

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Elementary
Principal Name:	Dr. Jennifer Ridgway
Date Submitted:	June
Revision Date(s):	

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Hollydale Elementary School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Dr. Jennifer Ridgway
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Jennifer.Ridgway@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	678-594-8143
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: The Hollydale leadership team utilized a collaborative and data-driven process to develop the 2026–2027 school improvement plan by actively seeking input from a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, staff, school leaders, paraprofessionals, families, and community members. Feedback and recommendations were gathered through the Principal’s Advisory Committee during the April 24, 2026 meeting, as well as through multiple stakeholder surveys, including the Georgia Student Health Survey, Georgia Personnel Survey, Georgia Department of Education Family Survey, Leader in Me Measurable Results Assessment (MRA), and Cognia surveys completed by staff, students, and families.

In addition, Action Team meetings focused on Reading, Math, and Leadership were utilized to analyze local formative and summative assessment data and identify trends in student performance. Classroom walkthrough data was reviewed alongside assessment results to determine root causes and develop strategic action steps aligned to school goals. Input from parents and staff was also collected through IEP meetings, RTI meetings, Guided Coalition meetings, and ongoing communication with families and employees throughout the school year.

The leadership team further examined multiple sources of schoolwide data, including discipline, attendance, enrollment, ACCESS scores for English Learners, End-of-Grade (EOG) Math data, and Beacon Reading and Math data. Trends related to student mobility, enrollment increases, and changes in the number of homeless students were also reviewed to ensure the plan reflected the evolving needs of the Hollydale student population. This comprehensive process ensured that the school improvement plan was developed with broad stakeholder involvement and grounded in meaningful evidence and data analysis.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are individuals with valuable experiences and perspectives who will provide the team with important input, feedback, and guidance. Stakeholders must be engaged in the process to meet requirements for participating in federal programs. Documentation of stakeholder involvement must be maintained by the school.

Suggested stakeholder participation includes the following roles. **A parent is required.**

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

Required Stakeholders	Suggested Stakeholders
Administrative Team	Parent Facilitators
Content or Grade Level Teachers	Media Specialists
Local School Academic Coaches	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)	Social Workers
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists
MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)	Community Health Care Providers
	Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	Spring Input Mtg w/Stakeholders – 4/2/2026 Principal Advisory Committee Mtgs & PTA April 17 & 24, 2026	Grade Level& Action Team Mtgs: March 25, 2026 April 15 & 23, 2026 May 6, 2026	Leadership Team Mtgs: May 21, 2026 May 27 & May 28, 2026 June 1 & 2, 2026	Admin/Coach Mtgs: March 19, 20 2026 April 8, 16, 2026 May 26, 2026 June 5 & 8, 2026
-----------------------	---	--	--	---

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Jennifer Ridgway	
Assistant Principal	Wendy Astin	
EIP Teacher	Erica Matthews	
EIP Teacher	Livia Reed	
Instructional Support Specialist for ELA	Caryn Adkinson	
Instructional Support Specialist for Math	Afrikka Ellison	
Counselor	Karen Scarver	
Media Specialist	Anne Garrett	
ESOL Teacher	Karen Fincham	
K Teacher	Kim Reid	
1 st Grade Teacher	Melissa Justice	
2 nd Grade Teacher	Tracy Black	
3 rd Grade Teacher	Ciara Harrison	
4 th Grade Teacher	Edgar Rivas	
5 th Grade Teacher	Gerardo Rodriguez	
Special Ed Teacher	Faith Biedermann	
Parent Facilitator	Carmen Rodriguez	
Title I Coach	Dr. Angela Mack	
Title I Supervisor	Delores Thompson	
Parent & PTA	Martha Lozano-Cantu	

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	In the 2025-2026 School Year: 1st Grade: The percentage of 1st Grade students scoring prepared will increase by at least 25% from the baseline in August 2025 to May 2026 as measured by Beacon. 2nd Grade: The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring prepared will increase to 25% from August 2025 to May 2026, as measured by Beacon. 3rd-5th Grade: The percentage of students scoring proficient and distinguished in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade will increase from 25% to 30% as measured by the 2025-2026 EOG ELA Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Beacon Data supports the outcome of this goal for 1st and 2nd grade, but we are still waiting on the Milestone EOG data for 3rd-5th Grades. 1st Grade: The 1st grade goal was met because the number of students scoring Prepared increased from the baseline and showed growth greater than the required 25% increase by Spring 2026, with strong performance across multiple Beacon ELA domains. 2nd Grade: The 2nd grade goal was met because at least 25% of students scored Prepared in several Beacon ELA categories by Spring 2026, demonstrating progress toward grade-level proficiency. 3rd-5th Grades: (Waiting on Milestone EOG Scores)
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	Both 1st and 2nd Grade met their School Improvement Plan (SIP) ELA goals because students demonstrated measurable growth across multiple literacy domains, particularly in foundational reading skills, language development, and comprehension. The data suggests that instruction successfully moved students from the “Support Needed” category into “Near Target” and “Prepared.” In first grade, the largest increase occurred in Foundations, which grew from 2 → 22 Prepared. This indicates students made strong gains in: - Phonics - Decoding - High-frequency word recognition - Early fluency skills Strong foundational literacy instruction likely allowed students to access grade-level texts more successfully throughout the year. Growth was not isolated to one area. Students improved in: - Language: 4 → 12 Prepared

	• Texts Performance: 6 → 11 Prepared • Interpreting Texts: 1 → 10 Prepared • Constructing Texts: 8 → 12 Prepared This suggests: • Balanced literacy instruction was implemented consistently • Students developed both reading comprehension and writing skills • Teachers likely aligned instruction to standards and used targeted interventions The data shows students did not remain stagnant in intervention categories. Instead: • Many students progressed into higher performance levels • The increase in Prepared students across all domains indicates successful differentiation and instructional support This reflects effective: • Small-group instruction • Data-driven interventions • Progress monitoring • Explicit modeling and guided practice The broad improvement across domains suggests teachers effectively implemented: • New curriculum resources • Standards-aligned instruction • Structured literacy practices • Frequent assessment and reteaching The consistency of growth across categories indicates instructional alignment and strong teacher responsiveness to student needs. In second grade, final prepared rate was approximately 26%, exceeding the 25% target. Foundational reading skills showed major improvement: • Foundations: 8 → 25 Prepared This suggests students strengthened: • Decoding • Fluency • Word recognition • Phonics application As foundational skills improved, students were better able to comprehend and analyze texts independently. Students also demonstrated strong growth in: • Language: 8 → 23 Prepared • Texts Performance: 5 → 18 Prepared • Interpreting Texts: 5 → 24 Prepared These increases indicate: • Improved vocabulary and language understanding • Increased ability to comprehend and discuss texts • Stronger analytical thinking and comprehension strategies The large increase from 4 to 21 Prepared students suggests instruction effectively targeted students who were previously below proficiency. Contributing factors include: • Data-driven small groups • Explicit comprehension instruction • Frequent progress monitoring
--	---

	• Differentiated instruction • Increased opportunities for guided reading and discussion
--	---

Previous Year's Goal #2	In the 2025 – 2026 school year, Kindergarten: The percentage of kindergarten students fluently adding and subtracting within 5 (using a variety of strategies) will increase from 0% to 80% as measured by the 2025-2026 GKIDS 2.0 Assessment. 1st Grade: The percentage of students who score <i>prepared</i> on the Beacon will increase from 11% in May 2025 to 30% in May 2026. 2nd Grade: The percentage of students who score <i>prepared</i> on the Beacon will increase from 13% in May 2025 to 20% in May 2026. 3rd Grade: The percentage of students scoring prepared on the Beacon (May 2025) will increase from 11% to 20% achieving <i>distinguished learner</i> and <i>proficient learner</i> on the Milestones in May 2026. 4th Grade: The percentage of students achieving <i>distinguished learner</i> and <i>proficient learner</i> will increase from 35 % in May 2025 to 45% in May 2026 as measured by Milestones. 5th Grade: The percentage of students achieving <i>distinguished learner</i> and <i>proficient learner</i> will increase from 32% in May 2025 to 40% in May 2026 as measured by Milestones.
	Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Kindergarten Sixty-two percent of kindergarten students scored <i>demonstrating</i> or <i>exceeding</i> in “Addition and Subtraction” on the Spring 2026 administration of the GKIDS 2.0 Assessment. 1st Grade Approximately 13% of first grade students scored prepared on the Spring 2026 administration of the Beacon math assessment. 2nd Grade About 10% of second grade students scored prepared on the Spring 2026 administration of the Beacon math assessment. 3rd Grade The percentage of students scoring in the distinguished learner and proficient learner ranges was 27%. The third-grade goal was exceeded. 4th Grade The percentage of student scoring in the distinguished learner and proficient learner ranges is 32% 5th Grade The percentage of students scoring in the distinguished leaning and proficient learner ranges was about 24%

Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The goal was not met for this school year. Many students are demonstrating growth. However, their performance seems to level out just below proficiency. The following strategies could address the areas of need: • Professional learning on how the math skills progress through K-5 • Continuing work to connect representations in math • Consistent math vocabulary instruction • Developing assessments and lessons that reflect the requirements of the standards
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	Third grade teachers consistently used exit tickets to provide feedback and form small groups.

