

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Elementary
Principal Name:	Georgette Clinton
Date Submitted:	
Revision Date(s):	5/7/26, 5/8/26, 5/12/26, 5/19/26

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Argyle Elementary School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Georgette Clinton
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Georgette.Clinton@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	678.842.6800
Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems ONLY
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only
Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

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

School Response: In the development of this plan, advice and recommendations from various stakeholders were obtained through a series of meetings. Parent input was gathered during our end of the year Title I Parent Input meeting that was held in May. Staff input was received during afternoon staff meetings that took place in May. The writing and development of this plan encompasses recommendations presented during those meetings.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

Required Stakeholders	Suggested Stakeholders
Administrative Team	Parent Facilitators
Content or Grade Level Teachers	Media Specialists
Local School Academic Coaches	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)	Social Workers
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders

Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists
MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)	Community Health Care Providers
	Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	5/7/26	5/8/26	5/12/26	5/19/26	7/9/26	8/7/26
-----------------------	--------	--------	---------	---------	--------	--------

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Georgette Clinton	
Assistant Principal	LeShon Graham	
Parent Facilitator	Zoila Hill	
EIP Teacher	Balisha Johnson	
EIP Teacher	Joseph Wang	
Counselor	Mark Baker	
Kindergarten Teacher	Lauren Henderson	
Kindergarten Teacher	Dana Lefler	
Kindergarten Teacher	Maria Payne	
First Grade Teacher	Stephaine Laurens	
First Grade Teacher	Melissa Michalec	
First Grade Teacher	Talissa Jones	
Second Grade Teacher	Beth Dettelbach	
Second Grade Teacher	Jenifer Mitacek	

Second Grade Teacher	Sara Murphey	
Third Grade Teacher	Tameka Circle Bear	
Third Grade Teacher	Christy Barton	
Third Grade Teacher	Diana Rixom	
Fifth Grade Teacher	Angel Brown-Pierre	
Fourth Grade Teacher	Candace Elliott	
Fourth Grade Teacher	Lakeesha Walker	
Fourth Grade Teacher	Katy Schorn	
Fifth Grade Teacher	Keturah Drake	
Fifth Grade Teacher	Ryan Garza	
ESOL Teacher	Tammie Howell	
ESOL Teacher	Janet Sweeney	
ESOL Teacher	Lunie Campbell	
IRR Teacher	Amanda Benyo	
IRR Teacher	Lashana Walley	
IRR Teacher	Nicole Pierson	
Speech Teacher	Galia Sayyar	
EIP Teacher	Alexis Lauderdale	
District Literacy Coach	Kresta Kaplowitz	
Art Teacher	Jerilyn Price	
Music Teacher	Joshua Fleming	
Media Specialist	Roshanda Wilson	

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	K-2 Literacy Goal: The percent of 1st – 2nd grade students scoring within the "Prepared" range will increase from 33% (33 students) to 40% (40 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 Beacon assessment. 3-5 Literacy Goal: The percent of 3rd-5th grade students scoring Proficient or higher will increase from 24% (34 students) to 31% (43 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 EOG ELA Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially *Awaiting further data from the Milestones	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The ELA goals are supported through data collected from the Beacon ELA Assessment and the Georgia Milestones ELA EOG Assessment. For the K-2 ELA goal, the Beacon ELA Assessment data indicates that 32 out of 106 First and second grade students scored within the “prepared” range, representing 30% of students. This indicates that the goal of 7% growth was not met. For the 3-5 ELA goal, the school is currently awaiting the results of the Georgia Milestones ELA EOG Assessment. Once released, the data will be used to determine progress toward the goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring “proficient” or “distinguished” from 24% to 31%.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	• Increase standards-based small group instruction focused on reading comprehension, vocabulary development, and written response skills identified as areas of weakness through formative and benchmark assessments. • Provide targeted intervention during WIN time for students performing below proficiency, with lessons aligned specifically to the rigor of the new Georgia ELA standards. • Strengthen teacher collaboration in CCC meetings to unpack standards, analyze data, develop common assessments, and share effective instructional strategies. • Provide more time for writing. • Provide professional development on the new Georgia ELA standards and effective literacy practices. • Integrate discourse opportunities where students explain and justify their thinking
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

