><td>ELL</td><td>49.26%</td><td>50.47%</td></tr><tr><td>SWD</td><td>60.69%</td><td>62.63%</td></tr></table>	Name Descriptions	"S8P1"	"S8P1.a"		Obtain, evaluate, and communicate information about the structure and properties of matter.	Develop and use a model to compare and contrast pure substances (elements and compounds) and mixtures.	Grade Level	71.07%	64.62%	ELL	49.26%	50.47%	SWD	60.69%	62.63%
Name Descriptions	"S8P1.c"	"S8P1.e"	"S8P1.d"																																		
	Plan and carry out investigations to compare and contrast chemical (i.e., reactivity, combustibility) and physical (i.e., density, melting point, boiling point) properties of matter.	Develop models (e.g., atomic-level models, including drawings, and computer representations) by analyzing patterns within the periodic table that illustrate the structure, composition, and characteristics of atoms (protons, neutrons, and electrons) and simple molecules.	Construct an argument based on observational evidence to support the claim that when a change in a substance occurs, it can be classified as either chemical or physical.																																		
Grade Level	76.50%	76.17%	74.58%																																		
ELL	62.33%	60.33%	63%																																		
SWD	72.38%	66.41%	71.02%																																		
Name Descriptions	"S8P1"	"S8P1.a"																																			
	Obtain, evaluate, and communicate information about the structure and properties of matter.	Develop and use a model to compare and contrast pure substances (elements and compounds) and mixtures.																																			
Grade Level	71.07%	64.62%																																			
ELL	49.26%	50.47%																																			
SWD	60.69%	62.63%																																			

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Lack of interest or motivation in science can lead to lower performance. Students might find these topics less engaging or relevant to their lives. • The way assessments are designed can impact student performance. If assessments do not align well with the instructional methods or do not accurately measure student understanding, they may not reflect true proficiency. • Limited access to quality instructional materials and resources can hinder effective teaching and learning. Ensuring that teachers have access to up-to-date and comprehensive resources is crucial.
---	--

School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	Resources - Teachers regularly use district-provided instructional materials and Cobb County School District Curriculum Maps, focusing on priority standards. Learning Targets - In at least 80% of the classrooms observed, learning targets aligned with the standards are consistently implemented.	Formative Assessments - Teachers do not consistently provide an exit ticket or formative assessment at the end of each lesson. Academically Challenging Environment - Data from instructional walks shows that only 60% of observed teachers offer rigorous learning tasks that encourage extended learning.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers often feel pressured to cover the entire curriculum, which limits their ability to develop and use meaningful exit tickets or other formative assessments effectively. - There may be a discrepancy between the expected level of rigor and what teachers believe is realistic or appropriate for their students. - Concerns about maintaining student engagement and managing behavior can lead teachers to avoid assigning more rigorous tasks. - The emphasis on ensuring all students achieve minimum proficiency levels may unintentionally reduce the focus on activities that promote deeper cognitive engagement.	

Other Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☒ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey 	Parent Survey • Learning extended beyond the classroom through field trips to locations such as the Aquarium and Ruby Falls. • Teachers provide weekly instructional updates on CTLS Learn. • Engagement with families through various PTA meetings and events, including the Kick-off, International Night, and Spring Festival.	Teacher Survey • Science: Critical thinking, graph reading, inferencing, endurance, and test-taking strategies are areas of concern. • Professional Learning: Gaps in training on using new resources, data analysis, and student engagement strategies. • Student Recognition: Current recognition systems may not fully motivate or include all deserving students. Parent Survey • Desire for more supplemental learning opportunities that include hands-on experiences.
		• Request for clearer information about Milestone testing, including grading practices and preparation strategies. • Increased interest in meetings focused on the safe use of social media and technology. • Concern about low attendance at parent meetings and a perceived lack of effective communication. • Recommendation for teachers to place greater emphasis on building community and intentionally fostering strong relationships between the school and families.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

- ☐ Coherent Instruction
☒ Professional Capacity
☒ Effective Leadership
☒ Supportive Learning Environment

Root Cause Explanation:

Teacher Survey

- Lack of consistent use of reading strategies across subjects (especially in Science and Social Studies).
- Inconsistent or insufficient data analysis during CCC (Collaborative Content Cycle) meetings.
- Limited student endurance and focus during assessments.
- Professional learning does not always align with current classroom challenges or engage all teacher levels.
- Recognition systems may be narrowly defined (e.g., focused only on grades or attendance).

