

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Clarkdale Elementary
Principal Name:	Dwan Jones
Date Submitted:	May 27, 2026
Revision Date(s):	

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Clarkdale Elementary
<i>Team Lead</i>	Dwan Jones
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Dwan.jones@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	770-819-2422
Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems ONLY
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only
Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>
In developing this plan, the school actively sought input from a diverse range of stakeholders to ensure a comprehensive and effective approach to meeting students' academic needs and the professional needs of teachers, support personnel, and families. This collaborative process included a series of meetings and discussions to identify the school's most urgent priorities and to gather feedback on current programs and initiatives. The CCC teams began this work by analyzing mid-year achievement data from multiple sources, including district and school-level assessments, Title I survey results, minutes from Building Leadership Team (BLT) meetings, and input from teacher teams.

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 • Dwan Jones, Principal • Carmen Bandy, Assistant Principal • Charlie Eaddy, Assistant Principal • Deidre Booker, SSA	Parent Facilitator • Cheryl Bush
Content or Grade Level Teachers • Lauren Clark, Kindergarten • Unique Duffy, First Grade • Ashlynn Bailey, Second Grade • Tiffany Spicer, Third Grade • Darius Jones, Fourth Grade • Talecia Tabb, Fifth Grade	School Librarian • Cynthia Adams
Local School Academic Coach • Katy Laine	Public Safety Officer • Officer Bowman
District Academic Coach • Dr. Angela Mack	Business Partners • Colonial Pipeline • Greystone Power • Mayor of Austell
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee) • Ms. Logan	Social Worker • Ms. Evans

Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders • Mr. Lust (Kiwanis Club)
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialist • Ms. Todaro
MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)	Community Health Care Providers
	Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	May 5, 2026	May 12, 2026	May 26, 2026
-----------------------	-------------	--------------	--------------

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Dwan Jones	
Assistant Principal	Carmen Bandy	
Assistant Principal	Charlie Eaddy	
Academic Coach	Katy Laine	
Parent Facilitator	Cheryl Bush	
Technology/STEAM	Kaitlin Todaro	
Kindergarten Team Lead	Ieshia Wilkerson	
First Grade Team Lead	Unique Duffy	
Second Grade Team Lead	Sontikka Mitchell	
Third Grade Team Lead	Dominique Anderson	
Fourth Grade Team Lead	Darius Jones	
Fifth Grade Team Lead	Talecia Tabb	
Counselor	Michael Brown	
ESOL Team Lead	Felicia Hill	
SWD Team Lead	Natasha Polite	

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	Increase the number of students in grades 1 -2 performing at PREPARED levels on the Beacon assessment from 37% (84 of 228 students assessed) in March 2025 to 44% of students assessed in March 2026. Increase the number of students in grades 3 -5 performing at PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED levels on the EOG from 33% (133 of 402 students assessed) in May 2025 to 40% of students assessed in May 2026.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Based on Spring Beacon assessment data for grades 1 and 2, 45% (102 of 225 students) performed in the Prepared levels. Based on the EOG,
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the	Grades 1 -2 were able to meet or exceed their goal because: - Regularly analyzing student performance data to monitor performance - Sharing performance data with students (accountability) - Adjusting instruction to align with what the data reflected as it was analyzed (Beacon & Common Assessments) Grade 3 – 5 – Goals data is still pending scores from the EOG.

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

Previous Year's Goal #2	Increase the number of students in grades 1-2 performing at Prepared levels on the Beacon from 25% (58 of 228 students assessed) in March 2025 to 30% (68 of 225 students assessed) in March 2026. Increase the number of students in grades 3 -5 performing at PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED levels on the EOG from 42% (169 of 404 students assessed) in May 2025 to 47% of students assessed in May 2026.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Based on Spring Beacon data for grades 1 and 2, 35% (79 of 225 students) performed in the Prepared levels. Grade 1: 33% (38 of 116 students) Grade 2: 38% (41 of 109 students) Based on the EOG data for grades 3, 4, and 5, 44% (167 of 376 students) performed in the Proficient and Distinguished levels. Grade 3: 52% (57 of 108 students) Grade 4: 40% (53 of 133 students) Grade 5: 42% (57 of 135 students)
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	To achieve our SIP goal of increasing the percentage of students performing at proficient and distinguished levels from 42% to 44%. We did not meet our goal; as a result, we will ensure these actionable strategies will be implemented: • Alignment of teacher-made assessments to ensure they align with the rigor of the standard • Quarterly, revisit the SIP goals during CCCs to monitor the progress toward the goals • Use student performance data to inform instructional strategies • Spiral review skills (scaffold the review) to support ongoing review of skills and support throughout the school year. • Explicit vocabulary instruction will be provided to all students
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the	Grades 1 -2 were able to meet or exceed their goal because: • Regularly analyzing student performance data to plan for instruction. • Sharing performance data with students (accountability)

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

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	38%	31%	
4 th Grade	28%	33%	
5 th Grade	54%	39%	