Previous Year's Goal #3	Decrease the number of office referrals due to rough and boisterous behavior and classroom disruptions by 25% during the 2025-2026 school year (from 40 incidents of rough and boisterous behavior to 30 & from 24 classroom disruptions to 18).
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Discipline Referral Data for 2025-2026; GA Health Survey; Leader in Me – MRA

Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The number of classroom disruptions totaled 30 for the year reflecting an increase in classroom disruptions from the year before. Strategies to increase student ownership of their learning including... • Check in/Check out for specific students focused on tracking a goal; celebrating successes for the day • Stamina building per classroom on sustained work and focus • Utilize self-monitoring and reflection tools along with leadership contracts
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	The number of rough and boisterous behavior referrals decreased from 40 to 26 for the 2025-2026 school year which exceeded the goal set for 2025-2026. • Continued consistency in teaching daily Leader in Me lessons & habits. • Positive reinforcement of students utilizing habits to resolve conflicts with one another. • Pilot of check in and check out with focus group of students to set leadership goals and track/celebrate their data. • Use of RTI and IEP meetings to problem solve as well as every other week of CORE team meetings to address student needs.

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

ELA DATA			
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data Waiting on Milestone Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade			
4 th Grade			
5 th Grade			

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	28	22	22	31	29	12	29	32	11	27	35	10	41	33	37
2 nd Grade	26	30	25	29	29	23	30	33	18	27	30	24	31	42	8

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade	20	58	10	14	66	8	12	66	10	33	49	6	23	59	5	23	59	6	23	61	3
4 th Grade	26	47	8	22	51	7	21	52	8	30	43	8	19	55	7	16	52	13	25	54	2
5 th Grade	34	58	22	30	64	21	26	69	18	42	52	20	25	68	19	22	73	19	42	59	13

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups) Waiting on Milestone Data	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3rd Grade: 4th Grade: 5th Grade: EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3rd Grade: 4th Grade: 5th Grade: EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): 1st Grade: - Constructing Texts was the strongest area, with 37 students scoring Prepared, indicating strong growth in writing and response construction skills. - Students also demonstrated strengths in Foundations (22 Prepared) and Language (12 Prepared), showing progress in foundational literacy and language development. - The lower numbers in the Support Needed category for several domains suggest many students moved toward grade-level expectations. 2nd Grade: - Foundations showed the strongest performance, with 25 students scoring Prepared, indicating solid phonics and decoding development. - Students also demonstrated relative strength in Interpreting Texts (24 Prepared) and Language (23 Prepared), suggesting improvement in comprehension and language conventions. - The reduction in students requiring Support Needed in several domains reflects positive overall academic growth. 3rd Grade: - Texts: Context/Structure & Style (Interpreting Texts) was the strongest reporting category, with 20 students scoring Prepared, indicating students are developing the ability to analyze text structure, author's craft, and literary elements.	Grade Levels (all students): 1st Grade: - Texts had only 11 students scoring Prepared, showing students continue to struggle with reading comprehension and understanding complex texts. - Interpreting Texts also remained an area of concern, with only 10 students Prepared and 35 students still Near Target. - High numbers of students in the Near Target category across all domains indicate many students are close to proficiency but still need targeted instructional support 2nd Grade: - Constructing Texts was the weakest area, with only 8 students scoring Prepared and 42 students remaining Near Target. - Texts also remain an area for growth, with only 18 students Prepared. - Large numbers of students in the Near Target category suggest students are not consistently applying reading and writing skills independently. 3rd Grade: - Constructing Texts was the greatest area for growth, with only 5 students scoring Prepared, indicating students continue to need additional support with written responses and communicating their understanding through writing. - Interpreting Texts: Reading also remains an instructional priority, with only 9 students scoring Prepared, suggesting students need continued support

	- Students also demonstrated strengths in Language: Vocabulary (18 Prepared) and Interpreting Texts: Listening (16 Prepared), reflecting growth in academic vocabulary and comprehension through listening. - High numbers of students scoring Near Target across multiple reporting categories—including 218 students in Interpreting Texts: Reading and 183 students in Language: Vocabulary—indicate that many students are approaching grade-level proficiency and are well-positioned for continued growth with targeted instruction. 4th Grade: - Texts: Techniques were the strongest reporting category, with 23 students scoring Prepared, indicating students are developing the ability to analyze author's craft and text techniques. - Students also demonstrated strengths in Texts: Research & Analysis (22 Prepared) and Interpreting Texts: Listening (20 Prepared), reflecting growth in research skills and comprehension through listening. - The high numbers of students scoring Near Target across all reporting categories suggest many students are approaching grade-level expectations and are well-positioned for continued growth through targeted instruction. 5th Grade: - Texts: Context/Structure & Style was the strongest reporting category, with 58 students scoring Prepared, indicating strong performance in analyzing text structure, author's craft, and literary elements. - Students also demonstrated strengths in Texts: Techniques (53 Prepared) and Texts: Context/Structure & Style/Techniques (49 Prepared), reflecting continued growth in literary analysis and interpretation. - Strong numbers of students scoring Prepared across several reporting categories indicate increasing readiness for middle school literacy expectations. EL: English Learners demonstrated strengths in Foundations and Language, reflecting growth in foundational literacy skills, vocabulary development, and increasing access to grade-level instruction through targeted language supports.	with reading comprehension and analysis of complex texts. - The large number of students scoring Near Target across all reporting categories indicates many students are close to meeting grade-level expectations and would benefit from focused Tier I instruction, small-group support, and opportunities to strengthen written and analytical responses. 4th Grade: - Constructing Texts was the greatest area for growth, with only 8 students scoring Prepared, indicating students continue to need support with written responses and communicating their understanding through writing. - Interpreting Texts: Reading also remained an area of concern, with only 11 students scoring Prepared and 180 students scoring Near Target, suggesting many students are close to proficiency but need additional support with reading comprehension. - High numbers of students in the Near Target category across multiple reporting domains indicate many students are approaching proficiency and would benefit from focused Tier I instruction and small-group intervention. 5th Grade: - Constructing Texts was the greatest area for growth, with only 34 students scoring Prepared, indicating students continue to benefit from explicit instruction in written response construction and communicating their understanding through writing. - Language: Grammar Conventions also remained an instructional priority, with 37 students scoring Prepared and 186 students scoring Near Target, suggesting many students are close to meeting grade-level expectations but require continued support with language conventions. - High numbers of students scoring Near Target across all reporting categories indicate many students are approaching proficiency and would benefit from continued targeted instruction and opportunities to apply literacy skills independently. EL: English Learners continue to require additional support in Interpreting Texts and Constructing Texts, particularly when
--	--	---

	SWD: Students with disabilities demonstrated strengths in Foundations and Language, indicating positive growth in foundational reading skills, language development, and access to grade-level literacy instruction through specially designed instruction and targeted interventions.	applying academic language to analyze text, cite evidence, and communicate understanding through written responses. SWD: Students with disabilities continue to need additional support in Interpreting Texts and Constructing Texts, particularly when engaging in higher-order comprehension, making inferences, and producing written responses aligned to grade-level standards.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The root cause analysis of Grades 1–5 ELA data identified Coherent Instruction and Professional Capacity as the primary contributing factors impacting student achievement. Across grade levels, students demonstrated growth in foundational literacy skills and reading comprehension; however, a significant number of students remained in the Near Target category across multiple reporting domains, particularly in Constructing Texts, Interpreting Texts, and grade-level reading comprehension skills. This trend indicates a need for greater instructional alignment and consistency in implementing rigorous grade-level standards, providing explicit instruction in reading comprehension and evidence-based writing, differentiating small-group instruction, and using text-dependent questioning purposefully across classrooms. Additionally, teachers continue to build capacity in implementing new curriculum resources, evolving Georgia ELA standards, and evidence-based literacy practices, including teacher clarity, learning progressions, and high-quality instructional strategies that move students from Near Target to Prepared. Strengthening collaborative Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and consistent instructional practices across grade levels will ensure students experience a coherent literacy progression that prepares them for continued academic success.	
ACCESS Scores	Grade Levels (all students): EL: English Learners demonstrated relative strengths in oral language development, with Listening and Speaking proficiency generally exceeding Reading and Writing proficiency across grade levels. These strengths indicate that students are developing receptive and expressive language skills that support classroom participation and oral comprehension.	Grade Levels (all students): EL: English Learners continue to require targeted support in reading comprehension and written language development. ACCESS results indicate that Literacy (Reading/Writing), particularly Writing, remains the area of greatest need, suggesting the need for continued explicit instruction in academic vocabulary, complex text comprehension, and evidence-based writing aligned to grade-level ELA standards.
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	The root cause analysis for English Learners identified Coherent Instruction and Professional Capacity as the primary contributing factors impacting student achievement. While English Learners demonstrated strengths in oral language development, ACCESS results indicate that reading comprehension and written language proficiency continue to lag behind listening and speaking across grade levels. This suggests a need for greater instructional consistency in integrating explicit academic vocabulary instruction, complex text comprehension strategies, language objectives, and evidence-based writing into daily Tier I instruction. Additionally, teachers continue to build capacity to implement effective instructional practices that intentionally develop all four language domains, while providing appropriate scaffolds to ensure English Learners can successfully access and demonstrate mastery of grade-level ELA standards. Strengthening collaborative planning and the consistent use of language-rich instructional strategies will help accelerate literacy growth and increase the number of English Learners achieving grade-level proficiency.	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing) Waiting for scores to be entered into CTLS from teachers to run data reports	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	- Teachers demonstrated consistent use of the new ELA curriculum resources and grade-level standards during classroom instruction. - Evidence of structured literacy practices and foundational skills instruction was observed, particularly in phonics, vocabulary, and language development. - Many classrooms incorporated small-group instruction and differentiated support to address varying student needs.	- Instructional rigor and consistency varied across classrooms, particularly in opportunities for students to engage with complex grade-level texts independently. - Students often required significant teacher support during comprehension and written response tasks, indicating a need for stronger gradual release practices. - Limited evidence was observed of students consistently citing textual evidence or engaging in higher-order text analysis during reading and writing instruction.

