

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Belmont Hills Elementary
Principal Name:	Dr. Ashley Campoli
Date Submitted:	May 29, 2026
Revision Date(s):	August 17, 2026

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Belmont Hills Elementary
<i>Team Lead</i>	Patrice Hill and Ashley Owenby
<i>Position</i>	Teacher Leaders/EIP support
<i>Email</i>	Patrice.hill@cobbk12.org Ashley.owenby@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	678.842.6810
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: Each grade level met to review Beacon data and group students for instruction and for the development of the SIP. Later, each grade level met to review the 2026 student achievement data, and reflected on strengths, weaknesses, and root causes and completed the reflections document. After careful reflection, we used the conversation to create our SSP goals aligned to each team's identified needs. Parents had the opportunity to participate in developing the SIP through the spring input meeting. After the plan was completed, all stakeholders had a chance to provide feedback on the finished plan. Additionally, our BLT discussed our goals for the upcoming school year.

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 Dr Ashley Campoli and Haroldeen Swearingen	Parent Facilitator Dinna Ortiz De Gracia
Content or Grade Level Teachers	Librarian: Natarsha Miller
Local School Academic Coaches	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches Dr. Angela Mack	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:	Leadership Meeting February 27, 2026	Grade level meeting March 24, 2026	Grade level meeting March 31, 2026
-----------------------	---	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
EIP	Patrice Hill	Pat Hill
EIP	Ashley Owenby	Ashley Owenby
Principal	Ashley Campoli	Ashley Campoli
Assistance Principal	Haroldeen Swearingen	Haroldeen Swearingen
Teacher	Ashley Bollinger	Ashley Bollinger
Teacher	Kim Test	Kim Test
Teacher	Amy Hall	Amy Hall
Teacher	Samantha Phillips	Samantha Phillips
Teacher	Jessica Smith	Jessica Smith
Teacher	Kristen Thalacker	Kristen Thalacker
Counselor	Hollie Ollivierre	Hollie Ollivierre
Gifted	Jennifer Darnell	Jennifer Darnell
Librarian	Natarsha Miller	Natarsha Miller
Teacher	Jordan Hirst	Jordan Hirst
Teacher	Melissa Weatherford	Melissa Weatherford
Teacher	Mireya Nuñez	Mireya Nuñez
Parent	Lisa Hawk	Lisa Hawk

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	- The percentage of kindergarten students demonstrating at/near or above grade level proficiency will increase from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 by at least 80% as measured by the Amira in Spring 2026. - Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 50 points from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 as measured by the Beacon assessment. - The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in ELA will increase from 17% to at least 20% as measured by the 2025-2026 Milestone EOG ELA Assessment.										
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially											
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Amira – Kindergarten students met the goal of 82% (32/39 students) demonstrating proficiency at/near or above grade level on the End-of-Year assessment. Beacon - First- and second graders met their ELA goal. Their Beacon data scale score average growth was greater than 50 points. First grade showed 69 points of growth, and second grade showed 62 points of growth. - First grade's average scale score was 422 (Fall 2025) and increased to 491 (Spring 2026). - Second grade's average scale score was 441 (Fall 2025) and increased to 503 (Spring 2026). Milestone ELA – <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-top: 10px;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;"></th><th style="text-align: center;">Spring 2026</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grade 3</td><td>--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Grade 4</td><td>--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Grade 5</td><td>--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Grades 3 -5</td><td>--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Spring 2026	Grade 3	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)	Grade 4	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)	Grade 5	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)	Grades 3 -5	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)
	Spring 2026										
Grade 3	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)										
Grade 4	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)										
Grade 5	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)										
Grades 3 -5	--- out of ---- students scored proficient or distinguished (--%)										
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?	Amira's data successes were attributed to UFLI instruction. Beacon data successes were attributed to our Shine Time (school-wide 20-minute daily intervention block) for ELA (UFLI) foundational skills, and to the ELA homework initiative (Wonders progress-monitoring questions/passages), both of which will be implemented in the 26-27 school year. Milestones