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	25%	30%	45%	19%	52%	29%	13%	50%	37%	14%	48%	38%	4%	19%	15%
2 nd Grade	18%	45%	37%	18%	28%	53%	1%	14%	39%	19%	26%	55%	18%	48%	34%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Text												Constructing Text											
	Interpreting Texts: Listening			Interpreting Texts: Reading			IT: Language/ Vocabulary			IT: Texts: Context/ Structure			Constructing Texts			CT: Language: Grammar & Conventions			CT: Texts: Context/ Structure			CT: Research & Analysis		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade	25%	61%	14%	8%	77%	15%	7%	76%	7%	20%	60%	19%	9%	79%	12%	14%	69%	17%	21%	63%	15%	14%	73%	14%
4 th Grade	25%	58%	17%	12%	75%	14%	17%	68%	16%	22%	60%	18%	13%	74%	13%	22%	63%	17%	14%	63%	22%	21%	68%	11%
5 th Grade	30%	51%	19%	15%	69%	16%	17%	62%	22%	19%	61%	21%	17%	67%	16%	26%	56%	18%	18%	63%	19%	22%	59%	20%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups) Data is pending	For Grade level (All Students): Based on the ELL: EIP: SWD: GIFTED:	For Grade level (All Students): ELL EIP: SWD: GIFTED:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): K – 2 Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 35% (79 of 225 students) performed in the Prepared levels. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 45% of 1st-grade students performed in the prepared category on Foundations. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 55% of 2 nd Grade students performed in the prepared category in Interpreting Texts 3 – 5 Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 3 rd grade reduced the number of students in the support needed category by 50%. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, the 3 rd grade's greatest area of strength was Interpreting Text: Context and Structure. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment for 4th grade, two-thirds of students who were in the support-needed category in the Fall moved to the near-target category, in all areas assessed.	Grade Levels (all students): K – 2 Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 65% of students in grades 1 & 2 performed in the Near Target and Support Needed categories. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 15% of 1 st Grade students performed at a prepared level in Constructing Text. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 34% of 2 nd Grade students performed at a prepared level in Constructing Text. 3 – 5 Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 7% of 3 rd Grade students performed at a prepared level in Interpreting Texts: Language/Vocabulary. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 13% (18 of 141 students) of grade 4 students performed at the overall prepared level. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 13% (18 of 138 students) of grade 5 students performed at the overall prepared level. ELL: Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 18% (7 of 39) of students in grades 1 & 2 scored at prepared levels.

	Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, more than half of the 5th-grade students moved from support needed to near target. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, more than 20% of students who were in the support-needed category in the fall moved to the Near target category by the Spring administration. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, students performed best in Constructing Text: Context/Structure at 22% proficiency. EIP (Receiving additional support from tutors): Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 69% (11 of 16 1st-grade students) moved from the Support Needed to Near Target category. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 18% (3 of 17 2nd-grade students) who worked with tutors scored in the prepared category. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 91% (10 of 11 3rd-grade students) moved from the Support Needed to Near Target category. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 80% (16 of 20 4th-grade students) moved from the Support Needed to Near Target category. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 50% (10 of 20 5th-grade students) moved from the Support Needed to Near Target category. GIFTED: Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 67% (39 of 58 1st–5th-grade students) performed in the prepared category. Specifically in language/vocabulary and IT: Context Structure.	Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 7% (7 of 104) of students in grades 3, 4 & 5 scored at prepared levels. EIP: Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 16% (9 of 55 students) of students in grades K – 5 performed at prepared levels. SWD: Based on Spring Beacon assessment, 8% (6 of 74 students) of students in grades 1 – 5 performed at prepared levels. GIFTED: Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 33% (19 of 58 Gifted students in grades 1-5) performed in the Near Target category. Specifically in Constructing Text.
--	---	--

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Limited use of Inspire instruction and assessment resources, which align with the rigor of the grade-level standards for literacy or informational text. - In the primary grades, the development of foundational skills has been greatly emphasized, resulting in limited development and monitoring of the application of foundational skills in building reading comprehension. - Tier 2 explicit vocabulary instruction is limited to K – 5 - Word walls were not effectively posted and used to support the acquisition of new vocabulary.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	For Grade level (All Students): Based on 3rd-grade Access scores, 73% (16 of 22 students) scored 4.3 or higher in Listening Comprehension. Based on 4th-grade Access scores, 93% (27 of 29 students) scored 4.3 or higher in Listening Comprehension. Based on 4th-grade Access scores, 83% (24 of 29 students) scored 4.3 or higher in Comprehension. Based on 5th Grade Access scores, 79% (19 of 24 students) scored 4.3 or more in Listening Comprehension.	For Grade level (All Students): Based on Kindergarten Access scores, 6% (1 of 18 students) performed at a proficient level in Writing and Literacy. Based on 1st Grade Access scores, 0% of students performed at a proficient level in Speaking, Reading, Writing, and Literacy. Based on 2nd Grade Access scores, 0% of students performed at a proficient level in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Language. Based on 3rd Grade Access scores, 0% of students performed proficiently in speaking. Based on 4th Grade Access scores, 10% (3 of 29 students) performed proficiently in Writing. Based on 5th Grade Access scores, 4% (1 of 24 students) performed proficiently in Speaking and Writing.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Limited instructional scaffolds for ELL students (visuals, modeling, sentence frames) - Instruction focused on grade-level content without explicit language objectives based on their WIDA scores - Assessments with complex language demands that obscure student understanding - Limited teacher training on ESOL strategies and second-language acquisition - Language barriers that reduce student participation and confidence - Limited family engagement due to language barriers or unfamiliarity with the school system	

ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	For Grade level (All Students): K – 2 Based on Kindergarten baseline data updated in the Spring, 63% (93 of 102 students assessed) performed at a proficient level. Students in 1st grade scored an average of 79% on the r-controlled (ar/or/ore) reading and spelling assessment. 3 – 5 In 3rd grade, 67% of students performed at or above grade level in reading comprehension (Author’s claim, Main Idea, and using text evidence) ELL: 83% of ESOL students performed at or above grade level in reading comprehension in the areas of Author’s Claim, Main Idea, and Using Text Evidence. EIP (Receiving additional support from tutors): 43% of EIP students performed at or above grade level reading comprehension in the areas of Author’s Claim, Main Idea, and Using Text Evidence. SWD: Based on literacy common assessment data, 83% (5 of 6 students) of students performed at proficient levels. GIFTED: 80% of 3rd grade gifted students performed above grade level in reading comprehension in the areas of Cause & Effect and Compare & Contrast.	For Grade level (All Students): K – 2 Based on literacy common assessment data, 37% (of 102 students) faced challenges with reading high-frequency words. In 1st grade, ending blends remain a point of weakness for students, with a grade-level average of 67%. 3 -5 In 3rd grade, 73% of students performed below grade level in reading comprehension in the areas of Cause & Effect and Compare & Contrast. ELL: EIP (Receiving additional support from tutors): 85% of 3rd-grade students performed below grade level in reading comprehension in the areas of Cause & Effect and Compare and Contrast. SWD: Based on kindergarten literacy common assessment data, 17% (1 of 6 students) performed at beginning and developing levels. Based on 1st grade phonics data, 35% of SWD students are proficient on ending-blend assessments. GIFTED: 20% of 3rd grade gifted students performed below grade level in reading comprehension in the areas of Cause & Effect and Compare & Contrast.
--	--	---

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Tier 2 explicit vocabulary instruction is limited in grades K -5 • Inconsistent levels of teacher proficiency in teaching foundational (phonics) instruction (grades 1 – 5) • Inconsistent knowledge of strategies to effectively address the language needs of EL students. • Inconsistent grasp of strategies to effectively address the processing deficits of SWD students.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	• During walkthroughs, 100% of K-2 observed teachers used UFLI as their instructional resource. • During walkthroughs, 89% of observed classrooms delivered targeted, differentiated instruction to a group of 3 – 6 students. • During walkthroughs, 100% of observed classrooms modeled the targeted skill or strategy in a small group.	• During walkthroughs, 50% of observed teachers provided explicit language, vocabulary, and grammar instruction • During walkthroughs, only 9% of observed teachers used decodable texts. • During teacher-led small group instruction, 89% of classrooms observed, teachers did not collect data (use a checklist, take anecdotal notes) to inform their instruction. • During small group instruction of writing connected to text, 67% of observers were unable to observe the teacher model genre-specific writing
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Monitoring writing connected to text proved to be a challenge because of the way it was embedded in the literacy instructional resources • Classroom schedule changes without notification to leadership didn't create an opportunity to observe what was expected to be observed consistently. • Limited strategies explicitly for teaching language, grammar, and vocabulary acquisition.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	By May 2027, 85% of kindergarten students will be performing at demonstrating and exceeding levels on GKIDS in phoneme-grapheme correspondence, decoding with phonics, and motor skills with letter/word formation. Increase the number of students performing at PREPARED levels on the Beacon from Grade 1: 37% (43 of 116 students) to 40% Grade 2: 54% (59 of 109 students) to 57% Of students assessed in March 2027. Increase the number of students performing at PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED levels on the EOG from Grade 3: ____ (of ____ students) to ____ % Grade 4: ____ (of ____ students) to ____ % Grade 5: ____ (of ____ students) to ____ % Of students assessed in May 2027.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Limited differentiated instruction and scaffolding for diverse learning needs. • Instruction is misaligned with the expected rigor of the standard. • Irregular monitoring of reading proficiency using comprehension assessments • Limited vocabulary acquisition to support complex text.		
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 October 2026, 100% of K-5 teachers will consistently document structured ELA/Reading small-group plans that incorporate specific differentiated strategies and scaffolding tailored to student needs. Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: ELA teachers will review 25 – 26 Milestones and Spring Beacon data along with SIP and action steps, to plan instruction for identified areas of improvement. Teachers will review SY27 student IEPs and select grade-level ELLevation strategies to implement during the first semester.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, at least 70% of students in each grade level will score 80% or higher on assessed standards in formative and summative assessments. By May 2027, at least 70% of students with IEPs and EL needs at each grade level will score 60% or higher on grade-level standards on formative and summative assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): • Instructional Focus Walks • Formative and Summative Assessments • Lesson/Unit Plans	CTLS Assess CCSD Teaching and Learning Framework GaDOE DRC Beacon Title 1 Coach District Personnel
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. K-5 Teachers will implement flexible, data-driven ELA/Reading small-group instruction at least 2-3 times per week.	• August-September: Provide professional development on differentiated instruction and scaffolding techniques while facilitating weekly collaborative planning sessions for teachers to begin incorporating these strategies into their lesson plans. Start reviewing lesson plans for evidence of differentiation and scaffolding, offering timely feedback, and conduct initial classroom walkthroughs to observe implementation and provide coaching. • October-December: Continue supporting teachers through collaborative planning and targeted coaching, increase the frequency of lesson plan reviews to monitor progress toward performance targets, and use data from walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews to identify and address challenges. • January-February: Teachers will participate in mid-year reflection CCCs to share successes and refine strategies, as well as attend refresher training. Additional support will be provided based on the teachers' needs, and regular walkthrough and lesson plan monitoring will continue. Teachers will participate in PL sessions to brainstorm instructional adjustments to ensure tasks meet the required rigor. • March-April: Deeper analysis of lesson plans and classroom practices will be conducted to ensure consistency. Peer collaboration sessions will be held to share best practices and successful differentiation techniques. • May: Finalize data collection and prepare summary reports on implementation fidelity, recognize teachers demonstrating exemplary use of differentiated strategies and scaffolding, and gather teacher feedback to inform planning for the following year. Artifacts to be Collected: • PL attendance records and materials	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Create a detailed assessment calendar and provide a data analysis template to support planning for interventions or enrichment. Review student data during CCC meetings to guide small-group instruction and make informed adjustments to whole-group teaching as needed. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/Teacher Leaders ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