	- Students were actively engaged in collaborative discussions, partner work, and teacher-led questioning aligned to text-based learning tasks. - Classroom environments reflected positive relationships, established routines, and supportive learning conditions that promoted student participation. - Teachers utilized formative assessment practices and data conversations to monitor student progress and adjust instruction.	- Small-group instruction was not always strategically differentiated based on student data and specific skill deficits. - Writing instruction, particularly in constructing extended text-dependent responses, lacked consistency in modeling, scaffolding, and student practice opportunities. - Teachers are still developing confidence and capacity in implementing new standards, pacing expectations, and instructional strategies aligned to rigorous ELA instruction.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The root cause analysis of classroom walkthrough data identified Coherent Instruction and Professional Capacity as the primary contributing factors impacting instructional effectiveness. While walkthrough observations demonstrated strong implementation of grade-level standards, district-adopted instructional resources, and student engagement strategies, evidence of consistent differentiated instruction, data-driven instructional decision-making, explicit academic vocabulary instruction, and opportunities for student discourse varied across classrooms. These findings indicate a need to strengthen instructional consistency through collaborative planning, purposeful use of formative assessment data, and implementation of high-impact instructional practices that promote teacher clarity, student ownership, and rigorous grade-level learning experiences. Continued professional learning, coaching, and Professional Learning Community (PLC) collaboration will support teachers in consistently implementing evidence-based instructional strategies that increase student engagement and achievement across all classrooms.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
GOAL #1: ELA	1st & 2nd Grade: The percentage of students scoring Prepared on the ELA Beacon assessment will increase by at least 10 percentage points from the Fall 2026 baseline to the Spring 2027 administration through rigorous, standards-based instruction, differentiated small-group literacy instruction, and evidence-based reading and writing practices. 3rd -5th Grade: The percentage of students scoring Proficient and Distinguished on the Georgia Milestones ELA Assessment will increase by at least 10 percentage points from the 2025–2026 baseline to the Spring 2027 administration through consistent implementation of grade-level standards, text-dependent instruction, targeted intervention, and strengthened writing and comprehension practices across all classrooms.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Coherent Instruction: Inconsistent implementation of rigorous, standards-based literacy instruction, explicit writing instruction, differentiated small-group instruction, and teacher clarity across classrooms. - Professional Capacity: Teachers continue to build expertise in using formative assessment data, evidence-based literacy practices, and the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle to provide consistent, high-quality Tier I instruction.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: <u>Grant from REAP</u>		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: By May 2027, 90% of classroom walkthroughs will demonstrate: - Clearly posted Learning Targets and Success Criteria - Differentiated small-group instruction - Text-dependent reading and writing - Explicit vocabulary instruction - Use of formative assessment to guide instruction	Evaluation Performance Target: By Spring 2027, the percentage of students scoring Prepared on the Beacon ELA assessment in Grades 1–2 and Proficient/Distinguished in Grades 3–5 will increase by at least 10 percentage points from the Fall 2026 baseline as a result of collaborative planning, standards-based instruction, and data-informed instructional adjustment	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Summer/Preplanning: Introduce schoolwide instructional priorities, teacher clarity, and collaborative planning expectations.	Evaluation Tool(s): Beacon Benchmark Assessments	
☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD		Evaluation Plan:	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Implement Hollydale's evidence-based IMPACT Cycle during weekly collaborative planning by unpacking ELA standards, developing teacher clarity through learning intentions and success criteria, using high-quality instructional materials, analyzing common formative assessment data, adjusting instruction based on student evidence, and engaging students in goal setting to improve literacy achievement.	• Provide professional learning on the IMPACT instructional planning process, learning intentions, success criteria, and data-informed instructional planning. • Grade-level collaborative planning teams complete the IMPACT planning process for ELA Unit 1, including unpacking priority standards, analyzing learning progressions and Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs), developing success criteria, and identifying how the Wonders formative assessments will be used to monitor student learning and inform instruction. August–September: • Implement the collaboratively developed Unit 1 instructional plans and monitor implementation through walkthroughs, coaching, and PLC discussions. • Grade-level teams engage in collaborative planning to complete the IMPACT planning process for ELA Unit 2. • Analyze Wonders formative assessment results, student work, and classroom evidence to identify student misconceptions, adjust small-group instruction, and determine next instructional steps. • Vertical Action Teams share instructional "aha's," discuss student learning trends, and strengthen alignment across grade levels. October–December: • Grade-level teams engage in collaborative planning to complete the IMPACT planning process for ELA Unit 3. • Continue implementation through coaching, walkthroughs, collaborative planning, and analysis of Wonders formative assessment data and student work. • Vertical Action Teams continue discussions focused on instructional practices and progression of student learning. January–February: • Grade-level teams engage in collaborative planning to complete the IMPACT planning process for ELA Units 4 and 5.	Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Both Admin and Academic Coach will lead grade level teams and vertical teams (Action Teams & Guided Coalition) through the data analysis process to celebrate growth and reflect on areas of improvement and/or changes that need to be made after each administration of the Beacon. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	---	--

	- Analyze benchmark assessments, Wonders formative assessments, and student writing to refine instruction, intervention, and small-group support. - Continue coaching cycles and collaborative data analysis to strengthen implementation. March–April: - Grade-level teams engage in collaborative planning to complete the IMPACT planning process for ELA Unit 6. - Use formative assessment data and student work to strengthen student independence, evidence-based responses, and readiness for end-of-year assessments. - Reflect on instructional effectiveness and refine instructional plans based on student evidence. May: - Evaluate implementation using walkthrough data, benchmark assessments, Wonders formative assessment trends, writing samples, and end-of-year assessment results. - Grade-level teams reflect on the year's collaborative planning process, identify successful instructional practices, and revise instructional plans to strengthen implementation for the following school year. Artifacts to be Collected: - Grade-Level Collaborative Planning Agendas and Notes - Completed IMPACT Planning Documents (unit planning guides) which will include unpacked standards, learning progressions, and student success criteria. - Wonders Formative Assessment Data - PLC/Data Meeting Agendas and Data Analysis Notes - Small-Group Instruction Plans and Intervention Documentation - Classroom Walkthrough Observation Forms - Coaching/Feedback Notes - Action Team Agendas and Reflection Notes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:		
--	--	--	--

	☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches & Guided Coalition Frequency of Monitoring: • Weekly informal classroom walkthroughs • Bi-weekly PLC and collaborative planning review • Monthly data meetings and coaching conversations • Quarterly implementation review following each collaborative planning cycle		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Teachers have implemented opinion writing instruction inconsistently across classrooms, resulting in varying levels of instructional clarity and student expectations. • Learning intentions, success criteria, and grade-level writing expectations have not been consistently communicated, limiting students' understanding of what quality opinion writing looks like. • Students need additional opportunities to engage in explicit modeling, guided practice, and timely feedback aligned to grade-level writing standards and rubrics. • Teachers need ongoing collaborative planning and analysis of student writing to strengthen instructional practices and use formative assessment data to adjust 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
	Implementation of Performance Target: By May 2027, 100% of K–5 grade-level teams will administer and analyze monthly opinion writing assessments using the Hollydale grade-level opinion writing rubrics during collaborative data meetings and document instructional adjustments based on student writing data. Additionally, 90% of classrooms will consistently demonstrate implementation of the Hollydale schoolwide opinion writing framework, including clearly communicated learning intentions, success criteria, explicit modeling, use of mentor texts, and standards-based writing instruction, as evidenced through monthly	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, the percentage of students meeting grade-level expectations on the Hollydale Opinion Writing Rubric and scoring Prepared (Grades K–2) or Proficient/Distinguished (Grades 3–5) on Beacon ELA Benchmark Assessments will increase from baseline. Evaluation Tool(s): • Beacon Benchmark Assessments • Georgia Milestones/EOG ELA Assessment Data • Common Formative Assessments in CTLS • Opinion Writing Rubrics in CTLS	Quarterly read aloud books lending themselves to opinion writing.
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. Implement a consistent schoolwide opinion writing framework in grades K–5 by using evidence-based instructional practices, including clearly communicating learning intentions and success criteria, explicitly modeling the writing process, utilizing mentor texts and grade-level writing rubrics, providing regular opportunities for text-dependent opinion writing, and delivering standards-based instruction that enables students to develop, support, and communicate opinions with evidence and reasoning.	classroom walkthroughs and collaborative planning documentation. Implementation Plan: Preplanning/August: • Introduce the schoolwide opinion writing framework and implementation expectations. • Review grade-level opinion writing standards and common opinion writing rubrics. • Develop common learning intentions, success criteria, and instructional expectations for opinion writing. • Establish monthly writing assessment, data collection, and collaborative planning schedules. September: • Launch monthly opinion writing instruction using mentor texts and explicit teacher modeling. • Implement monthly opinion writing assessments using common grade-level rubrics. • Begin teacher/student writing conferences using rubric feedback. • Analyze student writing during monthly CCC & ensure consistency of practice (instruction/assessment) both among grade levels and vertically in Action Team Mtgs. • Determine Tier 2 and 3 instructional needs for support through classroom small groups, EIP, ESOL, and/or Special Education support. October–December: • Continue monthly opinion writing assessments and rubric scoring. • Analyze student writing during monthly PLC/data meetings to identify trends and instructional next steps. • Differentiate writing instruction based on formative assessment data. • Monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs focused on learning intentions, success criteria, and evidence-based writing instruction. January–February: • Review mid-year student writing growth using opinion writing rubrics and Beacon benchmark data.	• Classroom Walkthrough Observation Forms • PLC/Data Meeting Agendas and Notes • Teacher Lesson Plans • Student Conferencing Documentation Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☒ <u>Bi-Quarter</u> Data Analysis Plan: Monthly opinion writing data will be analyzed during collaborative planning and PLC meetings to identify student needs and adjust instruction. School leaders and academic coaches will monitor implementation through monthly walkthroughs and planning documentation to ensure consistent use of the Hollydale opinion writing framework, learning intentions, success criteria, and standards-based instructional practices. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	--	--

