

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Pearson Middle School
Principal Name:	Kristie Brown
Date Submitted:	6/1/26
Revision Date(s):	

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	
<i>Team Lead</i>	
<i>Position</i>	
<i>Email</i>	
<i>Phone</i>	
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 SIP was reviewed by all shareholders (families, teachers, staff and community members) with the expectation/understanding that all shareholders reviewing this document will have the power to make suggestions, additions, and edits in which they felt best represented the needs of our community.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

Required Stakeholders	Suggested Stakeholders
Administrative Team	Parent 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:			
-----------------------	--	--	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	By the end of the 2025-2026 school year, the percentage of students scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories will increase by 10% on the Spring administration as measured by the DRC Georgia ELA Beacon assessment. 6th Grade will increase from 54% to 64% 7th Grade will increase from 45% to 55% 8th Grade will increase from 56% to 66%																												
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially																													
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Fall Beacon Data</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="background-color: #f8d7da;">Support Needed</th> <th style="background-color: #fff3cd;">Near Target</th> <th style="background-color: #d4edda;">Prepared</th> <th>Combined Near Target/Prepared</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6th Grade</td> <td>47%</td> <td style="border: 2px solid red;">47%</td> <td style="border: 2px solid red;">7%</td> <td>54% total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7th Grade</td> <td>55%</td> <td style="border: 2px solid red;">40%</td> <td style="border: 2px solid red;">5%</td> <td>45% total</td> </tr> <tr> <td>8th Grade</td> <td>44%</td> <td style="border: 2px solid red;">42%</td> <td style="border: 2px solid red;">14%</td> <td>56% total</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Fall Beacon Data						Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Combined Near Target/Prepared	6 th Grade	47%	47%	7%	54% total	7 th Grade	55%	40%	5%	45% total	8 th Grade	44%	42%	14%	56% total
Fall Beacon Data																													
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Combined Near Target/Prepared																									
6 th Grade	47%	47%	7%	54% total																									
7 th Grade	55%	40%	5%	45% total																									
8 th Grade	44%	42%	14%	56% total																									

		Spring Beacon Data				
			Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Combined Near Target/Prepared
		6 th Grade	41%	46%	13%	59% total
		7 th Grade	47%	42%	12%	54% total
		8 th Grade	40%	38%	22%	60% total
Overall Growth:						
6th Grade: 5% increase in students scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories 7th Grade: 9% increase in students scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories 8th Grade: 4% increase in students scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories						
Reflecting on Outcomes						
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of?	Action Steps to Eliminate or Change:					
	- ESOL Targeted Groups: Change this goal to focus on academic conversations. Create a student-friendly version of the WIDA Speaking Rubric to guide and support academic conversations across the school. Teachers will intentionally plan opportunities for students to engage in academic conversations in all content areas and include daily structured discussions to strengthen students’ language development. Clear protocols will be developed for activities such as turn-and-talk, questioning, and responding, so students learn how to share ideas, ask questions, and build on each other’s thinking using academic language. - Pilot Block: Because this step has already become a routine practice, it is no longer necessary to include it as a separate action. It would be more beneficial to replace it with a different step that supports continued growth and improvement.					
	Action Steps to Keep or Extend:					
	- Vocabulary: Expand each grade level’s vocabulary list to include commonly used Tier 2 words that appear frequently on assessments and in everyday language, in addition to the Tier 2 and Tier 3 words from the expanded frameworks. Develop a grade-level list of these additional Tier 2 words and implement them as “Word of the Week” vocabulary throughout the school year to support students’ academic language development and comprehension. - Thinking Routines: Provide professional learning for teachers on how to effectively use Project Zero Thinking Routines in their classrooms. Share a list of “go-to” routines that can be used across different content areas to support student thinking and discussion. Refine implementation expectations so teachers and students can use these routines in more meaningful ways that promote deeper thinking and learning.					
	Possible Action Step Additions:					
	Small Group: Prioritize intentional, data-driven small group instruction in ELA/Reading classrooms to target specific student needs and help close gaps in student learning.					