	• Reviewed lesson plans with feedback documentation. • Classroom walk-through observation notes. • Meeting agendas and minutes from collaborative planning and reflection sessions. • Samples of student work demonstrate differentiated and scaffolding learning. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/Teacher Leaders Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly monitoring during: August – September Bi-Weekly monitoring during October – December and Monthly monitoring from January through May		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Instruction is misaligned with the expected rigor of the standard. • Irregular monitoring of reading proficiency using comprehension assessments • Limited explicit instruction on the acquisition and application of Tier 2 and 3 vocabularies.		
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 October 2026, 100% of K–5 ELA teachers will provide explicit daily vocabulary instruction embedded in core content. Vocabulary instruction will focus on Tier 2 (academic vocabulary) and Tier 3 (content-specific vocabulary) using research-based strategies. Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: Establish common vocabulary routines, word wall expectations, notebooks, Frayer models, and digital tools. • August-September: Administer core phonics survey. Lesson plans will reflect explicit vocabulary instruction planning. Walkthroughs will be conducted to support classroom instruction. • October-April: Vocabulary instruction is aligned across grade-level or content areas, and instruction includes student practice and application. Differentiated vocabulary supports (EL, SWD, and intervention blocks are provided, teachers use data to refine instructional strategies. Vocabulary instruction will be embedded into daily lessons. Teachers model and engage in higher-level academic discourse Artifacts to be Collected: Walkthrough data CCC documentation Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, at least 80% of students will demonstrate increased proficiency in student vocabulary assessment scores from baseline to the end of the year. Evaluation Tool(s): • Instructional Focus Walks • Student work samples/notebooks • Formative and summative vocabulary assessments Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Develop an assessment calendar with specific dates. Establish a grade-level CCC schedule and provide a standardized template for analyzing assessment data and planning interventions or enrichment activities. Review student performance data during CCC meetings to inform small-group instruction and make necessary adjustments to whole-group teaching strategies. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals	
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. K- 5 Teachers will implement explicit daily vocabulary instruction across all content areas to improve academic language and comprehension.			

	☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/Teacher Leaders Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly walkthrough and Quarterly check-in during collaboration days to determine effectiveness of small group instruction.	☒ Academic Coaches/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	58%	48%	53%
4 th Grade	38%	42%	40%
5 th Grade	54%	35%	44%

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 (Winter Administration)	27%	39%	34%	35%	49%	15%	43%	38%	19%	34%	49%	17%
1st Grade	21%	45%	34%	22%	39%	39%	7%	45%	48%	18%	44%	38%
2nd Grade	18%	47%	35%	28%	42%	30%	36%	28%	36%	10%	29%	61%
3rd Grade	6%	90%	4%	9%	83%	8%	11%	85%	5%	17%	76%	7%
4th Grade	32%	66%	2%	32%	63%	5%	29%	68%	2%	42%	51%	7%
5th Grade	46%	49%	6%	48%	47%	5%	36%	58%	7%	51%	40%	9%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade level (All Students): 3 – 5 Based on the EOG, 53% (57 of 108 students) of 3rd grade students scored Proficient and Distinguished overall. This exceeds our SIP goal for SY26. Based on the EOG, 44% (48 of 108 students) of 3rd grade scored Proficient or Distinguished in Numerical Reasoning: representing fractions.	For Grade level (All Students): 3 – 5 Based on the EOG, 25% (27 of 108 students) of 3rd grade scored Proficient and Distinguished in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning: Attributes of polygons. Based on the EOG, 40% (53 of 133 students) of 4th grade students scored in the Proficient and Distinguished range.

	ELL: Based on the EOG, 58% (11 of 19) of ELL students in 3rd grade scored in the proficient and distinguished category. GIFTED: Based on the EOG, 100% (15 of 15 gifted students) in grade 3 performed in proficient and distinguished categories. Based on the EOG, 85% (11 of 13 gifted students) in grade 4 performed in proficient and distinguished categories.	Based on the EOG, 20% (26 of 133 students) of 4th grade scored Proficient and Distinguished in Numerical Reasoning: Connection between decimals and fractions. Based on the EOG, 42% (47 of 135 students) of 5th grade scored Proficient and Distinguished. Based on the EOG, 22% (30 of 153 students) of 5th grade scored Proficient and Distinguished in Measurement Conversions & Data Displays. ELL: Based on the EOG, 42% (8 of 19 students in 3rd grade scored at beginning and developing levels. EIP: Based on the EOG, 92% (36 of 39 students scored in the beginning and developing levels. SWD: Based on the EOG, 83% (10 of 12 students) scored in the beginning and developing levels.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	For Grade level (All Students): K – 2 Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 35% of kindergarten students performed in the prepared category. This is the only time Kindergarten students are given this assessment all year. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 48% of 1st-grade students performed in the prepared category in Measurement and Data Reasoning. Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 61% of 2nd-grade students performed in the prepared category in Geometric & Spatial Reasoning.	For Grade level (All Students): K – 2 Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 84% of kindergarten students performed in the Near target and Support needed categories for Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning. This represents (80 of 95 students that were assessed). 3 – 5 Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, students in grades 3 – 5 less than 10% of students performed at the prepared levels in all domains (Numerical Reasoning, Patterning &