Previous Year's Goal #2	At least 80% of kindergarten students will demonstrate proficiency by scoring 75% or higher in mathematics as measured by the CCSD Common Formative (Post) assessments at the end of each unit. Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 80 points from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 as measured by the Beacon assessment. The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in Math will increase from 31% to at least 34% as measured by the 2025-2026 Milestone EOG Math Assessment.																		
Was the goal met? YES NO Partially																			
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Kindergarten partially met the goal in two of the seven units, with 80% (28 students) scoring 75% or higher. CLTS math post assessment data for kindergarten <table><tr><td>Unit 1</td><td>32 out of 44 students</td><td>73% of students scored 75% or higher</td></tr><tr><td>Unit 2</td><td>29 out of 41 students</td><td>71% of students scored 75% or higher.</td></tr><tr><td>Unit 3</td><td>21 out of 42 students</td><td>50% of students scored 75% or higher.</td></tr><tr><td>Unit 4</td><td>31 out of 37 students</td><td>84% of students scored 75% or higher</td></tr><tr><td>Unit 5</td><td>22 out of 39 students</td><td>56% of students scored 75% or higher.</td></tr><tr><td>Unit 6</td><td>32 out of 36 students</td><td>89% of students scored 75% or higher.</td></tr></table> The Beacon goal was partially met. First grade met the goal by scoring at least an 80-point growth. Second grade missed the goal by 10 points. First grade scored an average of 92 points growth and Second grade scored an average of 70 points growth. First grade's average scale score was 415 (Fall 2025) and increased to 507 (Spring 2026). Second grade's average scale score was 444 (Fall 2025) and increased to 514 (Spring 2026).	Unit 1	32 out of 44 students	73% of students scored 75% or higher	Unit 2	29 out of 41 students	71% of students scored 75% or higher.	Unit 3	21 out of 42 students	50% of students scored 75% or higher.	Unit 4	31 out of 37 students	84% of students scored 75% or higher	Unit 5	22 out of 39 students	56% of students scored 75% or higher.	Unit 6	32 out of 36 students	89% of students scored 75% or higher.
Unit 1	32 out of 44 students	73% of students scored 75% or higher																	
Unit 2	29 out of 41 students	71% of students scored 75% or higher.																	
Unit 3	21 out of 42 students	50% of students scored 75% or higher.																	
Unit 4	31 out of 37 students	84% of students scored 75% or higher																	
Unit 5	22 out of 39 students	56% of students scored 75% or higher.																	
Unit 6	32 out of 36 students	89% of students scored 75% or higher.																	

	Milestones	
		Spring 2026
	Grade 3	25 out of 42 students scored proficient or distinguished (59.5 %)
	Grade 4	13 out of 36 students scored proficient or distinguished (36%)
	Grade 5	7 out of 38 students scored proficient or distinguished (18%)
	Grades 3 -5	45 out of 116 students scored proficient or distinguished (39%)
Reflecting on Outcomes		
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	With continued support, additional staff, more small-group interventions with GLOSS activities to build number sense, and iReady support. Milestones – EIP staff supporting students in math using iReady, math tutoring	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	The goal was partially met, most likely because time was intentionally set aside for Number Talks, which reinforce number sense.	

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	20.9%	17.9%	
4 th Grade	16%	16%	
5 th Grade	34%	34%	

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Foundations			Language			Texts			Interpreting Texts			Constructing Texts		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1st Grade (43 Students)	35%	33%	33%	47%	35%	19%	33%	42%	26%	30%	44%	26%	49%	33%	19%
2nd Grade (36 Students)	36%	25%	39%	36%	28%	36%	25%	47%	28%	31%	36%	33%	33%	50%	17%