Parent Survey

- Resource or scheduling constraints may limit enrichment activities.
- Lack of integration between academic content and real-world application.
- Parents may not have access to user-friendly explanations of test content and scoring.
- A lack of parent-focused workshops or materials about academic assessments.
- Growing concerns about students' online behavior and digital safety.
- Meetings may not align with parent schedules or interests.
- Communication methods may not reach all families or may lack clarity.

SCIENCE - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: SCIENCE

By May 2027, the number of students scoring at Level 2 (Developing Learner) and above on the Science EOG will increase from 62.8% to 70%.

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:

- Align assessments to the rigor of Milestone expectations.
- Need for Greater Instructional Alignment and Intervention
- Weakness in Higher-Order Thinking and Text Analysis

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 October 2026, instructional walkthrough data will show that 100% of observed science classrooms consistently implement differentiated instructional strategies,

Evaluation Performance Target:
 By May 2027, Science formative and summative assessment data will show an increase in student proficiency and growth, with at least 80% of

CTLS Assess
 CCSD Teaching and Learning

Target Student Group	scaffolding techniques, standards-based planning, and rigorous assignments and assessments that promote higher-order thinking and deeper student understanding. Implementation Plan: Preplanning - Analyze Science Milestones, common assessment, walkthrough, and subgroup data to identify instructional gaps and priority standards. - Develop standards-based unit plans that include differentiated instructional strategies, scaffolds, and rigorous learning tasks. - Provide professional learning on higher-order questioning, mathematical discourse, productive struggle, and rigor in assignments and assessments. - Create common expectations for the implementation of exit tickets, formative assessments, and differentiated supports. - Collaboratively plan instructional resources and intervention/enrichment structures for ELLs, SWDs, and struggling learners.	students in each grade level demonstrating improved performance in higher-order problem solving, reasoning, and application of grade-level standards across all subgroups. Evaluation Tool(s): - Formative and Summative Assessments - Instructional Focus Walks Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Develop an assessment schedule with specific dates.	Framework
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			GaDOE
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(iii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i> 1. Implement differentiated instructional strategies, scaffolding techniques, standards-based planning, and hands-on inquiry-based learning experiences while increasing the rigor of science assignments and assessments to promote higher-order thinking and deeper student understanding.			Title I Coach District Personnel

	August–April: Teachers analyze student data, including assessment data, EL proficiency levels, and IEP goals, to plan targeted instructional supports. August–September • Implement standards-based lessons aligned to priority standards and learning targets. • Begin consistent use of differentiated instructional strategies and scaffolding techniques during daily instruction. • Incorporate rigorous mathematical tasks that require reasoning, problem solving, and student justification. • Utilize formative assessments, including exit tickets, to monitor student understanding and guide instructional adjustments. • Conduct instructional walkthroughs and provide feedback focused on rigor, differentiation, and student engagement. October–December • Analyze student assessment data during collaborative planning to adjust instruction and targeted interventions. • Increase opportunities for students to engage in mathematical discourse, productive struggle, and higher-order thinking tasks. • Monitor implementation of rigorous assignments and assessments through walkthroughs and PLC discussions. • Provide ongoing professional learning and coaching on differentiation, scaffolding, and standards-based instructional practices. • Implement targeted supports and enrichment opportunities based on student performance data. January–February	Create a grade-level CCC schedule along with a template for analyzing data and planning interventions or enrichment. Student data will be reviewed during CCC meetings to inform small group instruction and guide any necessary adjustments to whole group teaching. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