		Algebraic Reasoning, Measurement & Data Reasoning, and Geometric & Spatial Reasoning) ELL: Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 6% (9 of 143 ELL students in grades 1-5) performed in the prepared category. EIP: Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 5% (10 of 222 students) performed at the prepared level. SWD: Based on the Spring Beacon assessment, 5% (4 of 74 students) in grades 1 -5 performed at the prepared level. GIFTED: 41% (24 of 58 1st – 5th Grade students) performed prepared on the Beacon
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	• Limited integration of language supports in math instruction • Limited access to differentiated instruction, scaffolded supports, and inclusive mathematical discourse opportunities • Inconsistent acceleration or complex problem-solving opportunities	
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Based on Kindergarten common assessment trends, students demonstrated strengths in geometric and spatial reasoning, numbers and operations, measurement, and data. Based on 1st Grade common assessment trends, on average, 78% of students performed proficiently on the patterning assessment. Based on 2nd Grade common assessment trends, students demonstrated strengths in identifying and classifying shapes, partitioning shapes into equal parts, and solving word problems within 20.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Based on kindergarten common assessment trends, students demonstrate challenges in patterning and algebraic reasoning. Based on 1st grade common assessment trends, students' performance on the Unit 2 post-assessment was 56% proficient overall. This assessment focused on addition and subtraction within 20. Based on 2nd grade common assessment trends, students demonstrate challenges with solving word problems, particularly in reading and comprehending mathematical vocabulary.

	Based on 3 rd grade common assessment trends, 52% of students performed at or above grade level in the following areas: Telling time,	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Limited knowledge of implementing inquiry-based math instruction • Limited planned opportunities to engage students in discourse • Limited comprehension and application of mathematical vocabulary.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	• 100% of classrooms observed delivered targeted, differentiated instruction of 3 – 6 students.	• Spiral review support was observed in 0% of the time observed in observed classrooms. • 50% of observed classrooms provided inquiry-based math instruction with visuals and the use of manipulatives. • 50% of observed classrooms engaged in student discourse
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Inconsistent use of spiral review practices • Limited knowledge of implementing inquiry-based math instruction • Limited planned opportunities to engage in student discourse	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
	Root Cause Explanation:	

**Check the system that
contributes to the root cause:**

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

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	Increase the number of Kindergarten students performing at the demonstrating and exceeding levels in counting by 1s and 10s forward to 100 and backward by 1s. Increase the number of students performing at PREPARED levels on the Beacon from Grade 1: 33% (38 of 116 students) Grade 2: 38% (41 of 109 students) assessed in March 2026 to 40% in March 2027. Increase the number of students performing at PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED levels on the EOG Grade 3: 53% (57 of 107 students) to 55% Grade 4: 40% (53 of 133 students) to 43% Grade 5: 42% (57 of 136 students) to 45% of students assessed in May 2027.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Limited differentiated instruction and scaffolding for diverse learning needs. - Instruction is misaligned with the expected rigor of the standard. - Irregular monitoring of math proficiency using assessments that match the rigor of the standard. - Limited explicit instruction on the acquisition and application of tier 3 (content-specific) 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	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, 100% of K-5 classroom teachers will implement flexible, structured math small-group instruction with fidelity as documented through walkthroughs and lesson plans. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Math teachers will review 25 – 26 Milestones and Spring Beacon data along with SIP and action steps, to plan instruction for identified areas of improvement.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, at least 70% of students in each grade level will score 80% or higher on assessed standards in formative and summative assessments. By May 2027, at least 70% of students with IEPs and EL needs at each grade level will score 60% or higher on grade-level standards on formative and summative assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): - Instructional Focus Walks - Formative and Summative Assessments	CTLS Assess CCSD Teaching and Learning Framework GaDOE DRC Beacon Title 1 Coach District Personnel
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. K – 5 Teachers implement flexible, data-driven Math small group instruction 2 – 3 times per week.	Teachers will review SY27 student IEPs and select grade-level ELlevation strategies to implement during the first semester. • August-September: Provide professional development on differentiated instruction and scaffolding techniques while facilitating weekly collaborative planning sessions for teachers to begin incorporating these strategies into their lesson plans. Start reviewing lesson plans for evidence of differentiation and scaffolding, offering timely feedback, and conduct initial classroom walkthroughs to observe implementation and provide coaching. • October-December: Continue supporting teachers through collaborative planning and targeted coaching, increase the frequency of lesson plan reviews to monitor progress toward performance targets, and use data from walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews to identify and address challenges. • January-February: Teachers will participate in mid-year reflection CCCs to share successes and refine strategies, as well as attend refresher training. Additional support will be provided based on the teacher’s needs, and regular walkthrough and lesson plan monitoring will continue. Teachers will participate in PL sessions to brainstorm instructional adjustments to ensure tasks meet the required rigor. • March-April: Deeper analysis of lesson plans and classroom practices will be conducted to ensure consistency. Peer collaboration sessions will be held to share best practices and successful differentiation techniques. • May: Finalize data collection and prepare summary reports on implementation fidelity, recognize teachers demonstrating exemplary use of differentiated strategies and scaffolding, and gather	• Lesson/Unit Plans Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Create a detailed assessment calendar and provide a data-analysis template to support planning for interventions or enrichment. Review student data during CCC meetings to guide small-group instruction and make informed adjustments to whole-group teaching as needed. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/Teacher Leaders ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	---	--