If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	
---	--

Previous Year's Goal #2	• 6th Grade: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, at least 65% of 6th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2026. • 7th Grade: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, at least 60% of 7th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2026. • 8th Grade: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, at least 60% of 8th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2026.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	2026 RESULTS • 6th Grade – 63% of 6th graders scored level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment. • 7th Grade – 57% of 7th graders scored level II or higher on Georgia Milestones Math Assessment. • 8th Grade – 52% of 8th graders scored level II or higher on Georgia Milestones Math Assessment.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	• ELLevation strategies will be added to address differentiation needs of ESOL learners. • Tier 2 vocabulary will be added as a goal to support students with mathematical vocabulary deficits. • Academic discourse strategies will be added as a goal to address numerical reasoning deficits.

If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	Action steps to eliminate or change: • Manipulatives – Based on the past 2 years of documentation and data, the math team has successfully implemented manipulatives. Data from CTLS has shown progression and the need to eliminate the goal. • Adjust from Tier 1 to focus on Tier 2 math vocabulary. Consider language that focuses on specific math reasoning based on student needs.
---	--

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

ELA DATA			
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	21%	23.9%	20.4%
7 th Grade	28.4%	18.1%	27%
8 th Grade	24.1%	30%	24%

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
6 th Grade	35%	49%	17%	39%	45%	17%	39%	47%	13%	50%	36%	14%	39%	43%	18%	35%	45%	20%	49%	36%	15%
7 th Grade	38%	47%	15%	40%	40%	20%	48%	36%	17%	60%	31%	9%	41%	40%	19%	40%	44%	16%	49%	38%	13%
8 th Grade	35%	40%	26%	37%	35%	29%	39%	38%	23%	53%	29%	18%	36%	40%	25%	36%	37%	27%	53%	31%	17%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 6th Grade

	SWD:	EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): - 6th Grade: Students have demonstrated strengths in IT: Texts: Context/Structure & Style reporting category with 66% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, the IT: Texts: Techniques reporting category with 62% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, the CT: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques reporting category with 61% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, and the CT: Texts: Research & Analysis with 65% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. - 7th Grade: Students have demonstrated strengths in IT: Texts: Context/Structure & Style reporting categories with 62% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, the IT: Texts: Techniques reporting category with 60% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, and the CT: Texts: Research & Analysis with 60% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. - 8th Grade: Students have demonstrated strengths in IT: Texts: Context/Structure & Style reporting categories with 66% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, the IT: Texts: Techniques reporting category with 64% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, the CT: Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques with 65% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories, and the CT: Texts: Research & Analysis with	Grade Levels (all students): - 6th Grade: Students have demonstrated weaknesses in IT: Listening reporting categories with 50% of students scoring in the Support Needed category, as well as in CT: Language: Grammar Conventions with 49% of students scoring in the Support Needed category. - 7th Grade: Students have demonstrated weaknesses in IT: Listening and IT: Language: Vocabulary reporting categories with 60% and 48% of students scoring in the Support Needed category, as well as in CT: Language: Grammar Conventions with 49% of students scoring in the Support Needed category. - 8th Grade: Students have demonstrated weaknesses in IT: Listening reporting categories with 53% of students scoring in the Support Needed category, as well as in CT: Language: Grammar Conventions with 53% of students scoring in the Support Needed category. EL: - 6th Grade: Assessment scores for EL students indicate that 85% (58 of 69 students) are scoring in the Support Needed category overall. - 7th Grade: Assessment scores for EL students indicate that 76% (69 of 91 students) are scoring in the Support Needed category overall. - 8th Grade: Assessment scores for EL students indicate that 76% (75 of 99 students) are scoring in the Support Needed category overall. SWD:

	64% of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories. EL: - 6th Grade: Assessment scores for EL students indicate that 16% (11 of 69 students) are scoring in the Near Target category overall. - 7th Grade: Assessment scores for EL students indicate that 24% (22 of 91 students) are scoring in the Near Target category overall. - 8th Grade: Assessment scores for EL students indicate that 24% (24 of 99 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories overall. SWD: - 6th Grade: Assessment scores for SWD students indicate that 26% (7 of 27 students) are scoring in the Near Target category overall. - 7th Grade: Assessment scores for SWD students indicate that 42% (10 of 24 students) are scoring in the Near Target category overall. - 8th Grade: Assessment scores for SWD students indicate that 46% (11 of 24 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories overall.	- 6th Grade: Assessment scores for SWD students indicate that 74% (20 of 27 students) are scoring in the Support Needed category overall. - 7th Grade: Assessment scores for SWD students indicate that 58% (14 of 24 students) are scoring in the Support Needed category overall. - 8th Grade: Assessment scores for SWD students indicate that 54% (13 of 24 students) are scoring in the Support Needed category overall.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Many students are still developing English proficiency, which impacts comprehension, vocabulary, and overall performance. - Language differences at home may limit access to academic support and learning materials. - Students have not had sufficient practice with the listening format of Beacon testing due to curriculum constraints. - Fast curriculum pacing limits opportunities for deep, meaningful instruction and practice. - There is not enough consistent use of clear and explicit teaching using gradual release, often due to curriculum demands. - Teachers may feel uncertain about using new materials effectively and about students' ability to apply skills to grade level texts.	

	- Curriculum resources do not provide enough support to help students access and master grade level content, and teachers are not consistently able to add appropriate supports and scaffolds due to time constraints and limited comfort with the new curriculum. - Instruction is primarily teacher-centered, with limited opportunities for students to actively engage, think, and do the work of learning. - Schoolwide structures for academic discourse are not established or consistently implemented, and opportunities for meaningful student discussion are not intentionally planned. - Teachers have difficulty analyzing assessment data and using it to plan and implement effective small groups including identifying targeted strategies, selecting appropriate materials, and managing time efficiently. - Small group instruction is primarily spent on current standards rather than addressing foundational skill gaps students already have. - The lack of consistent, explicit vocabulary instruction prevents students, especially ELL and SWD student groups, from fully accessing and engaging with academic content. Students do not have enough opportunities to learn and practice high utility academic vocabulary (Tier 2 words) that are seen across assessments.																																																						
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Data Set #1 <table><tr><th>School Average by Domain (Longitudinal)</th><th>Listening</th><th>Speaking</th><th>Reading</th><th>Writing</th></tr><tr><td>SY22</td><td>5.2</td><td>3.4</td><td>3.9</td><td>3.7</td></tr><tr><td>SY23</td><td>5.2</td><td>3.3</td><td>3.2</td><td>3.4</td></tr><tr><td>SY24</td><td>5.7</td><td>3.7</td><td>4.2</td><td>4.2</td></tr><tr><td>SY25</td><td>4.3</td><td>2.85</td><td>2.67</td><td>3.12</td></tr><tr><td>SY26</td><td>4.4</td><td>2.8</td><td>2.9</td><td>3.1</td></tr></table> Data Set #2 <table><tr><th colspan="6">Grade Level Averages by Domain</th></tr><tr><th>Grade Level</th><th>Listening</th><th>Speaking</th><th>Reading</th><th>Writing</th><th>Composite (Overall)</th></tr><tr><td>6th Grade</td><td>4.2</td><td>2.9</td><td>2.6</td><td>2.8</td><td>2.9</td></tr><tr><td>7th Grade</td><td>4.5</td><td>2.8</td><td>2.8</td><td>3.2</td><td>3.0</td></tr></table>	School Average by Domain (Longitudinal)	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	SY22	5.2	3.4	3.9	3.7	SY23	5.2	3.3	3.2	3.4	SY24	5.7	3.7	4.2	4.2	SY25	4.3	2.85	2.67	3.12	SY26	4.4	2.8	2.9	3.1	Grade Level Averages by Domain						Grade Level	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Composite (Overall)	6 th Grade	4.2	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.9	7 th Grade	4.5	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.0
School Average by Domain (Longitudinal)	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing																																																			
SY22	5.2	3.4	3.9	3.7																																																			
SY23	5.2	3.3	3.2	3.4																																																			
SY24	5.7	3.7	4.2	4.2																																																			
SY25	4.3	2.85	2.67	3.12																																																			
SY26	4.4	2.8	2.9	3.1																																																			
Grade Level Averages by Domain																																																							
Grade Level	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Composite (Overall)																																																		
6 th Grade	4.2	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.9																																																		
7 th Grade	4.5	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.0																																																		