	• Refine instructional practices based on midyear assessment and walkthrough data. • Increase the use of real-world application activities. • Continue progress monitoring of student subgroup performance and instructional effectiveness. • Facilitate peer observations and collaborative planning focused on rigorous instructional practices. • Ensure consistent use of formative assessment data to drive reteaching and intervention decisions. March–April • Continue implementing rigorous tasks that require analysis, justification, and application of mathematical concepts. • Monitor student growth through common assessments, walkthrough data, and formative assessment practices. • Provide targeted support for ELLs, SWDs, and students demonstrating learning gaps. • Reinforce academic vocabulary, discourse, and written justification strategies across classrooms. May • Review end-of-year assessment, walkthrough, and implementation data to evaluate effectiveness of instructional practices. • Reflect on successes, challenges, and areas for improvement related to rigor, differentiation, and standards-based instruction. • Identify effective strategies and best practices to sustain and scale for the upcoming school year. • Develop recommendations for future professional learning and instructional priorities based on student outcomes.		
--	---	--	--

	Artifacts to be Collected: • PD agendas, sign-in sheets, and training materials • Data analysis documents, lesson plans, and PLC notes • Classroom walkthrough observations, walkthrough forms, and instructional trends data • Student work samples and differentiated instructional tasks • PLC agendas, collaborative planning documents, and data discussion notes • Coaching logs, modeled lesson documentation, and PD follow-up notes • Progress monitoring reports, walkthrough trend data, and implementation summaries • Feedback notes, action steps for support, and school improvement documentation Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly monitoring during August-September, bi-weekly monitoring during October-December, and monthly monitoring from January through May.		
--	---	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<u>Required Components</u>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required <u>Annual Title I Meeting</u> Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	September 9, 2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required <u>Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method)</u> Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	October 13, 2026 to November 2, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required <u>Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method)</u> Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	April 16, 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required <u>TWO Building Staff Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy)</u> Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school.	September 8, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5
	February 9, 2027		☒ 3 ☐ 6
5. Required <u>Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school)</u> Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. <u>Briefly describe the transition activities here:</u> - Incoming 6th Grade Parent Meeting- Rising 6th Grade families are introduced to expectations and learning opportunities offered in middle school. - Rising 9th Grade Parent Meeting- Rising 9th Grade families are introduced to expectations and learning opportunities offered in high school.	Incoming 6 th Grade Parent Meeting- April 2, 2027 Rising 9th Grade Parent Meeting - April 23, 2027		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> Family-School Engagement Policy for Shared Student Success ***Weekly newsletters sent through CTLS Parent will be translated into the parent/guardian’s preferred language.	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
--	--	--

School Developed Family Engagement Activities (<i>Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6</i>)							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be academic-related and listed in the school policy</u>)	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Team Lead
Curriculum in Action Night Teachers will share academic concepts with parents. The parents will have an opportunity to see what their child is learning in school.	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	CCSD Instructional Framework and Curriculum Map GaDOE Standards	District and Local	September 17, 2026	The Parent Facilitator will survey the parents to receive feedback on learned strategies to be implemented at home for continuous learning.	BLT
Title I Family Data Night – January 26, 2027 Parents will have a guided review of student achievement data, academic goals, strategies and resources that can be used to support student success at home. Families will also learn more about assessments, student progress, and schoolwide academic priorities.	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3	CCSD Instructional Framework and Curriculum Map GaDOE Standards	District	January 26, 2027	The Parent Facilitator will survey the parents to determine the next steps.	BLT

GaDOE required six “Shall’s”. Each shall must be addressed at least once during the school year:

1. Assist parents in understanding state academic standards, state and local assessments, and how to monitor their child’s academic progress.
2. Provide materials and training to help parents work with their child to improve academic achievement. (Ex. Literacy training, technology training)

3. Educate school staff in the value and utility of the contributions of parents, and how to reach, communicate with, and partner with parents to implement parent programs to build ties between parents and the school.
4. Coordinate and integrate parent programs and activities with other Federal, State, and local programs (Preschool to Kindergarten, transitions, parent resource centers, etc.) to support parents in more fully participating in their child’s education.
5. Ensure information related to school and parent programs/meetings are sent in a format and language parents can understand.
6. Provide other reasonable support for parental involvement activities as parents may request. These are school developed activities based upon parent input. (#14 in list of “shall” and “mays”)

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Garrett Middle School will leverage state and local funds, along with community support, to enhance student success and well-being. Title II funding will support professional development initiatives, including staff training and professional learning opportunities. Title III resources will focus on advancing language proficiency for English learners. The school will also utilize Twenty Day funds to provide targeted tutoring for students who are not meeting state standards or showing proficiency on the Beacon Assessment.