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
3rd Grade (42 Students)	20%	71%	10%	12%	73%	15%	10%	73%	17%	37%	49%	15%	12%	78%	10%	15%	73%	12%	24%	73%	2%
4th Grade (34 Students)	32%	59%	9%	18%	74%	9%	29%	65%	6%	47%	50%	3%	32%	53%	15%	26%	71%	3%	41%	53%	6%
5th Grade (39 Students)	28%	62%	10%	33%	56%	10%	49%	41%	10%	51%	46%	3%	44%	46%	10%	38%	51%	10%	49%	46%	5%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD (all students): 3rd grade % of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in ____ domain. 4th grade % of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in ____ domain. 5th grade % of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in ____ domain.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD (all students) 3rd grade % of students scored Below performance levels in the ____ domain. 4th grade % of students scored Below performance levels in the ____ domain. 5th grade % of students scored Below performance levels in the ____ domain.
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	First Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in Foundations, with 66% (28/43) of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. EL: ESOL students are showing strength in the Foundations domain. SWD: SWD students are showing strengths in blending and segmenting. Second Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in the Constructing Texts domain, with 67% (24/36) of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. EL: Students are showing strength in the Foundations domain. SWD: Students are showing strength in Language Third Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in the Vocabulary domain, with 88% (37/42) of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories.	First Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Constructing Texts domain, with 49% (21/43) scoring at the Support Needed level. EL: Students are showing weakness in the Language domain SWD: Students are showing weakness in the Constructing Text and Language domains. Second Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Foundations domain, with 36% (13/36) in the Support Needed level. EL: Students demonstrated weakness in the Interpreting Text domain. SWD: Students demonstrated weakness in the Foundations and Texts domains. Third Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Language: Grammar Conventions domain, with 2% (1/42) in the Proficient level. EL: Students demonstrated weakness in the Constructing Text domain.

	EL: The Vocabulary domain is a strength; they are applying the strategies we are teaching. They notice words that have prefixes. SWD: Students are demonstrating strengths in the Interpreting texts domain. Fourth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in the Texts: Research & Analysis domain, with 74% (25/34 students) performing in the Near Target or Proficient levels. EL: Although students are still developing vocabulary skills, they are showing growth in reading fluency and comprehension. SWD: Although students are still developing vocabulary skills, they are showing growth in reading fluency. Fifth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strength in the Texts: Research & Analysis domain, with 62% (24/39 students) performing in Near Target or Proficient levels. EL/SWD: Although students are still developing vocabulary and interpreting text, they are showing growth in reading fluency and comprehension.	SWD: Students demonstrated weakness in the Language: Grammar Conventions domain. Fourth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Listening domain, with 47% (16/34 students) scoring in the Support Needed level. EL: Students demonstrated a weakness in the Vocabulary domain. SWD: Students demonstrated a weakness in the Interpreting texts and Vocabulary domains. Fifth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Listening domain, with 51% (20/39 students) scoring in the Support Needed level. EL: Students demonstrated a weakness in the Vocabulary domain. SWD: Students demonstrated a weakness in the Interpreting texts domain.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: There is a need for consistent Tier 1 instruction. Limited understanding of UFLI components and whole group expectations. Limited opportunities for collaborative planning focused on unpacking and leveraging the Wonders curriculum resources. Need for establishing small group instruction protocols and expectations.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing) Edit/add domains: speaking/listening, reading & writing data	Grade Levels (all students): STRENGTHS Schoolwide Reclassify/Exit 20 of 140 students 14% Schoolwide Strengths by Domain:	Grade Levels (all students): WEAKNESSES Schoolwide Weaknesses by Domain: Writing: 37.6% Entering (level 1); 12.7% Emerging (level 2) Total 50.3%

	Listening: 43.3% Bridging (level 5); 10.6% Expanding (level 4) Total 53.9% Reading: 19.1% Bridging (level 5); 4.9% Expanding (level 4) Total 24%	Speaking: 19.1% Entering (level 1); 31.9 Emerging (level 2) Total 51%
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Limited academic vocabulary. Limited opportunities to practice speaking academic language with peers in small group instruction. Limited foundational skills.	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing) (Transformational Schools PMA)	For all grade levels, areas of strength: K: tapping and identifying the number phonemes in words 1: After the story is read aloud, they can answer comprehension questions best. 2: Students are developing the essential skills for responding to texts. 3: Morphology 4: Students are growing in reading fluency and comprehension. 5: Students' fluency is improving.	For all grade levels, areas of weakness: K: isolating phonemes in one-syllable words 1: breaking apart syllables within text 2: context clues 3: conventions of standard English 4: vocabulary 5: comprehension
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Limited use of data to identify whole and small group instructional needs for reteaching, maintaining, or extending.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	K-2 UFLI Teachers were providing instruction according to the Transformational Schools Calendar. 3-5 Wonders	K-2 UFLI Observations: Teachers were not adhering to the recommended time constraints for each UFLI 8-step component. As a result, teachers are not meeting all parts of the lesson on days 1 or 2 due to time limitations.