8 th Grade	4.4	2.8	3.2	3.3	3.2
-----------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Data Set #3

ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Reading Grade Level Average Scores)			
Grade Level	SY24	SY25	SY26
6 th	1.89	2.02	2.6
7 th	2.03	1.85	2.8
8 th	2.44	2.45	3.2

Data Set #4

ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Writing Grade Level Average Scores)			
Grade Level	SY24	SY25	SY26
6 th	2.37	2.69	2.8
7 th	2.50	2.45	3.2
8 th	2.63	2.81	3.3

- **Listening Continues as the Highest-Performing Domain**

- o In SY26, listening remained the strongest domain schoolwide at 4.4, slightly improving from SY25 (4.3). Grade-level data shows consistently solid performance across all grades, with 7th grade highest at 4.5, confirming listening as a relative instructional strength.

- **8th Grade Shows the Strongest Overall Language Proficiency**

- o By SY26, 8th grade demonstrated the highest proficiency across academic domains. ACCESS data shows reading at 3.2 and writing at 3.3, the strongest outcomes across all grade levels. The grade-level composite score (3.2) further

- **Speaking Remains the Lowest-Performing Domain**

- o Despite stabilization in SY26, speaking remains the weakest domain schoolwide at 2.8. Grade-level speaking scores are nearly identical (2.8–2.9), indicating a systemic need for intentional oral language development rather than a grade-specific issue.

- **Schoolwide Performance Has Not Fully Returned to SY24 Levels**

- o Although SY26 shows improvement over SY25 in all domains, reading (2.9) and writing (3.1) remain well below SY24 highs (4.2 in both). This indicates partial recovery but highlights the need for continued focus on academic language acceleration.

	supports evidence of cumulative language growth over time. - Reading and Writing Rebounded Across All Grades - o SY26 data reflects recovery from the SY25 decline. All grades showed gains in reading and writing compared to the prior year. Notably, 7th grade rebounded sharply in reading (1.85 → 2.8) and writing (2.45 → 3.2), indicating instructional stabilization or improved supports. - 6th Grade Continues Steady Upward Progress - o In SY26, 6th grade maintained positive momentum, with reading improving to 2.6 and writing to 2.8. While proficiency remains below upper grades, the consistent year-over-year growth suggests effective entry-level instruction and foundational language supports. - Based on ESOL exiting criteria, approximately 26 students achieved a composite score of 4.3 and above.	- Middle Grades Still Trail 8th Grade Outcomes - o While 7th grade showed strong recovery in SY26, composite scores remain below 8th grade, and 6th grade continues to lag behind both. This gap suggests the importance of sustained, vertically aligned supports to ensure earlier mastery rather than late consolidation.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Tier 1 instruction does not consistently embed language objectives or provide enough explicit support for academic language development across content areas. - Listening and speaking are not intentionally integrated into daily instruction, resulting in limited opportunities for students to engage in meaningful oral language and academic discourse across subjects. - Vertical alignment of language expectations is inconsistent, leading to uneven development of language skills as students progress through grade levels. - ESOL teachers have limited capacity to consistently co-plan and co-teach with content teachers due to scheduling constraints, caseloads, and competing instructional responsibilities. - Schoolwide structures for oral language, discussion, and student-centered discourse are not clearly established or consistently implemented. - Instructional supports are not consistently differentiated to meet the needs of students who are developing intermediate academic language skills.	

ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing) 2025-2026 Assessment Data.docx	Grade Levels (all students): - 6th Grade: Students are averaging 71% on the nine reading assessments administered thus far. The following standards were strengths for this grade level: - o Language Standards: 6.L.V.1.a 87% - o Texts Standards: 6.T.SS.1.c 73% and 6.T.SS.1.d 76% - o Practices Standards: 6.P.ST.2 70% - 7th Grade: Students are averaging 72% on the fourteen ELA assessments administered thus far. Students are averaging 73% on the nine reading assessments administered thus far. The following standards were strengths for this grade level: - o Language Standards: 7.L.V.1.a-b (82-83%), 7.L.V.3.d 89% - o Texts Standards: 7.T.SS.1.d 80%, 7.T.T.1.e 76%, and 7.T.T.3.c 77% - o Practices Standards: 7.P.EICC.3.d 81% and 7.P.ST.2.b 95% - 8th Grade: Students are averaging 76% on the fourteen reading assessments administered thus far. The following standards were strengths for this grade level: - o Texts Standards: 8.T.T.2.b-d (71%-78%), 8.T.T.3.c 79%, and 8.T.T.4.a - o Practices Standards: 8.P.EICC.3.g 80% and 8.P.ST.2.c 89% EL: The assessment scores for our EL students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages similar to those of their non-EL peers. SWD: The assessment scores for our SWD students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages similar to those of their non-SWD peers.	Grade Levels (all students): - 6th Grade: Students are averaging 46% on the sixteen ELA assessments administered thus far. The following standards were weaknesses for this grade level: - o Language Standards: 6.L.V.3.b-e 36%-42% - o Texts Standards: 6.P.AC.1.a 38%, 6.P.AC.3.d 30%, and 6.P.ST.2.c 20% - o Practices Standards: 6.T.T.1.b 41%, 6.T.T.1.d 37%, and 6.T.T.2.d 40% - 7th Grade: The following standards were weaknesses for this grade level: - o Language Standards: 7.L.V.2 50% and 7.L.V.3 58% - o Texts Standards: 7.T.PM.1.a 43%, 7.T.SS.1 49%, and 7.T.T.4.a 51% - o Practices Standards: 7.P.AC.1.d 59% - 8th Grade: Students are averaging 65% on the seventeen ELA assessments administered thus far. The following standards were weaknesses for this grade level: - o Texts Standards: 8.T.C.1.b 43%, 8.T.C.2.a 37%, and 8.T.T.3.a 56% - o Practices Standards: 8.P.AC.1.b 53% and 8.P.EICC.1.d 41% EL: While the assessment scores for our EL students indicate that they are exhibiting similar growth percentages as their non-EL peers, their proficiency averages are about 10-15% lower on grade-level standards. SWD: While the assessment scores for our SWD students indicate they are exhibiting similar growth percentages as their non-SWD peers, their proficiency averages are about 10-15% lower on grade-level standards.
Root Cause Explanation:		

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

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

- Misalignment between assessments: Reading assessments are more straightforward, with clear questions and separate vocabulary sections focused on memorization. In contrast, ELA assessments require deeper thinking—students must interpret more complex questions and apply word-part knowledge within the test.
- Fast curriculum pacing limits opportunities for deep, meaningful instruction and practice.
- There is not enough consistent use of clear and explicit teaching using gradual release, often due to curriculum demands.
- Teachers may feel uncertain about using new materials effectively and about students’ ability to apply skills to grade level texts.
- Curriculum resources do not provide enough support to help students access and master grade level content, and teachers are not consistently able to add appropriate supports and scaffolds due to time constraints and limited comfort with the new curriculum.
- Instruction is primarily teacher-centered, with limited opportunities for students to actively engage, think, and do the work of learning.
- Schoolwide structures for academic discourse are not established or consistently implemented, and opportunities for meaningful student discussion are not intentionally planned.
- Teachers have difficulty analyzing assessment data and using it to plan and implement effective small groups including identifying targeted strategies, selecting appropriate materials, and managing time efficiently.
- Small group instruction is primarily spent on current standards rather than addressing foundational skill gaps students already have.
- The lack of consistent, explicit vocabulary instruction prevents students, especially ELL and SWD student groups, from fully accessing and engaging with academic content. Students do not have enough opportunities to learn and practice high utility academic vocabulary (Tier 2 words) that are seen across assessments.