	teacher feedback to inform planning for the following year. Artifacts to be Collected: • PL attendance records and materials • Reviewed lesson plans with feedback documentation.		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Limited differentiated instruction and scaffolding for diverse learning needs. - Instruction is misaligned with the expected rigor of the standard. - Irregular monitoring of math proficiency using assessments that match the rigor of the standard. - Limited explicit instruction on the acquisition and application of tier 3 (content-specific) 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	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, 100% of K-5 grade-level teams will implement math CCCs by analyzing formative assessments, progress monitoring data, connecting data trends to inform instructional planning, and supporting teams in identifying targeted strategies and next instructional steps. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Teachers will be introduced to the CCC format expectations to ensure a successful process within their grade-level CCCs. Clear expectations will be communicated through a detailed timeline and monitoring checklist. - August-September: Grade-level teams analyze formative assessment and progress-monitoring data. Identify baseline trend and priority needs. - October- April: Math CCCs will use analyzed data to reflect clear learning progress, support instructional planning, and develop formative assessments. Implement instructional adjustments based on progress monitoring. Evaluation of CCC effectiveness and instructional impact. Artifacts to be Collected:	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, at least 70% of students in each grade level will score 80% or higher on assessed standards in formative and summative assessments. By May 2027, at least 70% of students with IEPs and EL needs at each grade level will score 60% or higher on grade-level standards on formative and summative assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): - Formative and Summative Assessments - CCC Meeting Notes Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Review student data during CCC meetings to guide small-group instruction and make informed adjustments to whole-group and small-group teaching as needed.	CTLS Assess CCSD Teaching and Learning Framework GaDOE DRC Beacon Title 1 Coach District Personnel
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. K – 5 Teachers will implement weekly math CCCs to improve the use of data-driven decision-making			

	- Revised CCC documentation: Principals Monitoring Checklist (Local School form) - Lesson plans Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/Teacher Leaders Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/Teachers Leaders ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

Science – Improvement Plan

Goal #3: Science

By May 2027, we will increase the number of students performing at proficient levels on grade-level Science Interim assessments.

Grade 1: 67% to 70%
Grade 2: 70% to 73%
Grade 3: 68% to 70%
Grade 4: 67% to 70%
Grade 5: 73% to 75%

CLARKDALE ELEMENTARY SCIENCE INTERIM DATA COMPARISON (25-26 VS 26-27)									
Unit	5th		4th		3rd		2nd		1st
	25-26	26-27	25-26	26-27	25-26	26-27	25-27	26-27	26-27
1	Geodesic/Destructive Forces		Seasons		Rock & Minerals		Properties of Matter (Solid & Liquid)		Adaptation & Survival
	71%		65%		71%		66%		54%
2	Classification of Organisms		States, Mass, & Phase Is		Soils		Properties of Matter		Properties of Matter
	68%		65%		70%		69%		70%
3	Interrelated Traits & Learned Behaviors		Ecosystems		Weathering & Erosion		States		Light
	68%		67%		75%		70%		60%
4	Cells & Microorganisms		Under Geologic		Fossils		Seasons, Shadown, & Day/Night		Sound
	78%		64%		76%		68%		67%
5	Physical/Chemical Changes		Weather		Classification of Organisms		Environmental Changes		Animals
	75%		65%		46%		77%		70%
6	Geodesic/Destructive Forces		Light		Conservation/Recycling		Life Cycles		Plants
	76%		67%		79%		77%		81%
7			Sound		Health				
			68%		63%				
8			Force & Motion						
			74%						

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:

- Inconsistent science instruction across classrooms
- Limited hands-on inquiry

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	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, 100% of grade 1 -5 classroom teachers will implement structured Science instruction with fidelity as documented through walkthroughs and lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, at least 70% of students in grade levels 1 -5 will score 70% or higher on assessed standards in summative assessments.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: Teachers will be presented with SY27 Science instructional expectations. • August-September: Provide professional learning on implementing STEAM instructional practices, including the CER (claim, evidence, reasoning) strategy.	Evaluation Tool(s): • Interim assessments • Lesson Plans	
☒ 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>	October-May: Monitor Science instructional plans and provide support to teachers as needed.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ __quarterly__	
1. Teachers in grades 1 – 5 will implement weekly standards-aligned science instruction.	Artifacts to be Collected: - Walkthrough data - Lesson plan Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/Teacher Leaders Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Data Analysis Plan: Develop an assessment calendar with specific dates to administer the interim assessments. Establish a grade-level CCC schedule and provide a standardized template for analyzing assessment data and planning interventions or enrichment activities. Review student performance data during CCC meetings. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/Teachers Leaders ☒ 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, descriptions of the curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, the professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement, including the use of the family resource center.	September 9, 2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026) Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	October 13 – 16, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	April 1, 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 parents' contributions, including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between parents and the school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	September 8, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5
	February 2, 2026		☒ 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: - KinderCamp Parent Meeting: July 23, 2027, 11:00 – 12:00 - Rising 6th Grade Parent Meeting: March 2027	Kindergarten Parent Meeting – July 23, 2026 Rising 6th Grade Parent Meeting – March 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: Parent Policy School Compact Survey		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