	• Refine instruction through collaborative planning, coaching, and analysis of student work. • Continue monthly writing instruction, conferencing, and data analysis. • Monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs focused on learning intentions, success criteria, and evidence-based writing instruction. March–April: • Strengthen students' ability to construct evidence-based written responses across all content areas. • Continue monthly opinion writing assessments and collaborative analysis of student work. • Provide targeted intervention and enrichment based on student writing data. • Monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs focused on learning intentions, success criteria, and evidence-based writing instruction. May: • Analyze end-of-year opinion writing growth using rubric data, Beacon benchmarks, and Georgia Milestones results. • Evaluate implementation fidelity and determine instructional priorities for the following school year. Artifacts to be Collected: • Monthly Opinion Writing Assessments scored using Hollydale Grade-Level Opinion Writing Rubrics in CTLS • Student Writing Samples • Teacher/Student Writing Conference Notes • Monthly Collaborative Planning Agendas and Notes • Monthly PLC/Data Meeting Agendas and Notes • Classroom Walkthrough Observation Forms • Teacher Lesson Plans with Learning Intentions and Success Criteria Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals		
--	---	--	--

	☒ Academic Coaches & ELA Action Teams Frequency of Monitoring: - Monthly Classroom Walkthroughs - Monthly Collaborative Planning Meetings - Monthly PLC/Data Meetings - Monthly Review of Opinion Writing Rubric Data - Beacon Benchmark Analysis (3 times per year)		
--	--	--	--

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	18%	35%	27%
4 th Grade	28%	33%	32%
5 th Grade	39%	20%	24%

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 (Spring Administration)	11	24	21	18	27	11	13	22	21	18	28	10
1 st Grade	19	44	7	17	42	11	9	41	20	18	39	13
2 nd Grade	40	35	6	39	30	12	43	25	13	16	43	22
3 rd Grade	11	74	3	11	72	5	12	74	2	17	71	0
4 th Grade	26	51	1	38	43	1	34	48	0	36	46	0
5 th Grade	68	47	1	66	49	1	61	48	7	73	41	2

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3 rd Grade	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3 rd Grade

	Twenty-seven percent (goal 20%) of students were scored as proficient or distinguished learners. There are relative strengths in computations. About 40% of students were approaching or met the target in multiplication and division. In addition and subtraction, about 35% of students were approaching or met the target. 4th Grade Fourth grade students have a relative strength in angle measurement (about 40%) and area/perimeter (about 35%). 5th Grade About 55% of students were approaching or met the target in multiplication, division, and expressions. About 50% of the students were approaching or met the target in place value/decimals. Overall, there is stronger performance in computation. EL: English Learners demonstrated strengths in Numeric Reasoning, reflecting their ability to apply foundational mathematical concepts while continuing to develop English language proficiency. SWD: Students with Disabilities demonstrated strengths in Numeric Reasoning, indicating that targeted interventions and specially designed instruction are supporting the development of foundational mathematical concepts and computational skills.	A large majority, about 80%, of students were below target in measurement/data, geometry, and place value. 4th Grade About 80% of students were below target in fraction operations. About 70% were below target in numerical reasoning. About 70% of students were below target in data displays. 5th grade Students' lowest performance was in fraction operations, with about 80% of students scoring below target. Measurement/data and geometry also had most students performing below target. Domains that require rich vocabulary learning such as fractions, measurement, and geometry are significant areas of growth. EL: The greatest opportunity for growth remains in Geometric Reasoning and mathematical problem-solving, where students benefit from explicit instruction in academic vocabulary, mathematical discourse, and explaining their reasoning using precise mathematical language. SWD: Students with Disabilities continue to demonstrate the greatest need in Geometric Reasoning and higher-order mathematical reasoning tasks, indicating a need for continued scaffolding, visual representations, and opportunities to apply mathematical concepts in multi-step problem-solving situations.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	Kindergarten During the Spring administration of the Beacon, numerical reasoning had the lowest number of students <i>scoring support needed</i>, 20% (11). 1st Grade Students showed the strongest improvement from fall to spring in measurement and data reasoning. The number of students scoring support needed went from 38 to 9. Highest number of prepared students, 20, is in measurement and data reasoning. 2nd Grade During Spring administration, geometric and spatial reasoning is the domain in which the fewest students scored <i>support needed</i>, 16, and the most students scored <i>prepared</i>, 22. 3rd Grade Numerical reasoning (11) and patterning/algebraic reasoning (11) are the domains in which the fewest students scored support needed. Patterning/algebraic reasoning is the domain in which the highest number of students scored prepared (5) in the Spring.	Kindergarten During the Spring administration of the Beacon, geometry/spatial reasoning and patterning/algebraic reasoning had the highest number of students scoring <i>support needed</i>, 32% (18) in each big idea. 1st Grade Numerical reasoning is the domain with the highest number of students scoring <i>support needed</i>, 19, and the lowest number <i>prepared</i>, 7, in the Spring. 2nd Grade All other domains, measurement/data reasoning (43), numerical reasoning (40), and patterning/algebraic reasoning (39) had a high number of students scoring <i>support needed</i> in the Spring. 3rd Grade Nineteen percent of students who scored <i>need support</i> (17) in geometric/spatial reasoning. This is the domain with the lowest number of students scoring <i>prepared</i> (2).

	4th Grade Numerical reasoning is a relative strength with 26 students scoring <i>support needed</i> in the Spring. 5th Grade Students are moving from <i>support needed</i> to <i>near target</i> in numerical reasoning, from 86 in Fall to 68 in Spring. EL: English Learners demonstrated strengths in Number Relationships (NR), indicating increasing proficiency with foundational number sense, computation, and mathematical procedures. SWD: Students with disabilities demonstrated strengths in Number Relationships (NR) through targeted intervention and scaffolded instruction, reflecting growth in foundational mathematical concepts and computation.	4th Grade All other domains have a high number of student scoring <i>support needed</i>: Patterning/algebraic reasoning 38 Geometric/spatial reasoning 36 Measurement/data reasoning 34 These domains have 0-1 student scoring prepared. 5th Grade Many students continue to score near target or support needed in all domains with measurement being the domain with the most students scoring <i>prepared</i> (7). EL: English Learners continue to require additional support in Measurement & Data Reasoning (MDR) and Geometry & Spatial Reasoning (GSR), particularly when solving multi-step, language-rich problems requiring mathematical reasoning and explanation. SWD: Students with disabilities continue to require additional support in Patterns & Algebraic Reasoning (PAR) and Measurement & Data Reasoning (MDR), particularly when applying mathematical reasoning, solving multi-step problems, and explaining their thinking.
ACCESS	EL: English Learners demonstrated oral language skills that support mathematical discussions, classroom collaboration, and understanding of teacher-directed instruction. These strengths provide a foundation for developing mathematical reasoning through structured academic conversations.	EL: English Learners continue to require support in solving language-intensive mathematical tasks, particularly those involving multi-step word problems, explaining mathematical reasoning, and interpreting academic vocabulary within grade-level mathematical contexts. Continued integration of language support into mathematics instruction will strengthen conceptual understanding and problem-solving performance.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Our goal for the year was to increase the percentage of students scoring “prepared”, “proficient,” and “distinguished” on the Beacon and Milestones assessments. The data show progress in moving from “support needed” to “near target.” However, students are not meeting our goals. Tier 1 instruction is effective in achieving some growth, but most students’ performance remains below proficiency. There are significant gaps in conceptual understanding, though students can perform computations. Tier 1 instruction is not effective in teaching students to reason more deeply about math concepts. Students have proficiency in isolated skills but cannot apply these skills in multi-step and real-world contexts which are necessary to meet the grade level standards. The data suggests that students are entering each grade level without the skills needed for success. Therefore, there is a need for stronger vertical alignment. Students tend to score lower in domains that require mathematical language, which suggests a need for deepening math vocabulary instruction. Students also need more opportunities to reason, solve multi-step problems, and participate in tasks that match the rigor of the Georgia math standards.	