The Positive School Culture department will play a key role in implementing the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program, Restorative Practices, and professional learning led by positive school culture coaches and staff. Community partners, including Carroll Agency Allstate, Walton Communities, Love Bridge Church, South Cobb Rotary Club, Target, and other local organizations, will contribute by supporting PBIS rewards, offering volunteers, and providing mentors. Additionally, local food pantries and the City of Austell will assist families with essential needs such as food, housing, and other physical resources.

Together, these programs and partnerships will address the needs identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and feedback from parent and family surveys, fostering a supportive and inclusive environment for students and families.

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:

The school leadership team convenes monthly, while Cobb Collaborative Communities (CCCs) meet weekly on Wednesday to review formative and summative assessment data, ensuring consistent monitoring of student achievement. Beacon assessments, administered three times a year through DRC Insight, provide critical data on student progress. Results are integrated into the student information system and used to evaluate Lexile and Quantile growth.

CCCs and departmental teams collaborate regularly to analyze this data. Based on their findings, the CCCs identify effective intervention strategies and establish flexible grouping to address specific learning needs, ensuring targeted support for students.

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 leadership team evaluates data across all student groups (e.g., ELL, SWD, Gen-Ed) to assess the effectiveness of instructional strategies and interventions. School-based interventions are reviewed annually to determine their impact on improving student achievement and to guide future planning.

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 leadership team will update the plan to address the learning needs of all student groups. Professional learning opportunities will be offered to teachers and paraprofessionals as needed to support effective implementation.

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

10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State’s challenging academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State’s challenging academic standards, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(a)*

11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(b)*

12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include - counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)*

13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). *SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Garrett Middle School will continue to implement PBIS structures, including professional learning on Sources of Strength. The school has adopted a PBIS Matrix and Flow Chart, used alongside the PBIS Rewards App, to address minor classroom infractions and promote positive behaviors. Students can earn credits through the app for demonstrating positive behaviors, which can be redeemed for items from teacher-managed stores or participation in monthly Fresh Air Friday celebrations.

The minor infraction system will help identify and address the most frequently occurring behaviors, allowing for targeted interventions. Additionally, the student support team will continue to provide mentorship opportunities among peers, fostering a supportive school community. The PBIS team serves as the foundation of this initiative, leading efforts to train teachers and staff on positive social learning strategies and effective responses to challenging behaviors.

14. Describe professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

All staff members participate in weekly Cobb Collaborative Community (CCC) meetings on Wednesday during their planning periods and scheduled time during Digital Learning Days. These meetings are supported by CCSD, Title I academic coaches, and Garrett's instructional coach, who collaborate with the CCCs to monitor instructional pacing, share effective strategies, and provide tailored professional learning opportunities. Additionally, the school offers a comprehensive new teacher orientation program before the start of each school year, complemented by an ongoing induction program that includes mentorship pairings with experienced teachers.

Cobb Collaborative Communities

Focused professional development, rooted in high standards of teaching and learning, is vital for enhancing instructional practices and boosting student achievement. Effective professional development addresses the specific needs of educators at both district and school levels, fostering professional communities dedicated to higher student outcomes. To support career-long teacher growth and student learning, the following research-based practices are implemented:

- Provide ongoing learning opportunities for all staff.
- Improve teaching and learning through targeted initiatives.
- Focus on student outcomes aligned with school and district goals.
- Allocate time for teachers to apply new techniques and engage in collaborative planning.
- Establish study groups for exploring professional literature, such as books and journal articles.
- Involve all educators, including Special Education, ESOL, paraprofessionals, and specialists in music, art, science, math, and physical education.