Academic-Related 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 – Held at Clarkdale Elementary This is an academic-related, school-developed parent meeting/activity that gives families a clear picture of what their child will be learning during the school year. The focus will be on academic content, grade-level expectations, and the role families play in reinforcing learning at home.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office supplies (paper, folders, pencils, clipboards)	Title 1 Partners In Education	September 15, 2026	*Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Academic Coach(s) Parent Facilitator Academic Committee
Literacy Night – Will be held at the Austell Threadmill Library. During this event, families will meet at the library and participate in this school-hosted event designed to bring families and students together to celebrate reading and learning while building skills that support literacy at home.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office supplies (paper, folders, pencils, clipboards)	Title 1 Partners In Education Literacy Dept.	October 6, 2026	Literacy Night will be monitored using sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Academic Coach(s) Parent Facilitator Academic Committee
Math Night – Will be held at the Publix Supermarket on Macland Rd. We will have a standards-based activity for each family to complete, aligned with each student participant's grade level. Teachers will attend and facilitate learning.	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office supplies (paper, folders, pencils, clipboards)	Title 1 Partners In Education Math Dept.	TBD	Math Night will be monitored using sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Academic Coach(s) Parent Facilitator Academic Committee
STEAM Night – Families come to the school for a night of engagement and fun. Each letter in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Math) is represented through hands-on learning activities.	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office supplies (paper, folders, pencils, clipboards)	Title 1 Partners in Education CCSD STEM/	May 11, 2027	STEAM Night will be monitored through attendance sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Academic Coach(s) Parent Facilitator STEAM Committee

				STEAM Innovation Dept.			
				Science Dept.			
Family Data Night – Gives families the context they need to understand their child’s academic performance and become active partners in supporting growth. The goal is not simply to share numbers. It is to help families move from receiving data to understanding what it means and knowing what to do next. K – 2 (Beacon) 3 – 5 (Beacon/EOG)	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Office supplies (paper, folders, pencils, clipboards)	Title 1 Partners in Education	January 12, 2027	Family Data Night will be monitored through attendance sign-in sheets. We will evaluate the effectiveness through family surveys. *Surveys *Sign-in sheets	Academic Coach(s) Parent Facilitator Academic Committee

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 is 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 parents' 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 the 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 remain 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 posts 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:** Clarkdale Elementary School effectively integrates community financial support and federal, state, and local funds in several ways.
- Title II provides professional learning support to our teachers. The resources provide educators with tools to learn and implement current, evidence-based practices.
 - Title III funds support language proficiency through resources, including teacher and student materials, digital learning programs, and professional learning for Teachers of English Language Learners. It also provides resources and substitute teachers, enabling educators to engage in job-embedded professional learning to acquire Arts Integration and STEAM strategies and deepen student learning.
 - CCSD supports Clarkdale's plan to utilize extended day funds to provide specific interventions (i.e., after-school tutoring) for students striving to meet and exceed state standards.
 - The Office of Student Assistance supports the school's implementation of the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support Program (PBS).
 - Partners in Education provide resources (human and financial) to support family engagement, student encouragement, and literacy and math initiatives.
 - Title 1 supports Clarkdale's participation in the following CCSD initiatives: Effective Implementation of the 120-minute literacy block, teacher participation in the 2-year literacy training: Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS), and I-Ready, a digital literacy resource.
- These programs collaborate to address the needs of students and families identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CAN) and through our parent and family surveys.

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 a 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, and Fall and Spring input meeting agendas and sign-in sheets that provide 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: Teachers actively participate in Collaborative Teams (CTs) every week to regularly monitor student progress toward meeting state standards. In addition to this ongoing collaboration, the school conducts quarterly data analyses to examine key indicators, including Beacon results, common formative assessments, and i-Ready data, to monitor student progress.

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. *SWP Checklist 3(b)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The school utilizes the GaDOE CCRPI indicators (Content Mastery, Progress, and Closing the Gap) measurable tools to monitor academic progress. These metrics enable us to establish performance targets for the upcoming year. Additionally, EOG scores and domain data, ACCESS scores, and performance on common formative and summative assessments provide valuable information for Collaborative Teams (CTs) to identify and address students' content-specific needs.

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: Each year, the Title I Supervisor conducts a mid-year monitoring meeting to review the progress of implementation and monitoring plans. At the school level, Collaborative Teams (CTs) meet regularly to assess student progress, discuss instructional strategies, and determine appropriate next steps. Weekly meetings between the Administrative Team and the Academic Coach will support ongoing monitoring and alignment. As we implement each action step, we will evaluate its effectiveness and make adjustments as needed to ensure continued progress.

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's 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's student groups page, which identifies 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's 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: We serve our students through the Cobb System of Support (CSOS) Framework. Our goal is to provide students with the instruction and guidance they need when they need it. Teachers analyze student data to determine the intensity and intentionality of support through three tiers. Tier instruction and support are provided to all students every day. The approach and resources align with our curricula, and evidence-based practices and strategies have proven effective for most students.

Tier I: examples include the K-5 Uninterrupted Literacy Block, Georgia K-5 Mathematics Learning Plans, and Clarkdale's PBIS Matrix- Respectful, Responsible Role Models.

Tier 2: instruction and support provide explicit, teacher-led, small-group intervention. Teachers administer the intervention with fidelity and regularly implement progress monitoring to track student progress over a specified time. Teachers and our CSOS Specialist contact families to share data, the intervention plan, and student progress through the Tier 2 Framework. Tier 2 examples include Small-group instruction during teacher-led interventions, Tutor-led small groups, Interventionist-led learning, ESOL teacher-led interventions, DreamBox, i-Ready, or Check-in-Check-out (CICO).