Write Score Assessments SY 26
(Peer Revision Task 6th/7th Grade &
Argumentative Writing Task 8th Grade)

Grade Levels (all students):

Write Score Assessment Data SY26 (Nov. Administration)					
	Peer Revision Task				
	Genre	Beginning (0-7 Points)	Developing (8-11 Points)	Proficient (12-16 Points)	Distinguished (17-22 Points)
6 th Grade	Argumentative	20.27%	34.56%	35.94%	9.22%
7 th Grade	Argumentative	23.27%	36.14%	23.76%	16.83%
	Writing Task				
	Genre	Beginning (0-3 Points)	Developing (4-5 Points)	Proficient (6-7 Points)	Distinguished (8 Points)
8 th Grade	Argumentative	61.63%	33.47%	4.08%	0.82%

	- 6th Grade: 45.16% of sixth graders are at or above grade level on the Peer Revision Task (Proficient and Distinguished categories) - 7th Grade: 40.59% of seventh graders are at or above grade level on the Peer Revision Task (Proficient and Distinguished categories). Students falling in the Distinguished range is notably higher (16.83%) compared to sixth grade. - 8th Grade: 4.9% of eighth-graders are at or above grade level (Proficient and Distinguished categories)	- 6th Grade: More than half of the sixth-grade students are below grade level on the Argumentative Peer Revision Task (54.83% in the Beginning or Developing ranges). - 7th Grade: More than half of the seventh-grade students are below grade level on the Argumentative Peer Revision Task (59.41% in the Beginning or Developing ranges). - 8th Grade: The majority of the eighth-grade students are performing below grade level on the Argumentative Writing Task (95.1% in the Beginning or Developing ranges).
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Lack of explicit and consistent writing instruction limits students' ability to produce grade-level writing. - Limited opportunities for peer-revision prevent students from improving their writing and applying learned skills. - Low writing stamina results in underdeveloped writing in areas such as elaboration and explanations. - Gaps in foundational writing skills (sentence structure, conventions, paragraph structure) hinder students' ability to meet grade level expectations.	
School Instructional Walks (6th-8th Grade)	- Teachers consistently use the Tier 1 resources myPerspectives and CommonLit 360 (95.7% using it). - Interpreting texts was the most consistently observed component of the standards at 83% with teachers regularly offering time for class-wide discussions, modeling reading strategies, and giving feedback to students. - Teachers consistently introduce unit vocabulary with explicit instruction and provide students with opportunities to practice and apply the vocabulary in various contexts. - When grammar instruction was observed, it almost always included explicit modeling. - Teachers have the structure of Thinking Routines down; they are consistently able to choose an appropriate routine, connect it to content, and have students record their thinking.	- Writing (constructing texts) was observed in only 21% of walks. When it was observed, it was limited to guiding author craft or modeling a writing technique. There was no evidence of structured writing routines or student writing being regularly developed. - Grammar instruction was inconsistently observed in the ELA classrooms. - Independent reading was nearly absent from instructional walks with it being seen only 6% of the time.* - Small group instruction appeared in only 23% of walks indicating that classroom teachers differentiating and pulling students into small groups is not occurring as often as it should.** - Teachers have difficulty with leveraging individual student thinking and turning it into a rich whole-class discussion. - Structured academic discourse is inconsistently implemented across ELA/Reading classrooms. Teachers