	The teachers were providing instruction with the district's pacing for each lesson	3-5 Wonders Observations: During the ELA block, students' independent work time was used differently across classrooms, rather than district-aligned resources, such as the Wonders digital student resources. Learning Targets and Success Criteria were not always addressed in each classroom during the observation.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	Limited knowledge and expectations of the ELA instructional frameworks, including the pacing of whole and small group lessons. There is a need for additional professional learning to enhance teachers' capacity to effectively plan and implement instruction using the new ELA resources, specifically the use of Wonders and UFLI materials and lesson components. Additional professional learning needed for developing learning targets and success criteria.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	During the 26 - 27 school year, 40% (33/79) of first and second-grade students will score Prepared in the Foundations domain on the Spring Beacon Assessment. During the 26 - 27 school year, the percentage of students of 3rd to 5th grade scoring Proficient and Distinguished on the Georgia Milestones ELA Assessment will increase by at least 3% from the 2025–2026 baseline to the Spring 2027.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Limited understanding of whole group expectations and lesson steps in UFLI 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	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of Kindergarten through Second grade teachers will implement targeted small group instruction at least 3 times per week with a focus on phonics using UFLI resources. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Admin and Instructional Support team will attend the district's UFLI Next Steps training. - August-September: CCCs meeting with all K-2 teachers to review the expectations for small group instruction, daily steps in lessons for Day 1/Day2, and weekly progress monitoring spelling assessment. - October: Conduct walkthrough observations for data-driven small group instruction. Share walkthrough data results with staff. - October-December: Monitor student progress, restructure small groups as needed. - Nov-Dec:	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of students will score at least 75% or higher as measured by the UFLI progress monitoring spelling assessment. Evaluation Tool(s): Progress Monitoring Spelling Assessment Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 3 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Weekly Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Teacher Leader	
Target Student Group			
☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
1. All K-2 teachers will implement targeted small group instruction at least 3 times per week with a focus on phonics.			

	Based on the walkthrough data, the TL team will provide individual modeling. January – May: Continue monitoring student progress and restructuring small groups based on need. Artifacts to be Collected: Walkthrough data – UFLI checklist Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Teacher Leader Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Limited understanding of small group expectations in Wonders 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	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will implement daily small-group instruction aligned with the Wonders curriculum. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: The Literacy Task Force will meet to collectively create small group lesson plan components and a framework. - August-September: Belmont University will host all new teachers to onboard them to the resources on the Wonders platform. - October: The TL team will conduct	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 50% of students in each grade level will score 70% or higher on the progress monitoring assessment. Evaluation Tool(s): Walkthrough data Progress Monitoring by Grade Level: - Kinder: end of unit 1st grade PMA weeks 1/2 & 3/4 2-5 PMA weeks 3/4 Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly	
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>			

All K-5 teachers will implement small-group instruction with a focus on language skills, interpreting texts, and vocabulary development.	walkthrough observations for data on small group instruction, target on interpreting texts and vocabulary development. Share Walkthrough data results with staff. - Nov- Dec: Based on walkthrough data, the TL team will provide individual modeling. - January-May: Continue monitoring student progress and restructuring small groups based on need. Artifacts to be Collected: Walkthrough Wonder checklists Small group lesson plans Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Instructional Support Team Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly	☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ End of Unit Data Analysis Plan: Grade level teams will meet at least monthly at the end of each unit to analyze students' progress monitoring assessment. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Teacher Leaders ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

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	44.2%	25.6%	59.5%
4 th Grade	29.5%	44.1%	36.1%
5 th Grade	38.3%	24.4%	18.4%

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 (39 Students)	18%	51%	31%	31%	49%	21%	28%	51%	21%	36%	28%	36%
1st Grade (43 Students)	19%	51%	30%	21%	49%	30%	14%	49%	37%	28%	44%	28%
2nd Grade (36 Students)	44%	33%	22%	28%	56%	17%	53%	22%	25%	14%	42%	44%
3rd Grade (41 Students)	7%	85%	7%	17%	78%	5%	12%	88%	0%	22%	76%	2%
4th Grade (34 Students)	44%	50%	6%	53%	44%	3%	56%	44%	0%	62%	38%	0%
5th Grade (41 Students)	59%	39%	2%	71%	29%	0%	46%	51%	2%	73%	27%	0%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD (all students): 3rd grade 45% of students scored Proficient performance levels in the Numerical Reasoning domain. 4th grade 53% of students scored Proficient performance levels in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain. 5th grade 21% of students scored Proficient performance levels in Numerical Reasoning domain.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD (all students) 3rd grade 47% of students scored Below performance levels in the Numerical Reasoning domain. 4th grade 61% of students scored Below performance levels in the Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning domain. 5th grade 74% of students scored Below performance levels in the Numerical Reasoning domain.

Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Kindergarten (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in the Numerical Reasoning domain, with 82% (32/39) in the Near Target and Prepared levels. EL: Attention and ability to listen, process, and comprehend the questions. SWD: Strengths in patterning and algebraic reasoning. Super high-functioning students in math skills. First Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in the Measurement and Data Reasoning domains, with 86% (37/43) of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. EL: Have developed a great understanding of number sense SWD: Have developed an understanding of number sense, shapes, counting, and patterns Second Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in the Geometric and Spatial domain, with 86% (31/36) of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. EL: Students are demonstrating strength in the Patterning, Algebraic Reasoning, and Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domains. SWD: Students are showing strength in the Geometric and Spatial reasoning domains. Third Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strengths in the Numerical Reasoning domain, with 93% (38/41) of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. EL: Students are demonstrating strengths in the Numerical Reasoning domain (more visual). SWD: Students are demonstrating strengths in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain (more visual).	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Kindergarten (all students): Students demonstrated weakness in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain, with 36% (14/39) in the Support Needed level. EL: Need more support with Multi-step and response questions. (requiring more than 1 answer) SWD: Student response difficulty, multi-step questions and responses, choosing last answer when multiple choice questions because last item heard. Need strategies and manipulatives. First Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain, with 28% (12/43) scoring at the Support Needed level. EL: Students are showing weakness with multi-step problems and test-taking tools. SWD: Students are struggling with multi-step problems. Second Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Measurement and Data Reasoning domain, with 53% (19/36) in the Support Needed level. EL & SWD: Students demonstrated weakness in the Measurement and Data Reasoning domain. Third Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain, with 22% (9/41) in the Support Needed level. EL: Students demonstrated weakness in the word problems due to limited vocabulary. SWD: Students demonstrated weakness in the Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning and Numerical Reasoning domains. Fourth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain, with 62% (21/34 students) scoring in the Support Needed level.
--	---	--

	Fourth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strength in the Numerical Reasoning domain, with 56% (19/34 students) performing in the Near Target or Proficient levels. EL/SWD: Students are demonstrating strengths with computational skills. Fifth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated strength in the Measurement and Data domain, with 54% (22/41 students) performing in Near Target or Proficient levels. EL/SWD: Students are growing in rote comprehension	EL: Students demonstrated a weakness of vocabulary when reading word problems. SWD: Students demonstrated a weakness with word problems and solving problems with multi-digit numbers. Fifth Grade (all students): Students demonstrated a weakness in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain, with 73% (30/41 students) scoring in the Support Needed level. EL/SWD: Students demonstrated a weakness in reading and understanding mathematical language.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: There is a limited understanding of fully integrating the GA Inspire materials and expectations into the CCSD CTLS math lesson plans. There is a limited opportunity to engage in a spiral review of previously taught content standards. There is a limited understanding of math vocabulary as it relates to the problem-solving process.	
MATH Common Assessments	For all grade levels, areas of strength: K: numerical reasoning 1: number strength 2: patterning 3: numerical reasoning 4: mathematical computation 5: rote computation	For all grade levels, areas of weakness: K: measurement and data 1: multistep word problems 2: measurement and data 3: vocabulary and word problems 4: reading word problems (vocabulary) 5: reading and understanding mathematical language (vocabulary)
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: There is a limited understanding of math vocabulary as it relates to the problem-solving process.	