	In summary, the key root causes leading to our school not meeting the goals are: • lack of conceptual understanding, especially in fractions and number sense • Limited opportunities to apply mathematical skills in context • Gaps in vertical alignment • Language and vocabulary barriers • Inconsistent exposure to the rigor of the standards	
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Kindergarten In unit 6, kindergarten students learn about 3D shapes. Students showed significant gains in this unit, going from scoring an average 12% on the pre-test to 84% on the post-test. Students also improved in fluency with addition (from 74% to 84%). Kindergarten students showed growth from pre- to post-tests in every unit, going from an average of 48% to 73%. 1st Grade Student performance on pre- and post-tests improved in the area (from 44% to 70%). Students showed significant growth in numbers and operations (20% to 70%) and word problems (29% to 72%). Students started with strong addition understanding, 73% to 78%. 2nd Grade The average of common formative assessments is 85%. Overall, second grade students are meeting the expectations for proficiency in math. Students are demonstrating fluency in addition, all of the scores are 87 or above. 3rd Grade Common fluency assessments in addition/subtraction and multiplication/division were given. Fluency in addition grew from an average of 60% to 91%. 4th Grade Students are showing improvement from pre- to post-test (34% to 75%). Fourth-grade students scored an average of 79% in geometry, which has typically been a low-performing area at our school. Fourth grade students were proficient in Unit 2, Topic 1, which includes using rules to generate number and shape patterns. 5th Grade Students are growing from pre-to post-test assessments. Students performed best on coordinate planes, 84% EL: Across grade levels, EL students are growing in math skills. SWD: Overall, most SWD students are still growing in math skills with those operations requiring one step still being an area of strength.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Kindergarten Students showed less improvement in subtraction fluency (31% to 64%). 1st Grade The average for post-test, 70%, does not meet the expectations for proficient math performance. Students did not gain subtraction fluency (post 61%) 2nd Grade Students performed lower in subtraction than in addition. They also had more difficulty with word problems (scores from 60% to 79%). 3rd Grade Students have not become fluent in multiplication and division though there has been growth from 27% to 69%. 4th Grade Students have not developed computational fluency (70%). 5th Grade Fractions are an area of growth of fifth grade. The highest score on fraction assessments was 73%. Students also have difficulty understanding numerical expressions with the highest average being 68%. EL: ELL students consistently score lower than general education students on assessments due to the complex language they must read. SWD: Across grade levels, students with disabilities score significantly lower on assessments than their general education peers especially when it comes to problems requiring multi steps.
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Students do not seem to retain math skills from grade to grade. They are also not developing computational fluency at a grade. Students are growing and getting close to proficiency but not mastering math skills. Tier 1 instruction needs more vertical alignment to build on and maintain fluency and proficiency across grade levels. Teachers need to develop a deeper understanding of the rigor required for proficiency at each grade level. Teachers need more understanding of how the standards build from grade to grade. Tier 1 instruction seems to have more emphasis on procedural fluency than conceptual understanding.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	Grades K and 1 Students in these grades frequently use manipulatives. Teachers model thinking. Teachers are connecting representations. Grades 2 and 3 Math lessons are aligned to standards and learning targets. Students show their thinking using models, numbers, and other representations. Some classes had anchor charts with vocabulary present. Grades 4 and 5 Lessons are aligned with the standards. Students are using symbolic and numerical representations. Learning targets were posted.	Grades K and 1 Students do not seem to have many chances to explain their thinking with peers. Teachers are not providing opportunities for exploring math ideas. Grades 2 and 3 Teachers do not seem to consistently support students in making connections between representations. Students have opportunity to share their ideas in discourse or conversation. Students are not using academic vocabulary. Grades 4 and 5 Not many classes were using manipulatives. Much of the work was represented abstractly. Students do not appear to have many opportunities to engage in mathematical discourse.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Overall, math instruction seems to be centered procedures without fully understanding the math concepts. Students do not appear to have many opportunities to participate in discourse or develop problem solving skills, so students are not able to explain their thinking. Much of the math instruction appears to be teacher centered.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
GOAL #2: MATH	By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, student mathematics proficiency across grades K–5 will increase as measured by GKIDS 2.0, Beacon, and Georgia Milestones assessments: Kindergarten students fluently adding and subtracting within 5 will increase from 0% to 80%; Grade 1 students scoring “Prepared” on the Beacon will increase from 29% (May 2026) to 39% (May 2027); Grade 2 from 13% to 23%; Grade 3 from 10% to 20% achieving Proficient or Distinguished on Milestones; Grade 4 from 37% to 47%; and Grade 5 from 24% to 34%, as measured by end-of-year assessment data.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Lack of conceptual understanding • Limited opportunities to apply mathematical skills in context • Gaps in vertical alignment • Language and vocabulary barriers • Inconsistent exposure to the rigor of the standards • Limited opportunities to participate in mathematical discourse • Representations are not connected to building conceptual understanding		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: By December 2026, 100% of K-5 teachers will model mathematics using multiple representations to develop students’ conceptual understanding of the math standards as evidenced by instructional walk data.	Evaluation Performance Target: Eighty percent of students will score 80% or above on common formative assessments. By the end of the year, feedback forms will show an increase in students’ • Conceptual understanding • Mathematical discourse • Mathematical vocabulary • Ability to represent mathematical concepts By 50 percentage points of the baseline taken after first lesson study.	Math Manipulatives
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: The instructional lead teacher will introduce the lesson study routine to teachers. • August-March: CCC will identify an area where students typically demonstrate a lack of conceptual understanding by analyzing prior data. Teams will identify specific		
☒ 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>		Evaluation Tool(s):	

K-5 teachers will model mathematics using multiple representations (i.e. concrete, representational, and abstract models) daily as evidenced by quarterly instructional walks.	standards and misconceptions. With instructional support from teachers, teams will plan a lesson collaboratively for each math unit. A team member will demonstrate the lesson with the students. CCC will provide feedback and adjust lessons. The team will teach the lessons to students. Teachers will analyze formative data to determine the effectiveness of the lesson. May: Reflect and celebrate Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson plan Meeting minutes Feedback form Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: After each math unit	- Common formative assessments - Feedback forms Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ After each math unit Data Analysis Plan: Eighty percents of students will score 80% or above on common formative assessments. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
---	---	---	--

Commented [DT1]: Good action step, clearly stated.

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Inconsistent use of data to make instructional decisions. - Students lack conceptual understanding of math concepts.		
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 CCCs will meet to discuss one assessment per unit. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Instructional support specialist/academic coach will share schoolwide data planning calendar and set expectation of one data talk per unit. - August-September: Instructional support specialist/academic coaches will facilitate data talk. - October-December: Instructional support specialist/academic coach will co-facilitate data talk with data talk facilitator. - January-February: Data talk facilitator will lead the data team meeting. ISS/coach will provide feedback. - March-April: Data talk facilitator will continue to facilitate meetings. - May: Reflect and celebrate Artifacts to be Collected: - Data talk form & CCC meeting agendas and minutes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:	Evaluation Performance Target: 80% of students will demonstrate proficiency-by scoring 80% or higher on common formative assessment Evaluation Tool(s): - CTLS assessment data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Once during assessment cycle Data Analysis Plan: - ISS/coach will review data monthly to determine if the meetings are occurring (February to April) 100% of CCCs will complete at least one data form - ISS/coach will monitor calendar to determine if meetings are being scheduled - Guided coalition will discuss data monthly Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ 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> 2. K-5 CCCs will implement a common routine for analyzing assessment data to driven instructional planning at least bi-weekly.			

	☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: After each unit		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Teachers need a deeper, shared understanding of the intent, rigor, and progression of grade-level standards. - Collaborative planning has not consistently focused on standards internalization and alignment of instruction, assessment, and learning expectations. - Learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions have not been implemented consistently across classrooms, resulting in varying levels of teacher and student clarity. - Teachers need ongoing opportunities to collaboratively analyze standards, instructional practices, and assessment data to ensure rigorous, standards-based instruction.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will participate in collaborative planning as shown by meeting notes and lesson plans that reflect the expectations of the standards. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Develop and share planning protocols and templates. Set expectations for collaborative planning. - August-September: ISS/coach will facilitate standards internalization for an upcoming unit. Teams will begin aligning formative assessments with standards (using state and district assessments). - October-December: With support of ISS/coach, teams will develop learning progressions. Teams will analyze student work during CCCs to ensure common expectations of standards and a match between instruction and the expectations of the standards. CCCs, administrators, ISS/coach will conduct walkthroughs. - January-April: Coach/ISS will provide support to teams as needed. Coach/ISS will facilitate professional learning on differentiating while maintaining the rigor of the standards.	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 85% of lessons and assessments will show alignment to grade-level standards with appropriate rigor. At least 80% of students will score 80% or above on common assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): - Walkthrough form - Common assessments data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly (data) ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: CCC will analyze formative data at the end of each unit Guided Coalition will review walkthrough data and assessment data monthly. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ 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. Implement Hollydale's evidence-based IMPACT Cycle during weekly collaborative planning by unpacking Math standards, developing teacher clarity through learning intentions and success criteria, using high-quality instructional materials, analyzing common formative assessment data, adjusting instruction based on student evidence, and engaging students in goal setting to improve math achievement.			