		most often call on individual students to respond rather than creating structured opportunities for all students to share, build on each other's thinking, and engage in meaningful discussion. *These percentages reflect a brief moment in time of the classroom walkthroughs. Percentages can be skewed due to the time of the walk and what was not observed before/after the walk. **These percentages reflect a brief moment in time of the classroom walkthroughs and can be skewed due to the day of the walk if teachers only pull small groups 2-3 times a week.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Lack of explicit and consistent writing instruction limits students' ability to produce grade-level writing. - Writing routines are not consistently implemented resulting in students having an unclear understanding of the writing process. - Grammar instruction is inconsistent and does not systematically address grade-level standards or student skill gaps. - Instruction is primarily teacher-centered, with limited opportunities for students to actively engage, think, and do the work of learning. - Schoolwide structures for academic discourse are not established or consistently implemented, and opportunities for meaningful student discussion are not intentionally planned. - Teachers struggle to ask higher-order, open-ended questions and to leverage student responses to extend discussions. - Teachers have difficulty analyzing assessment data and using it to plan and implement effective small groups including identifying targeted strategies, selecting appropriate materials, and managing time efficiently.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
	Root Cause Explanation:	

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

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

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the percentage of sixth-grade students scoring at the <i>High Near Target</i> and <i>Prepared</i> levels on the DRC Georgia ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 26% (5th Grade Spring 2026 baseline) to 34% (6th Grade Spring 2027 target), as measured by the Spring administration of the assessment. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the percentage of seventh-grade students scoring at the <i>High Near Target</i> and <i>Prepared</i> levels on the DRC Georgia ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 32% (6th Grade Spring 2026 baseline) to 40% (7th Grade Spring 2027 target), as measured by the Spring administration of the assessment. By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, the percentage of eighth-grade students scoring at the <i>High Near Target</i> and <i>Prepared</i> levels on the DRC Georgia ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 33% (7th Grade Spring 2026 baseline) to 41% (8th Grade Spring 2027 target), as measured by the Spring administration of the assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- The lack of consistent, explicit vocabulary instruction prevents students, especially ELL and SWD student groups, from fully accessing and engaging with academic content. Students do not have enough opportunities to learn and practice high utility academic vocabulary (Tier 2 words) that are seen across assessments.		
Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26	Evaluation Plan SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 6th–8th grade ELA and Reading teachers will implement explicit vocabulary instruction at least one time per week as measured by classroom observations and CCC lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: By the Spring administration of the ELA Beacon Assessment, at least 20% of students in grades 6–8 will score in the Prepared category in the Vocabulary domain.	Vocabulary Instructional Routine ✓ Introduce the word's pronunciation. ✓ Introduce the word's meaning. ✓ Teach the synonym(s). ✓ Complete individual and peer activities with the word. ✓ Check students' understanding.
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: ○ Provide Membean PL for all Reading teachers and set school-wide expectations:		
☒ All Students ☒ EL ☒ SWD	Evaluation Tool(s): • ELA Beacon Assessment (Vocabulary Domain Results) • Monthly Membean Quiz Results • Classroom Observation Data		

Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
1. 6th–8th Grade ELA and Reading teachers will implement explicit vocabulary instruction 4 times per week, as evidenced by CCC lesson plans and classroom observations.	▪ Membean Warm-Up for 7-10 Minutes 3-4 times per week ○ Provide refresher PD on “Text Talk” strategy (CTLS Explicit Vocabulary Instruction 101) and explicit vocabulary practices ○ Set expectations for explicit vocabulary instruction within each unit ▪ Implement one 10–15 minute weekly mini-lesson using the Text Talk strategy ▪ Teach Tier 2 words identified in the Expanded Frameworks prior to reading CommonLit/MyPerspectives texts ▪ Preview unit texts and assessments to identify and explicitly teach additional Tier 2 vocabulary as needed • August-September ○ Reading teachers introduce Membean routines and expectations ○ Implement Membean three-four times per week for 7-10 minutes as warm-up in Reading classes ○ Begin explicit vocabulary instruction using the “Text Talk” strategy at least once per week (Tier 2 words taught prior to the start of each passage within both curriculums) ○ Academic coaches support initial planning and modeling • October-December: ○ Continue consistent implementation: ▪ Membean three-four times per week	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: • August-September: ○ Establish baseline data using Fall Administration Beacon Assessment vocabulary results • October-December: ○ Review monthly Membean progress reports for usage and growth ○ Analyze classroom observations for evidence of Text Talk instruction ○ Measure progress toward December vocabulary proficiency targets by grade level • January-February: ○ Conduct mid-year data review of: ▪ Beacon interim results ▪ Membean mastery and growth trends ○ Disaggregate data by grade level, EL, and SWD ○ Adjust instructional supports based on findings • March-April: ○ Continue monthly monitoring of vocabulary growth indicators ○ Evaluate consistency of Tier 2 vocabulary application across classrooms	