School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	Learning targets were posted or referenced in 65 out of the 71 classrooms (92%). Instruction was fully aligned to the standards in 54 out of the 71 classrooms (76%) During the apply segment of math instruction, targeted, small group instruction was observed in 18 out of 19 classrooms (95%). During the engage segment of math instruction, math talks or number talks were observed in 12 out of 21 classrooms (57%). During the explore segment of math instruction, inquiry-based learning with visuals and manipulatives was observed in 6 out of 11 classrooms (55%). The implementation of tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving were observed in 24 out of 71 classrooms (33%) The use and connection between various mathematical representations was observed in 34 out of 71 classrooms (47%) Meaningful math mathematical discourse was facilitated in 27 out of 71 classrooms (38%) Students were observed constructing viable arguments and critiquing the mathematical reasoning of others in 13 out of 71 classrooms (18%). During the explore segment of math instruction, real world connections were observed in 2 out of the 11 classrooms (18%).	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: There is limited opportunity for students to engage in mathematical discourse and explore real-world connections.	
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	- At least 85% of kindergarten students will demonstrate Near Target and Prepared proficiency as measured by the 2027 Spring Beacon assessment. - Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 75 points from Fall 2026 to Spring 2027 as measured by the Beacon assessment. - The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in Math will increase from 38% (44 students out of 116 students) to at least 41% as measured by the 2026-2027 Milestone EOG Math Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	There is a limited understanding of fully integrating the GA Inspire materials and expectations into the CCSD CTLS math lesson plans.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By December, 100% of classroom teachers will implement the collaborative math plans with fidelity. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: grade-level - Collaboration will create quarterly pacing guides for math. - August-September: The MRESA consultant will conduct observations and provide feedback to leadership. - October-May:		Evaluation Performance Target: At least 65% of students in each grade level will score 70% or higher on the Math Unit Post assessment. Evaluation Tool(s): - Math Pacing Guides - Walkthrough data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month
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>			

K-5 teachers will collaborate with the MetroResa consultant to plan quarterly unit math plans.	The MRESA consultant will meet quarterly with teams during CCCs to provide feedback from observations and plan accordingly. Based on the walkthrough data, the TL team will provide individual modeling. Artifacts to be Collected: MRESA contract MRESA feedback data Quarterly Math Pacing Guides Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Instructional Support Team Frequency of Monitoring: quarterly	☐ 3 times per year ☒ at end of unit Data Analysis Plan: Teachers will review unit assessment data to determine areas of strength and weakness and plan for student needs. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Teacher Lead Instructors ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	There is a limited opportunity to engage in a spiral review of previously taught content standards.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: The 3-5 grades tutor will work with students to increase their average growth in the Numerical Reasoning domain on the Beacon math assessment. Implementation Plan: Sept-March August: Tutor will meet with district coaches to support understanding of implementing spiral review of math vocabulary. Tutor will give a pre assessment. September: Review Assessments and creating an action plan. September-May: Work with students daily reenforcing math vocabulary.	Evaluation Performance Target: 60% of participating students will show an average growth of 50 pts on the Beacon assessment. Evaluation Tool(s): Beacon Math Assessment Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Collaborative grade level team meetings Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Tutors ☐ CCC Leads	
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
3-5 Tutors will implement a spiral review of math vocabulary weekly.	Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson plans Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Teacher Leaders Frequency of Monitoring: Each math unit		

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 (August 3 - 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.	09/17/2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - 30, 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.	10/1-30/2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (March 8 - 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.	03/30/2027		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. Deadline: July 30 - September 11, 2026 (Fall) Deadline: January 5-February 12, 2027 (Spring)	08/18/2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	01/26/2027		
5. Required: * Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visiting the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. Briefly describe the transition activities here: - Rising 6th-grade families are introduced to the expectations and learning opportunities offered in Middle School. This experience includes a school tour, an opportunity to meet the admin team, and a question and answer session designed to support a smooth transition. Deadline: January 1 - April 30, 2027. - Kindergarten Orientation orients parents with the school building, communication expectations, and the kindergarten school day format. Deadline: July 1 - October 30, 2026	04/13/2027 & 05/06/2027 05/06/2027		☐ 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: School Policy School-Parent Compacts School activities and events invitation CTLS posts/flyers and agendas.		☐ 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
Curriculum in Action Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			09/03/26 6-7 p.m.		Parent Facilitator Lead Teachers
STEM & Family Data Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			03/04/27 6 –7:15 p.m.		Parent Facilitator Lead Teachers
Kindergarten Orientation Meeting	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☒ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			05/06/27 9-10 a.m.		Parent Facilitator Kindergarten Teachers
Middle Schools Mindsets	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☒ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			04/13/27 11-12 p.m.		School Counselor Parent Facilitator

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) <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: Belmont Hills Elementary provides support for students in reading and mathematics using iReady and Dreambox software programs to support striving learners. Title III offers EL students access to Imagine Learning to support language development.	