	• May: CCCs will evaluate the effectiveness of the collaborative planning routine. Guided coalition will determine needed adjustments and next steps. Artifacts to be Collected: CCC agenda Lesson plans Walkthrough data Analyzing standards and developing learning progressions documents Data team minutes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly data review with the Guided Coalition Monthly walkthroughs		
--	---	--	--

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA / OTHER DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
GOAL #3: Leadership & Self Regulation	By May 2027, Hollydale Elementary will reduce office discipline referrals related to disrespectful language, peer conflict, physical aggression, and classroom disruptions by 20% compared to the 2025–2026 school year, as measured by office discipline referral data.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Students need additional explicit instruction and practice in self-regulation, emotional resilience, and managing conflict appropriately. - Students need consistent opportunities to develop and apply respectful communication, problem-solving, and positive peer interaction skills across school settings. - Schoolwide expectations for leadership behaviors and the Leader in Me 7 Habits need to be reinforced consistently through daily instruction, modeling, and feedback. - Students need regular opportunities to reflect on their behavior, set leadership goals, and receive feedback that promotes self-awareness and ownership. - Teachers need consistent structures and strategies to explicitly teach, model, and reinforce leadership behaviors and self-regulation skills throughout the school day.		
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 May 2027, 90% of classrooms will consistently implement the Hollydale Leadership and Self-Regulation Framework with fidelity, as evidenced through monthly classroom walkthroughs.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, Hollydale Elementary will reduce office discipline referrals related to disrespectful language, peer conflict, physical aggression, and classroom disruptions by 20% compared to the 2025–2026 school year.	Access to Leader in Me Lesson Plans & Resources
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning - Introduce the Hollydale Leadership and Self-Regulation Framework, Leader in Me pacing guide, and implementation expectations. - Review schoolwide behavior expectations, Leader in Me resources, and walkthrough look-fors. - Establish schoolwide routines for daily morning meetings and leadership instruction.	Evaluation Tool(s): Office Referral Data	
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD		Evaluation Plan:	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Implement the Hollydale Leadership and Self-Regulation Framework by all instructional staff through daily explicit instruction, modeling, practice, and reinforcement of the Leader in Me 7 Habits, emotional regulation, respectful communication, and conflict resolution, as evidenced by implementation of the schoolwide pacing guide, common area expectations, behavior lessons, leadership goal setting, and the House Point system.	August–September • Launch daily morning meetings using the Leader in Me pacing guide. • Teach and model classroom expectations, routines, and the Leader in Me 7 Habits. • Introduce emotional regulation, respectful communication, and conflict-resolution strategies. • Pinpoint small groups and individual check ins for students who need Tier 2 and 3 instructional support for leadership and self-regulation. October–December • Continue daily leadership instruction and reinforce leadership behaviors throughout the school day. • Provide opportunities for students to practice leadership, problem-solving, and positive peer interactions. • Monitor implementation through monthly walkthroughs and provide coaching and feedback. January–February • Review behavior and walkthrough data to identify strengths and areas for improvement. • Refresh leadership routines and provide targeted support for classrooms and students as needed. • Continue consistent implementation of daily morning meetings and leadership instruction. March–April • Reinforce leadership behaviors through daily instruction, student leadership opportunities, and classroom routines. • Continue monthly walkthroughs and implementation support. • Celebrate student leadership growth and positive behavior. May • Review implementation and behavior data to evaluate the effectiveness of the framework. • Identify successes, celebrate growth, and determine next steps for the following school year. Artifacts to be Collected: Leader in Me Morning Meeting Lesson Plans/Pacing Guide Classroom Walkthrough Observation Forms Student Leadership Goal-Setting and Reflection Forms Office Discipline Referral Reports Student Climate Survey Results	Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Office discipline referral data will be reviewed monthly to identify behavior trends, monitor progress toward the school goal, and determine instructional and behavioral supports needed to improve student leadership and self-regulation. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads & Lighthouse Leadership Team	
--	---	--	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches & Lighthouse Leadership Team Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly Classroom Walkthroughs		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavioral supports need individualized interventions to strengthen self-regulation, leadership behaviors, and positive peer interactions. - Students need consistent opportunities to set goals, monitor progress, and reflect on their behavior to build self-management and ownership. - Families need ongoing communication and collaboration to reinforce behavioral and leadership growth across home and school.		
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 May 2027, 100% of students identified for Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavioral support will participate in goal-setting and feedback conferences based on the established schedule (Tier 2: weekly; Tier 3: daily).	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, 80% of students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavioral support will demonstrate progress toward their individualized leadership and self-regulation SMART goals, as evidenced by student reflections, goal-monitoring documentation, and conference records.	Student Folders & reflection journals Regulatory tools (posters for feelings/emotions, fidgets, breathing cards, timers, sensory items).
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:	Evaluation Tool(s):	
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	Preplanning: - Develop the Tier 2/Tier 3 leadership conference process, SMART goal templates, and progress-monitoring forms. - Train teachers on conducting student conferences, documenting progress, and communicating with families.	- Student Leadership SMART Goal Forms - Student Reflection Forms - Student Conference Logs - Office Discipline Referral Reports - RTI Progress or Special Education Monitoring Documentation	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	August–September: - Identify students requiring Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral support using behavior and classroom data. - Establish individualized SMART goals with students. - Notify parents of students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports and partner with families to reinforce goals at home. - Begin weekly (Tier 2) and daily (Tier 3) conferences. October–December: - Continue student conferences and progress monitoring. - Communicate student progress with families and provide strategies to support leadership and self-regulation at home. - Refer students demonstrating limited progress to the MTSS/RTI process for additional problem-solving and intervention, as appropriate. January–February: - Review student progress through MTSS/RTI meetings and revise goals and supports as needed. - Continue regular communication with families regarding student growth.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
2. Conduct individualized goal setting and feedback conferences by teachers and instructional leaders with students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 behavioral support using evidence-based practices, including SMART goals, progress monitoring, reflection, and family communication, as evidenced by documented behavior goals, student conference records, progress-monitoring data, and family communication logs.		Data Analysis Plan: Student reflections, SMART goal progress, conference documentation, and office discipline referral data will be reviewed monthly to monitor student growth, evaluate the effectiveness of	

	March–April: - Continue conferencing, progress monitoring, and family communication. - Adjust interventions through the MTSS/RTI process based on student data, as needed. May: - Review student growth toward leadership and self-regulation goals. - Evaluate the effectiveness of interventions and make recommendations for continued support the following school year. Artifacts to be Collected: ☐ Student Leadership SMART Goal Forms ☐ Student Conference Logs/Documentation ☐ Parent Communication Documentation from CTLS ☐ RTI or Special Education Documentation (as applicable) ☐ Office Discipline Referral Reports Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: - Monthly review of student SMART goals and conference documentation - Monthly review of parent communication documentation - Monthly MTSS/RTI progress monitoring (as applicable) - Monthly review of office discipline referral data	interventions, and determine needed adjustments to goals and supports. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads & Lighthouse Leadership Team	
--	--	---	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i><u>Required Components</u></i>)		
Family Engagement Activities (<i><u>*Must be listed in the school policy</u></i>)	Date(s) Scheduled	“Shall” Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required: * <u>Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026)</u> Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	August 7, 2026 7:30AM and 1:00 PM	☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * <u>Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026)</u> 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 Conference Week	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * <u>Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027)</u> Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	March 24, 2027 8:00AM or Drop In	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: <u>Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy)</u> Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	July 30, 2026	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5
	January 5, 2027	☒ 3 ☐ 6
5. Required: * <u>Transition Activities</u> 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: - Kindergarten: 2026-2027 – July 30th 8AM – Kindergarten Orientation Mtg w/Admin and a K Teacher to understand what being a Kindergarten student is all about at Hollydale. 2027-2028 – April 1, 2027 12:30-1:30 PM “Spring into Kindergarten” Brief mtg with parents to discuss what it’s like to be a Kindergarten student at Hollydale, a tour of the school, practice going through the lunch line to get a cookie, brief playtime on the playground & read a book with the Media Specialist. 5th Grade: March 2027: 5th Grade Students will tour Smitha MS. March 2027: Principal Salter from Smitha MS & Team will speak with 5th grade students during the day to explain what MS is like – choices for Specials, expectations, musical opportunities, etc. April 2027: 5th Grade Parents will attend a meeting at Smitha MS.	Kindergarten: July 30, 2026: Kindergarten Orientation April 1, 2027: Spring into Kindergarten Parent Informational Mtg 5 th Grade: March, April, and May 2027	☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

May 2027: 5 th Grade Ceremony during which a current 6 th grade parent & student will speak on their experience throughout the year for parents and students.		
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>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u>	☐ 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
Open House & Family Curriculum Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Prepackaged Snacks Books Literacy Handouts	Title 1 Local Funds	9/10/26	Parent Survey Collected for feedback from families, agendas, sign in sheets, CTLS invitation	Carmen Rodriguez and Event Committee
STEAM Night (Math/Science Focus)	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	STEAM Materials County Science Kits	Title 1 Local Funds	12/3/26	Parent Survey Collected for feedback from families, agendas, sign in sheets, CTLS invitation	Carmen Rodriguez and Event Committee
Multicultural Night – ELA/Writing Focused on Interactive Country Boards, scavenger hunts, arts integration	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Art Supplies	Title 1 Local Funds	3/25/26	Parent Survey Collected for feedback from families, agendas, sign in sheets, CTLS invitation	Carmen Rodriguez and Event 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 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: iReady (Math and Reading support) Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Imagine Learning, etc.)</u>	

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

The Hollydale Schoolwide Title I Plan is developed and monitored throughout the year by a collaborative team that includes administrators, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, classroom teachers, the Title I Supervisor, and other district support staff. The team regularly reviews student achievement, attendance, behavior, perception survey, and instructional data to evaluate progress toward schoolwide goals, monitor implementation, and make adjustments based on student needs. This ongoing process ensures the plan remains responsive, data-driven, and aligned to federal, state, district, and local priorities.