Previous Year's Goal #2	K-2 Math Goal: The percent of 1st – 2nd grade students scoring within the "Prepared" range will increase from 18% (27 students) to 25% (38 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 Spring administration of the Beacon assessment. 3-5 Math Goal: The percent of students scoring within the "Proficient and Distinguished" range will increase from 33% (47 students) to 40% (57 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 EOG Math Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The outcome of the math goals is supported through both the Beacon Math Assessment and the Georgia Milestones EOG Math Assessment data. For the K-2 Math goal, the Beacon Math Assessment data indicates that 14 out of 107 First and Second grade students scored within the "prepared" range, representing 13% of students. This indicates that the goal of 8% growth was not met. For the 3-5 Math goal, the Georgia Milestones EOG Math Assessment data demonstrates that students exceeded the established goal. Our current assessment results show that 42% of students scored within the "Proficient" and "Distinguished" range, surpassing the goal.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	For K-2 students: • Increase daily number sense routines focused on place value, estimation, computation, and mental math • Incorporate explicit instruction in problem-solving strategies and mathematical reasoning • Use manipulatives, visual models, and hands-on-learning to deepen conceptual understanding • Provide differentiated small group instruction based on student performance data • Integrate math discourse opportunities where students explain and justify their thinking
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	The Fourth-grade team implemented innovative Saturday School sessions that provided students with engaging, hands-on application activities focused on problem-solving, numerical reasoning, and real-world math experiences. The success of the 3-5 math goal was attributed to: • Strong teacher collaboration and discussing standards and strategies being used to teach lessons • Ongoing progress monitoring and data analysis during CCC meetings to identify student needs and adjust instruction accordingly • Consistent use of mathematical vocabulary strengthened students' understanding and improved their ability to explain their mathematical thinking. • Targeted small group instruction based on student data to address individual learning gaps and provide differentiated support • Frequent use of spiral review and math fluency practice to reinforce previously taught skills and maintain mastery of standards These combined efforts strengthened students' numerical reasoning skills, and overall math performance aligned to grade-level standards.

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

ELA DATA			
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	28%	19%	TBD
4 th Grade	15%	28%	TBD
5 th Grade	33%	25%	TBD

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Foundations			Language			Texts			Interpreting Texts			Constructing Texts		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade (57)	28%	37%	35%	38%	37%	25%	37%	40%	23%	28%	44%	28%	44%	37%	19%
2 nd Grade (49)	34%	33%	33%	36%	29%	35%	42%	33%	25%	36%	33%	31%	35%	36%	29%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade (55)	33%	64%	4%	20%	75%	5%	31%	67%	2%	49%	47%	4%	24%	71%	5%	31%	69%	0	35%	62%	4%
4 th Grade (45)	27%	58%	16%	27%	64%	9%	29%	53%	18%	36%	49%	16%	36%	62%	2%	31%	58%	11%	31%	60%	9%
5 th Grade (44)	30%	55%	16%	30%	50%	20%	30%	48%	23%	48%	45%	7%	32%	48%	20%	32%	48%	20%	48%	43%	9%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Student Groups) Awaiting data from the Milestones- Expected release in October 2026	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): TBD EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): TBD EL: SWD:

Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Student groups)	Grade Levels (all students): The highest percentage of prepared students for 1st and 2nd is in the area of Foundations. This supports the building of reading skills for students. For 3rd-5th grade students, the area that is strongest is Interpreting Text (Text Techniques). EL: Data shows the trends for EL students align with the data for all students. SWD: Data indicates that the SWD population demonstrates strengths that align with all students. SWD students performed in the Near Target range in the area of Foundations.	Grade Levels (all student): Constructing Texts indicates a high number of students in the Support Needed category. Writing continues to be a weakness for students at all grade levels. Listening is a weak area in 3rd and 5th due to the need to adjust to comprehending and collecting information from audio sources and web-based resources. EL: Although EL students have shown growth and gain in the area of writing on the ACCESS test, Constructing Texts is an area of weakness according to Beacon data. SWD: Writing is an area of weakness for SWD students. Students scored in the Support Needed category for Constructing Texts.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The introduction of new standards at all grade levels has contributed to the need for teacher clarity and curriculum (program) alignment. Although teachers participated in professional learning that supported the understanding of new standards and programs, there is further need for support in this area.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: ACCESS scores indicate that 23 students of the 113 EL students exited. The percentage of exited	Grade Levels (all students): EL: The Speaking Doman is an area of weakness for our EL students. Many of our EL students scored at the Emerging level on the ACCESS assessment.

	students is 19.1%, which is above the county average of 14.3%. Student writing scores improved.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	Students require ongoing opportunities to access and acquire the language. Student discourse is an area of emphasis; however, more work is needed in this area. Students need more opportunities to participate in collaborative conversations with their peers.	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): Comparative data will be available after May 13 EL: SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
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?		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: 	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:	Root Cause Explanation:
☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	Literacy Goal: The percent of 1st-5th grade students scoring within the "Prepared" range will increase from 30% (71 students) to 32% (76 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 Beacon assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Not enough explicit instruction with analyzing audio - Not enough sustained writing practice time - Sentence construction standards need to be included in writing instruction		
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 2025, teachers will refer to and utilize the GUMS chart to plan and ensure an alignment with state standards and a progression of skills. Implementation Plan August-May: - All teachers will participate in quarterly planning days and a monthly CCC meeting that is focused on aligning instruction to GA new standards, Wonders, and UFLI Resources. - As part of CCC meetings, all teachers will participate in discussions focused on the implementation of	Evaluation Performance Target: By January 2026, 10% of the students in K-5 will score 80% or higher on grade level CFA Grammar assessments. By March, 2026, 20% of the students in K-5 will score 80% or higher on grade level CFA Grammar assessments.. By May 2026, 30% of the students in K-5 will score 80% or higher on grade level CFA Grammar assessments.	
Target Student Group ☐ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD			

Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v) 1. All K-5 teachers will implement an explicit, systematic way to teach conventions in writing weekly.	explicit instruction for conventions. Teachers will discuss strengths and weaknesses to determine instructional next steps. - Teachers will ensure students use iReady audio passages during - All teachers will include student discourse in literacy lessons in their lesson plans Artifacts to be Collected: - CCC Meeting Minutes - Curriculum Map and Pacing Guide - GUMS Chart Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	By January 2026, 20% of students in 1-5 grades will score “Prepared” on the ELA Beacon. By May 2026, 30% of the students in 1-5 will score ‘Prepared’ on the ELA Beacon. Evaluation Tool(s): - Grade Level CFA Grammar Assessments - Beacon Assessments Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Teachers will analyze Grammar CFAs and student work to determine student groupings for differentiated small groups. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	☐ 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 2025, 100% classroom teachers be provided with an ELlevation PL session with a focus on Instructional Resources along with the EL newcomer data collection portion of the school's data spreadsheet. September 2025-May 2026, 100% EL teachers will participate in weekly grade level CCC meetings.	Evaluation Performance Target: On the November 2026 administration, 10% of ESOL students enrolled in Imagine Learning will perform proficiently on the Imagine Learning report. On the January 2026 administration, 20% of ESOL students enrolled in Imagine Learning will perform proficiently on the Imagine Learning report. On the May 2026 administration, 30% of ESOL students enrolled in Imagine Learning will perform proficiently on the Imagine Learning report.	
Target Student Group ☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD	Implementation Plan: - August-October: Provide teachers with an overview/refresher of ELlevation, highlighting where instructional resources can be found and how to utilize resources. - October-May: Monthly morning collaboration with ESOL teachers to discuss data and resources available to address data findings. Additional support will be provided by ESOL consultants as needed. Artifacts to be Collected: Data from newcomer list to show tracking of Imagine Learning proficiency. Meeting minutes from morning collaboration meetings. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Evaluation Tool(s): Imagine learning proficiency report Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Every 4 1/2 weeks Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. Teachers will utilize instructional resources from Imagine Learning and Ellevation to address EL students' language needs weekly.			