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. <i>SWP Checklist 4</i>
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(a)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Administrators frequently walk through classrooms to ensure action steps are being implemented with fidelity. Teachers participate in grade-level CCCs and lead discussions regarding the action step implementation and effectiveness. These meetings occur weekly. The plan is also reviewed annually to ensure goals have been achieved. Reflection on goals helps determine whether to keep, revise, or abandon the action steps or goals.
8. Describe how the school determines whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the challenging State academic standards, particularly for those students who have been further from achieving the standards. <i>SWP Checklist 3(b)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Belmont Hills reviews the score reports for both local and state assessments, looking for students' growth from one level to the next. The goal is always to move students from Support Needed to Proficient or higher. Students who need additional support are provided with action steps found within the School’s Improvement Plan. Each student is then evaluated using the achievement data to assess whether that action step was effective. Revisions occur when needed to adjust the plan.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(c)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Revisions occur when needed to adjust the plan as determined by both formative and summative assessment data, as well as CCCs discussions with teachers and parent feedback when appropriate. The BLT also reviews this plan monthly to keep a pulse on what is working and what needs additional support. Areas that need additional support will be discussed in faculty meetings, and an additional PL can be provided to targeted teachers in CCCs.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2(a)</i>

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. <i>SWP Checklist 2(b)</i>
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)</i>
13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Revisions occur when needed to adjust the plan as determined by both formative and summative assessment data as well as CCC discussions with teachers and parent feedback when appropriate. The BLT also reviews this plan monthly to keep a pulse on what is working and what needs additional support. Areas that need additional support will be discussed in faculty meetings and additional PL can be provided to targeted teachers in CCCs.
14. <u>Describe professional development</u> and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, <u>and to recruit and retain effective teachers</u>, particularly in high need subjects. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Cobb Collaborative Communities- Focused professional development based on high standards of teaching and learning is essential to improving teaching and increasing student achievement. It must be focused on what teachers district-wide and in the individual schools need to know and be able to do for their students. Ultimately, professional development should build "professional communities" committed to higher student learning. Continuous learning opportunities that are focused, reflective, and coherent are essential. The following are research-based practices in professional development that support career-long development of teaching and student learning: • Provide on-going learning opportunities for all • Improve teaching and learning • Target student outcomes and goals of schools and districts • Set time aside to allow teachers to implement new techniques learned and to plan collaboratively • Establish study groups (e.g., book studies, professional magazine articles, etc) Involve all teachers including, Special Education, ESOL, paraprofessionals and specialists (music, art, science, math and physical education) In addition: • Quarterly professional learning led by MetroResa • Professional learning led by CCSD/MetroRESA • New Teacher Mentor/Mentee group • New Teacher University • Analyze data monthly with K-5 common formative assessments
15. ONLY MIDDLE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED Describe the transition activities provided for preschool children to kindergarten, 5th grade students to 6th grade and 8th grade students to 9th grade. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(v)</i>

SCHOOL RESPONSE: N/A

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, which 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
Include goals on the parent compacts and policy

Goal #1	• During the 26 - 27 school year, 40% (33/79) of first and second-grade students will score Prepared in the Foundations domain on the Spring Beacon Assessment. • During the 26 - 27 school year, the percentage of students of 3rd to 5th grade scoring Proficient and Distinguished on the Georgia Milestones ELA Assessment will increase by at least 3% from the 2025–2026 baseline to the Spring 2027.
Goal #2	• At least 85% of kindergarten students will demonstrate Near Target and Prepared proficiency as measured by the 2027 Spring Beacon assessment. • Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 75 points from Fall 2026 to Spring 2027 as measured by the Beacon assessment. • The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in Math will increase from 38% (44 students out of 116 students) to at least 41% as measured by the 2026-2027 Milestone EOG Math Assessment.
Goal #3	
Goal #4	