Tier 3: instruction and support is an intensive version of the Tier 2 intervention. The intensity may come from more frequent sessions, smaller group sizes, or individual support. The teacher conducts more frequent progress monitoring to measure growth and, if needed, adjusts the intervention. Teachers and our CSOS Specialist meet regularly with families to share data, intervention plans, and student progress for students served through the Tier 3 Framework. Tier 3 examples include tutor-led small-group or individual intervention, or a Function-Based Behavior Support Plan.

For students who continue to perform below grade-level expectations after moving through all tiers of service, our CSOS Specialist collaborates with the Parent/Guardian, Tutors, Teachers, the Student Support Specialist, and the Psychologist to determine the next steps. This committee determines whether the

data suggests that students should undergo professional assessments to determine eligibility for instructional support through an Individualized Education Program (IEP). If the consensus is no to a request for diagnostic testing, the committee discusses ways to support the student through CSOS. If testing proceeds, the committee reconvenes to review the results and decide the student's next steps. If the data shows the student is eligible for special education services, a new committee is formed under the leadership of the Student Support Specialist Administrator. That committee, which includes the child's Parent/Guardian, will decide the next steps. If they agree that an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) is necessary, they will collaborate to develop it, and a Special Education Teacher will provide instructional support for the student.

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: At Clarkdale Elementary, professional learning is designed to meet the needs of all teachers across grade levels and content areas. With the support of one Academic Coach, along with administrators and teacher leaders, we work collaboratively to plan, deliver, assess, and reflect on high-quality instruction. Our Academic Coach uses teacher feedback and instructional data to guide professional learning topics and provide targeted support. Teachers also have opportunities to attend conferences and workshops aligned to their professional goals, supported through District, Title I, Title II, and local funding. Learning sessions were offered on Digital Learning Days, covering CTLS, ELlevation, Progress Learning, and PBIS. Targeted support was also provided to IRR teachers and to ELA teachers using i-Ready. New teacher support is tailored to individual experience. First-year teachers and teachers new to their role attended monthly professional learning sessions. Schoolwide professional learning topics are identified during the summer leadership retreat through collaboration between administration and the BLT. Clarkdale works closely with District Title I staff to support our school improvement goals, deliver professional learning, model strategies, analyze data, and ensure curriculum, instruction, and assessments are aligned.

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: Clarkdale Elementary School offers KinderCamp in July, the week before teacher pre-planning, to help ease the transition into school for incoming Kindergarten students. This four-day camp offers students a half-day learning experience led by kindergarten teachers, helping rising Kindergarten students to become familiar with the school environment, routines, and learning activities. On the fourth day, families are invited to attend a special presentation showcasing what their children have learned and experienced during the week, helping prepare both students and their families for a successful start to the school year.

5th Grade students attend a field trip to our feeder middle schools (Cooper and Garrett Middle School) and participate in the activities created by the middle school for them. We use CTLSParent to share information about the middle school transition and activities offered during the year to support students and families.

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?
Academic Coach(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	• Align Instruction to SIP Goals Supports teachers in planning and delivering standards-aligned instruction directly connected to School Improvement Plan priorities. • Use Data to Drive Instructional Decisions Analyzes assessment and progress-monitoring data with teachers to identify needs, monitor SIP targets, and adjust instruction. • Build Teacher Capacity Through Coaching Provides coaching cycles, modeling, and feedback focused on high-impact strategies identified in the SIP. • Facilitate Effective CCCs Guides Professional Learning Communities to focus on collaborative planning, data analysis, and accountability tied to SIP goals. • Ensure Fidelity and Continuous Improvement Supports consistent curriculum and intervention implementation while monitoring progress and refining practices based on SIP outcomes.
Parent Facilitator	☒ 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.

School Improvement Goals

Include goals on the parent compacts and policy.

Goal #1	By May 2027, 85% of kindergarten students will be performing at demonstrating and exceeding levels on GKIDS in phoneme-grapheme correspondence, decoding with phonics, and motor skills with letter/word formation. Increase the number of students performing at PREPARED levels on the Beacon from Grade 1: 37% (43 of 116 students) to 40% Grade 2: 54% (59 of 109 students) to 57% Of students assessed in March 2027. Increase the number of students performing at PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED levels on the EOG from Grade 3: ____ (of ____ students) to ____% Grade 4: ____ (of ____ students) to ____% Grade 5: ____ (of ____ students) to ____% Of students assessed in May 2027.
Goal #2	Increase the number of kindergarten students performing at the demonstrating and exceeding levels in counting by 1s and 10s forward to 100 and backward by 1s. Increase the number of students performing at PREPARED levels on the Beacon from Grade 1: 33% (38 of 116 students) Grade 2: 38% (41 of 109 students) assessed in March 2026 to 40% in March 2027. Increase the number of students performing at PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED levels on the EOG Grade 3: 53% (57 of 107 students) to 55% Grade 4: 40% (53 of 133 students) to 43% Grade 5: 42% (57 of 136 students) to 45% of students assessed in May 2027.
Goal #3	By May 2027, we will increase the number of students performing at proficient levels on grade-level Science Interim assessments. Grade 1: 67% to 70% Grade 2: 70% to 73% Grade 3: 68% to 70% Grade 4: 67% to 70% Grade 5: 73% to 75%

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