The schoolwide plan integrates Cobb County School District instructional frameworks, Georgia's Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), and evidence-based practices supported through Title I to strengthen teaching and learning. Instructional improvement is supported through district initiatives such as a focus on teaching and learning through the use of Cobb Collaborative Communities (CCCs). Hollydale further uses the Leader in Me framework as a continuous model of improvement for all stakeholders as it relates to our work to ensure students are Middle School Ready. The CCC's on each grade level/department utilize a continuous improvement process that includes standards internalization, collaborative planning, formative assessment, data analysis, instructional adjustment, and student goal setting which provides the structure for implementing these initiatives with fidelity. Teachers use collaborative planning, formative assessment data, and ongoing professional learning to ensure instruction is responsive to student needs.

The schoolwide plan also coordinates family engagement opportunities through Title I parent workshops, Family Academic and Math Engagement (FAME) events, regular communication, and community partnerships that build families' capacity to support student learning. By integrating federal, state, district, and local resources, Hollydale provides a comprehensive system of academic, behavioral, and leadership supports designed to improve outcomes for every student.

ESSA Requirements to Include in the Schoolwide Plan – Section 1116(B)(1)

6. Jointly develop with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parental and family engagement involvement policy, agreed on by such parents, that shall describe the means for carrying out the requirements of Subsections (c) through (f). Parents shall be notified of the policy in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language the parents can understand. Such policy shall be made available to the local community and updated periodically to meet the changing needs of parents and the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes Posting every Title I school's parent policy on the school's website in multiple languages where practicable, Fall and Spring input meeting agendas and sign in sheets providing parents the opportunity to assist in the development of the school's parent policy, compact and parent engagement budget.**

SWP Checklist 4

Hollydale Elementary jointly develops and annually reviews its Parent and Family Engagement Policy in collaboration with parents, family members, school staff, and district Title I personnel. Parents are provided multiple opportunities throughout the year, including Fall and Spring Title I input meetings, surveys, School Council meetings, and other family engagement events, to provide feedback on the Parent and Family Engagement Policy, School-Parent Compact, Schoolwide Title I Plan, and Parent and Family Engagement Budget. Parent input is carefully reviewed and incorporated into revisions to ensure the documents reflect the evolving needs of students, families, and the school community.

The Parent and Family Engagement Policy is distributed in an understandable and uniform format and is translated into multiple languages, as practicable, to ensure accessibility for all families. The policy is posted on the school's website, shared during the Annual Title I Meeting, made available in the school's Parent Resource Center, and provided upon request. Hollydale is committed to maintaining ongoing communication with families and updating the policy annually based on stakeholder feedback and identified school needs.

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:

Hollydale determines the effectiveness of its schoolwide program through an ongoing cycle of data analysis, progress monitoring, and instructional adjustment. Student achievement is reviewed using multiple sources of data, including Georgia Milestones, Beacon benchmark assessments, CTLS formative assessments, classroom assessments, i-Ready diagnostic data, attendance, behavior, and student goal-setting evidence.

Through the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle (a continuous improvement process that includes standards internalization, collaborative planning, formative assessment, data analysis, instructional adjustment, and student goal setting), administrators, instructional coaches, teacher teams, and the Title I Supervisor regularly analyze student performance to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction and interventions. Data are disaggregated to monitor the progress of all student groups, with particular attention given to students performing below grade level, economically disadvantaged students, English Learners, students with disabilities, and students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports.

Results are used to identify strengths, determine instructional priorities, adjust interventions, allocate resources, and provide targeted professional learning. Student achievement data are also used to identify students who qualify for gifted education services and Advanced Content classes in grades 4 and 5, ensuring that students demonstrating advanced academic potential receive appropriate enrichment and acceleration opportunities. The school evaluates the success of the schoolwide program by measuring student growth over time, increasing the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations, reducing achievement gaps among student groups, and expanding opportunities for both intervention and advanced learning based on student needs.

8. Describe how the school determines whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the challenging State academic standards, particularly for those students who had been farther from achieving the standards. *SWP Checklist 3(b)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Hollydale evaluates the effectiveness of its schoolwide program through an ongoing cycle of implementation, progress monitoring, data analysis, and continuous improvement. Throughout the year, administrators, instructional coaches, teacher teams, and the Title I Supervisor monitor the implementation of the Schoolwide Plan and review multiple sources of data, including Georgia Milestones, Beacon benchmark assessments, CTLS formative assessments, classroom assessments, i-Ready diagnostic data, attendance, behavior, and perception survey results.

Using the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle (a continuous improvement process that includes standards internalization, collaborative planning, formative assessment, data analysis, instructional adjustment, and student goal setting), collaborative teams analyze student performance to determine whether instructional practices, interventions, and professional learning are improving student achievement. Data are disaggregated by student subgroup to monitor the progress of students who are performing below grade level, English Learners, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports. Student achievement data are also used to identify students who qualify for gifted education services and Advanced Content classes in grades 4 and 5, ensuring that all students receive instruction that meets their individual learning needs.

The effectiveness of the schoolwide program is measured by student growth, increases in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade-level expectations, reduction of achievement gaps among student groups, successful implementation of schoolwide instructional practices, and progress toward the goals identified in the Schoolwide Title I Plan. Students actively participate in monitoring their own progress by setting academic and leadership goals, reflecting on their growth, and celebrating milestones throughout the year in English Language Arts, mathematics, and leadership development. These celebrations reinforce student ownership of learning and recognize both achievement and growth. Findings from ongoing data reviews are used to refine instructional strategies, adjust interventions, allocate resources, and inform professional learning to ensure continuous improvement and increased student achievement.

9. Describe how the schoolwide plan will be revised, as necessary, based on regular monitoring to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program. *SWP Checklist 3(c)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

The Hollydale Schoolwide Plan is a living document that is continuously monitored and revised throughout the school year to ensure it remains responsive to the needs of students and aligned to school improvement goals. Administrators, instructional coaches, teacher teams, the Title I Supervisor, and other district support staff regularly review implementation of the plan and analyze multiple sources of data, including Georgia Milestones, Beacon benchmark assessments, CTLS formative assessments, classroom assessment data, i-Ready diagnostic data, attendance, behavior, and perception survey results. Through the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle (a continuous improvement process that includes standards internalization, collaborative planning, formative assessment, data analysis, instructional adjustment, and student goal setting), collaborative teams meet regularly to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices, interventions, and professional learning. Data are used to identify strengths, determine areas of need, monitor progress toward schoolwide goals, and make timely adjustments to instruction, interventions, resource allocation, and professional learning.

Parents, families, and other stakeholders are provided opportunities throughout the year to offer feedback through surveys, Title I input meetings, School Council meetings, and family engagement events. This feedback, along with student performance data and implementation evidence, is used to revise the Schoolwide Plan as needed to ensure continuous improvement and increased achievement for all students.

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.

Hollydale's schoolwide reform strategies are designed to ensure that every student has access to high-quality, standards-aligned instruction and the supports necessary to meet Georgia's challenging academic standards. Through the implementation of the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle (a continuous improvement process that includes standards internalization, collaborative planning, formative assessment, data analysis, instructional adjustment, and student goal setting), teachers work collaboratively to strengthen teacher clarity, align instruction to the rigor of the standards, and use evidence of student learning to make timely instructional decisions.

Schoolwide action steps focus on implementing consistent instructional practices, using formative assessment data to differentiate instruction, providing targeted interventions and enrichment, and strengthening students' academic ownership through goal setting and progress monitoring. Professional learning, instructional coaching, collaborative planning, and classroom observations are used to support the consistent implementation of these strategies across all grade levels.

To ensure equitable access and success for all learners, student performance data are regularly analyzed by subgroup, including English Learners, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, gifted learners, and students receiving Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports. In addition to grade-level collaborative teams, Hollydale's Early Intervention Program (EIP), Special Education, Gifted, and ESOL teacher leaders meet regularly to review student performance data, monitor student progress, evaluate the effectiveness of interventions and instructional supports, and make instructional adjustments throughout the year based on identified needs.

A key component of Hollydale's reform strategy is fostering student ownership of learning. Teachers meet individually with students to review achievement data, set meaningful academic and leadership goals, and teach students how to monitor and reflect on their progress throughout the year. These student conferences expand to include families through ongoing communication and parent-teacher conferences, creating a collaborative partnership focused on each child's success. By engaging students, families, and educators as a unified team, instructional decisions are strengthened and supports are aligned to help every student achieve at high levels.