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	31%	27%	34%
4 th Grade	29%	46%	53%
5 th Grade	19%	27%	34%

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kinder- (38 Students) Winter Beacon	8%	58%	34%	11%	53%	37%	26%	37%	37%	16%	55%	29%
1st Grade (58 students)	38%	47%	16%	28%	53%	19%	7%	50%	43%	29%	53%	17%
2nd Grade (49 students)	41%	45%	14%	33%	43%	24%	49%	29%	22%	14%	43%	43%
3rd Grade (57 students)	11%	84%	5%	21%	74%	5%	14%	86%	0%	26%	68%	5%
4th Grade (45 students)	24%	60%	16%	40%	56%	4%	47%	53%	0%	38%	53%	9%
5th Grade (45 students)	51%	40%	9%	58%	36%	7%	58%	33%	9%	62%	33%	4%

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

FY26 MATH Milestones (Grade Level & Student Groups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): The percentage of students proficient and above for each grade level increased. Fourth grade students showed improvement from previous year's assessment. EL: EL students with overall ACCESS scores that were near or at the exit range performed at Developing or higher. SWD: SWD students performed at the level of their non SWD peers.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Although growth was made in the area of numerical reasoning, this continues to be an area of weakness. EL: Data aligns with shown areas of weakness for all students. SWD:
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Student Groups)	Grades K–2: Strengths Kindergarten: Kindergarten students demonstrated strength in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning and Measurement and Data Reasoning, with 37% of students reaching the <i>Prepared</i> level by solving problems using patterns and basic structures, consistent with GSE K.OA and K.CC standards. 1st Grade: First-grade students showed strong performance in Measurement and Data Reasoning, with 43% of students <i>Prepared</i> to solve problems involving length and time (GSE 1.MD). 2nd Grade: Second-grade students demonstrated relative strength in	Grades K–2: Weaknesses Kindergarten: Kindergarten students showed a need for additional support in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning, with 16% of students in the <i>Support Needed</i> category. 1st Grade: In first grade, students showed weaknesses in Numerical Reasoning, where 38% with 16% of students in the <i>Support Needed</i> category. 2nd Grade: Second-grade students demonstrated the greatest need for support in Numerical Reasoning, with 41% of students in the <i>Support Needed</i> category. Grades 3–5: Weaknesses 3rd Grade: Third-grade students demonstrated significant weakness in

	Geometric and Spatial Reasoning, with 43% of students <i>Prepared</i> to describe and analyze shapes and their attributes (GSE 2.G). Grades 3–5: Strengths 3rd Grade: Third-grade students demonstrated strength in Numerical Reasoning, with 5% of students reaching the <i>Prepared</i> level and an additional 84% approaching target expectations—indicating strong progress in solving problems involving time, liquid volumes, and area (GSE 3.MD). In Geometric and Spatial Reasoning, 67% of students were <i>Near Target</i>, reflecting foundational understanding of attributes of shapes and area concepts (3.G). 4th Grade: Fourth-grade students showed strength in Numerical Reasoning, with 60% of students <i>Near Target</i> and 16% <i>Prepared</i>. 5th Grade: Fifth-grade students showed their strongest performance in Numerical Reasoning, with 9% <i>Prepared</i> and Measurement and Data Reasoning with 9% <i>Prepared</i>.	Numerical Reasoning, with 95% needing support or nearly meeting expectations. 4th Grade: In fourth grade, Measurement and Data Reasoning was a critical weakness, with only 0% of students <i>Prepared</i> and 47% still needing support in identifying and drawing geometric figures (4.G). 5th Grade: Fifth-grade students showed the most significant weaknesses in Numerical Reasoning, with 91% in the <i>Support Needed</i> or <i>Near Target</i> category and only 9% <i>Prepared</i> to perform operations with multi-digit whole numbers and decimals (5.NBT). Geometric and Spatial Reasoning also presented challenges, with only 4% reaching <i>Prepared</i> status in solving real-world problems involving measurement conversions and interpreting data displays (5.MD).
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership	Root Cause Explanation: Teacher time allotted to tasks oriented toward application through critical thinking prevents students from participating in assignments that allow for the expansion of understanding the concepts. The ability of students to apply and transfer knowledge is limited by lack of exposure.	

☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during walks?		

• What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during walks?		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	K-2 Math Goal: The percent of K – 2nd grade students scoring within the "Prepared" range will increase from 13% (17 students) to 15% (19 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 Spring administration of the Beacon assessment. 3-5 Math Goal: The percent of students scoring within the "Proficient and Distinguished" range will increase from 42% (62 students) to 44% (64 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG Math Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Inconsistent teacher clarity with Tier 1 Instruction for math standards Inconsistent use explicit instruction focused on mathematical vocabulary		
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: 100% of math teachers will include daily spiral review and vocabulary during math lessons. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Administrators and Instructional Leads will provide guidelines for implementation of Spiral Review lessons. Non-negotiables will be outlined. - August-May: CCC meetings will identify student gaps in learning and develop grade level spiral review lessons for students. Lessons will be developed weekly. Background vocabulary will be emphasized.	Evaluation Performance Target: By August 2025, 10% of students in 1- 5 grades will score “Prepared” on the Math Beacon. By December 2026, 20% of students in 1-5 grades will score “Prepared” on the Math Beacon. By March 2026, 30% of the students in 1-5 will score “Prepared” on the Math Beacon. Evaluation Tool(s): - CFAs - Beacon Assessment	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Implement a spiral review that regularly revisits all previously taught concepts, incorporates key mathematical vocabulary, and includes multi-step word problems to reinforce understanding and promote long-term retention.	• PL on incorporating Spiral Review presented by Instructional Leads. • August-May: Vertical Alignment Collaboration will occur quarterly to review learning gaps and targeted areas for spiral review lessons. Artifacts to be Collected: Meeting minutes Spiral Review Lessons Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Data discussions will take place during grade level CCC meetings. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
---	--	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will implement daily lessons aligned to the GSE Math Standards. Implementation Plan: Preplanning-August: Administrators & Instructional Specialists will establish expectations/non-negotiables for math with teachers August-March: Professional Learning (PL) Sessions: - Teachers and CCC leads receive PL from CCSD Math Department. - Focus on reviewing resources to ensure alignment with standards. August-May Grade Level Collaboration/Implementation - Math K-5 teachers will implement daily lessons and student experiences that are directly aligned to GSE Math Standards with a focus on numerical reasoning through the exploration and usage of the core math package inclusive of GA DOE state learning plans. - Conduct 1 full day of Grade Level Collaboration planning days. - Plan lessons and choose resources (e.g., CTLS resources, state learning plans). - Discuss and visualize what the standards look like in practice.	Evaluation Performance Target: By August 2025, 10% of students in 1- 5 grades will score “Prepared” on the Math Beacon. By December 2026, 20% of students in 1-5 grades will score “Prepared” on the Math Beacon. By March 2026, 30% of the students in 1-5 will score “Prepared” on the Math Beacon. Evaluation Tool(s): - Common Assessments - Beacon Assessments Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ Quarterly Data Analysis Plan:	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. Teachers will increase the rigor of instruction in the domain of numerical reasoning on a weekly basis.			

	Artifacts to be Collected: CCC & Collaboration Day minutes Walkthrough data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

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

<u>Academic-Related</u> School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)							
Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			Cannot be TBD		Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			Cannot be TBD		Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			Cannot be TBD		Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher

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

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

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

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

support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. *SWP Checklist 5(e)* **Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)**

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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:

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:

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:

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

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

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

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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:

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:

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:

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

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

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals

SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)

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

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

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

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