By fostering continuous, reflective, and coherent professional development, Garrett Middle School aims to build a culture of collaboration and excellence in teaching and learning.

15. **ONLY MIDDLE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED** Describe the transition activities provided for preschool children to kindergarten, 5th grade students to 6th grade and 8th grade students to 9th grade. *SWP Checklist 2.c(v)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Rising 6th Grade Transition Plan

Rising sixth-grade students will be introduced to middle school through transition meetings held at their elementary schools or Garrett Middle School in March and April. The sixth-grade administrator and counselor coordinate these meetings with feeder schools to ensure a smooth transition. Families are also welcome to schedule visitation days throughout the year.

As part of the transition plan, Garrett Middle School hosts a Rising 6th Grade Parent Night in late March. During this event, families and students can tour the school, meet staff and teachers, and ask questions about the upcoming school year. This initiative helps address transition concerns and ensures students feel more comfortable and confident as they prepare for middle school.

8th Grade Transition Plan

Eighth-grade students participate in informational meetings with administrators and counselors from their respective feeder high schools, South Cobb High School and Pebblebrook High School. These meetings, held in January or February, include visits to the high schools to familiarize students with the next stage of their academic journey.

Additionally, eighth-grade students receive an overview of the Magnet Programs and CITA opportunities available within CCSD during grade-level assemblies and parent meetings. Counselors organize articulation events to introduce students to innovative career paths, while Communities in Schools partners with the school to offer the Reality U program, providing practical insights into real-world decision-making.

Elective registration for high school begins in February, with students completing their selections during homeroom sessions. This comprehensive transition plan ensures that eighth graders are well-prepared for high school, both academically and socially.

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?

6 th Grade Math (Class Size Reduction)	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	This position focuses on reducing class sizes in grade 6 to offer enhanced support for students working to excel in math. The Class Size Reduction teacher will design and deliver engaging lessons using evidence-based strategies to ensure effective instruction. Utilizing assessment data, the teacher will tailor instruction and implement activities that promote both academic achievement and social development. Collaboration with colleagues on curriculum, instructional practices, and data analysis will support ongoing professional growth. Additionally, the teacher will maintain open and proactive communication with families.
8 th Grade ELA (Class Size Reduction)	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	This position is dedicated to reducing class sizes in grade 8 to provide targeted support for students striving in English Language Arts (ELA). The Class Size Reduction teacher will create and implement engaging lessons grounded in evidence-based strategies to ensure effective instruction. By analyzing assessment data, the teacher will tailor instruction to meet student needs and facilitate activities that foster both academic success and social development. Collaboration with colleagues on curriculum, instructional strategies, and data-driven decision-making will drive ongoing professional growth. Furthermore, the teacher will actively engage with families to support student progress and success.
8 th Grade Science (Class Size Reduction)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	This position focuses on reducing class sizes in grade 8 to provide targeted support for students striving in science. The Class Size Reduction teacher will develop and deliver engaging lessons using evidence-based strategies to ensure effective instruction. By leveraging assessment data, the teacher will customize instruction and lead activities that promote both academic achievement and social growth. Collaboration with colleagues on curriculum, instructional practices, and data analysis will support continuous professional development. Additionally, the teacher will maintain open communication with families to enhance student success.
Parent Facilitator	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The parent facilitator will work closely with the leadership team to develop opportunities for parents to learn about standards, assessments, available resources, and effective strategies to support their students' success.

School Improvement Goals

Include goals on the parent compacts and policy

Goal #1	From Spring 2026 to Spring 2027, the average ELA BEACON scale score for each grade level will increase by at least 15 points 6th Grade- 468 to 483 7th Grade- 502 to 517 8th Grade- 524 to 539
Goal #2	By May 2027, the number of students scoring at Level 2 (Developing Learner) and above on the Math EOG will increase from 74.6% to 80%. **Still waiting on updated data from 8 th grade math retake.
Goal #3	By May 2027, the number of students scoring at Level 2 (Developing Learner) and above on the Science EOG will increase from 62.8% to 70%.