Instructional resources, accommodations, interventions, enrichment opportunities, and flexible student groupings are continuously refined based on student data. Progress toward the schoolwide action steps is monitored through implementation evidence, classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning artifacts, student achievement data, and regular reviews by administrators, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and the Title I Supervisor. Findings are used to refine instructional practices and ensure continuous improvement for all students.

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

SWP Checklist 2(b)

Hollydale strengthens its academic program by implementing evidence-based instructional practices that provide all students with rigorous, standards-aligned learning experiences. Through the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle (a continuous improvement process that includes standards internalization, collaborative planning, formative assessment, data analysis, instructional adjustment, and student goal setting), teachers collaboratively plan high-quality instruction, establish clear learning intentions and success criteria, analyze student evidence of learning, and adjust instruction to maximize student achievement.

To increase both the amount and quality of learning time, teachers use formative assessment data to provide timely intervention, targeted small-group instruction, enrichment, and flexible grouping during the instructional day. Rather than waiting until the end of a unit, teachers continuously monitor student understanding and respond immediately to learning needs, ensuring that instructional time is purposeful and responsive. Students actively participate in setting academic and leadership goals, monitoring their progress, and reflecting on their learning, increasing engagement and ownership of their achievement.

Hollydale provides a well-rounded education by integrating leadership development through the Leader in Me framework, providing enrichment opportunities through the Gifted and Advanced Content programs, supporting multilingual learners through ESOL services, and delivering targeted academic interventions through the Early Intervention Program (EIP) and Special Education services. Students also participate in instruction in science, social studies, fine arts, physical education, technology, and other experiences that promote the development of the whole child.

The implementation and effectiveness of these reform strategies are monitored through collaborative planning meetings, classroom walkthroughs, instructional coaching, student goal-setting conferences, implementation artifacts, and ongoing analysis of Beacon benchmark assessments, CTLS formative assessments, classroom assessment data, i-Ready diagnostics, and Georgia Milestones results. Administrators, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, and the Title I Supervisor regularly review implementation and student outcomes to refine instructional practices, strengthen learning opportunities, and ensure continuous improvement for all students.

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)*

Hollydale implements a schoolwide Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to proactively prevent and address students' academic, behavioral, and social-emotional needs through a continuum of increasingly intensive supports. A strong Tier I foundation is established through high-quality instruction, clearly defined schoolwide expectations, leadership development using the Leader in Me 7 Habits, student goal setting, restorative

conversations, positive behavior supports, and explicit instruction in social-emotional skills. These proactive strategies help students develop the self-management, communication, problem-solving, and leadership skills necessary for success both inside and outside the classroom.

Students requiring additional support are identified through ongoing analysis of behavior, attendance, academic performance, teacher observations, counseling referrals, and other student data. Collaborative teams regularly review this information to determine appropriate interventions and monitor student progress. Tier II supports may include targeted behavioral interventions, Check-In/Check-Out, mentoring, social skills instruction, individual or small-group counseling, behavior contracts, leadership coaching, and increased family communication. Students are taught strategies to regulate emotions, resolve conflicts, make responsible decisions, and lead themselves and others in positive ways.

For students demonstrating more intensive needs, Tier III supports are individualized and may include Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs), Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), wraparound supports, frequent progress monitoring, and referrals for additional evaluations when appropriate. Hollydale's MTSS process is fully coordinated with services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). General education teachers, Special Education teachers, counselors, administrators, instructional coaches, the school psychologist, and other support personnel collaborate regularly to review data, evaluate interventions, and ensure students receive appropriate accommodations, services, and supports in the least restrictive environment.

The effectiveness of the school's tiered system is continuously monitored through MTSS meetings, intervention progress-monitoring, behavior and attendance reviews, classroom observations, counseling data, and student achievement results. Educators use this information to refine interventions, strengthen instruction, and respond proactively to student needs. Students and families are active partners throughout the process, participating in goal-setting conferences, progress monitoring, and celebrations of growth to reinforce shared responsibility for academic success, positive behavior, and leadership development.

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:

Hollydale implements a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) that emphasizes prevention, early intervention, and individualized support to address students' academic, behavioral, social-emotional, and leadership needs. A strong Tier I foundation is established through daily Morning Meetings, high-quality instruction, the Leader in Me 7 Habits, clearly defined schoolwide expectations, restorative practices, and explicit instruction in self-regulation, relationship skills, and responsible decision-making. These proactive practices help students develop the skills needed to lead themselves and contribute positively to the school community.

Students requiring additional support are identified through ongoing review of academic, attendance, and behavior data, teacher observations, and counseling referrals. Collaborative MTSS teams develop, monitor, and adjust targeted Tier II and Tier III interventions, which may include small-group counseling, mentoring, Check-In/Check-Out, social skills instruction, behavior intervention plans, academic interventions, and increased family communication.

Hollydale's MTSS process is coordinated with services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). General education teachers, Special Education teachers, counselors, administrators, instructional coaches, and other support staff collaborate to review student data, monitor progress, and

ensure students receive appropriate accommodations, interventions, and specialized services. Through the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle, teams continuously evaluate the effectiveness of supports and make adjustments to ensure every student develops the academic, behavioral, and leadership skills needed for success.

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:

Hollydale provides ongoing, job-embedded professional learning aligned to the Schoolwide Title I Plan and informed by student achievement data, classroom observations, teacher feedback, and school improvement priorities. Teachers, paraprofessionals, and other staff participate in collaborative planning, instructional coaching, PLCs, data analysis meetings, peer observations, and district professional learning to strengthen instructional practices.

Through the Hollydale IMPACT Cycle (a continuous improvement process that includes standards internalization, collaborative planning, formative assessment, data analysis, instructional adjustment, and student goal setting), educators use Beacon benchmark assessments, CTLS formative assessments, classroom assessment data, i-Ready diagnostics, and Georgia Milestones results to evaluate student learning and improve instruction. Professional learning focuses on teacher clarity, standards-based instruction, formative assessment, differentiation, literacy, mathematics, leadership development, and meeting the needs of diverse learners.

To recruit and retain effective educators, Hollydale fosters a collaborative culture through mentoring, instructional coaching, teacher leadership opportunities, meaningful feedback, recognition of staff accomplishments, and ongoing professional growth. These efforts strengthen instructional effectiveness and ensure students receive high-quality instruction from effective educators.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

16. **ONLY HIGH SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED** Describe how the school prepares and makes aware of opportunities for postsecondary education and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual or concurrent enrollment, or early college high schools. *SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

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

Hollydale's Schoolwide Title I Plan is grounded in a comprehensive needs assessment that examines multiple sources of data, including Georgia Milestones, Beacon benchmark assessments, CTLS formative assessments, i-Ready diagnostics, attendance, behavior, perception surveys, and stakeholder feedback. Data

are disaggregated to identify trends, achievement gaps, and the needs of students who are performing below grade level or are at risk of not meeting Georgia's academic standards.

The needs assessment is reviewed by administrators, instructional coaches, teacher leaders, classroom teachers, the Title I Supervisor, and other district support staff to identify schoolwide priorities, develop action steps, allocate resources, and monitor progress. This ongoing process ensures the Schoolwide Plan remains data-driven, responsive to student needs, and focused on continuous improvement for all learners.

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)			
Position	Supports Goal(s)	Supports which system(s)	How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?
Classroom Teacher(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	
Academic Coach(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	
Parent Facilitator(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Family Engagement and Communication: The Parent Facilitator will establish strong communication channels with families, ensuring they are informed about school goals, programs, and student progress, which fosters a collaborative school-home partnership. Workshops and Support for Parents: The facilitator will coordinate with teachers and staff, to organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies to support their children's academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. Increased Parental Involvement: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. Connecting Families with Resources: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.

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

School Improvement Goals <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy</i>	
Goal #1	1st & 2nd Grade: The percentage of students scoring Prepared on the ELA Beacon assessment will increase by at least 10 percentage points from the Fall 2026 baseline to the Spring 2027 administration through rigorous, standards-based instruction, differentiated small-group literacy instruction, and evidence-based reading and writing practices. 3rd -5th Grade: The percentage of students scoring Proficient and Distinguished on the Georgia Milestones ELA Assessment will increase by at least 10 percentage points from the 2025–2026 baseline to the Spring 2027 administration through consistent implementation of grade-level standards, text-dependent instruction, targeted intervention, and strengthened writing and comprehension practices across all classrooms.
Goal #2	By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, student mathematics proficiency across grades K–5 will increase as measured by GKIDS 2.0, Beacon, and Georgia Milestones assessments: Kindergarten students fluently adding and subtracting within 5 will increase from 0% to 80%; Grade 1 students scoring “Prepared” on the Beacon will increase from 29% (May 2026) to 39% (May 2027); Grade 2 from 13% to 23%; Grade 3 from 10% to 20% achieving Proficient or Distinguished on Milestones; Grade 4 from 37% to 47%; and Grade 5 from 24% to 34%, as measured by end-of-year assessment data.
Goal #3	By May 2027, Hollydale Elementary will reduce office discipline referrals related to disrespectful language, peer conflict, physical aggression, and classroom disruptions by 20% compared to the 2025–2026 school year, as measured by office discipline referral data.