	▪ Explicit vocabulary instruction using the “Text Talk” at least once per week ○ Provide daily opportunities for student application of Tier 2 vocabulary through: ▪ Turn-and-talk discussions ▪ Sentence stems requiring vocabulary use ▪ Written responses and reading activities ○ Incorporate student-centered vocabulary strategies (e.g., Frayer models, semantic maps, word sorts, words in sentences) ○ Begin administering monthly Membean quizzes ○ Coaches conduct walkthroughs focusing on explicit vocabulary instruction and student use of Tier 2 words and provide targeted feedback • January-February: ○ Continue consistent implementation: ▪ Membean three-four times per week ▪ Explicit vocabulary instruction using the “Text Talk” at least once per week ○ Increase emphasis on student application of vocabulary in speaking and writing tasks ○ Continue monthly Membean quizzes ○ Coaches continue walkthroughs and provide targeted feedback ○ CCC planning reflects intentional Tier 2 vocabulary integration	• May: ○ Analyze Spring Beacon Assessment Vocabulary results ○ Compare end-of-year data to baseline and December benchmarks ○ Determine effectiveness of Membean and Text Talk Membean mastery trends will be reviewed alongside Beacon Assessment data to determine the relationship between program usage fidelity and student vocabulary growth. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	• March-April: ○ Maintain consistent implementation across all vocabulary components ○ Connect vocabulary to EOG-style questions and writing prompts ○ Emphasize independent student use of Tier 2 vocabulary • May: ○ Review Membean and vocabulary data ○ Share out student exemplars, growth, and effective strategies to continue Artifacts to be Collected: • Membean usage and mastery reports • CCC Lesson Plans/Weekly PPTS with evidence of Text Talk Strategy • Classroom Observations • Student work showing vocabulary application Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Biweekly		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Instruction is primarily teacher-centered, with limited opportunities for students to actively engage, think, and do the work of learning.		
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 6th–8th grade teachers will integrate structured thinking routines one time per week throughout the school year, as measured by classroom observations and CCC lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May, average student scores on each CommonLit and Savvas summative assessment in grades 6–8 Reading and ELA will increase by at least 10 percentage points compared to SY '26 summative assessment averages.	Project Zero Thinking Routines
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • Revisit the SIP goal and reaffirm the Year 2 focus on shifting instruction away from teacher-centered practices. • Provide refresher professional learning focused on: ○ Student-centered learning versus teacher-centered learning ○ High-quality implementation of Project Zero Thinking Routines ○ Using routines to deepen thinking (not as stand-alone activities) • Finalize and share a schoolwide list of 5–6 “go-to” thinking routines to ensure consistency across classrooms. • Clarify implementation expectations: ○ One routine per week ○ Routines embedded within instruction (not add-ons) ○ Student thinking made visible (oral, written, or visual) • August–September: • Teachers consistently implement one thinking routine per week using selected “go-to” routines.	Evaluation Tool(s): • ELA/Reading Common Assessment CTLs Reports • Student Thinking Rubric & Work Samples • Thinking Routine Implementation Log • Summaries of Walkthrough Data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: CCC Level: • Review CCC documents weekly to verify consistent implementation of routines and the alignment of routines to the lessons objectives and texts being used.	
☒ 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. 6th–8th grade teachers will implement structured thinking routines that promote student-centered engagement, reasoning, and ownership of learning two times per week, as measured by classroom observations and CCC lesson plans.			

	• CCC teams plan warm-ups and lesson openers aligned to unit standards and texts. • Walkthroughs focus on: ○ Evidence of student thinking ○ Reduction of teacher talk during routine use • CCC discussions include glows and grows related to consistency and effectiveness • October-November: • CCC teams refine routine prompts based on the specific feedback focused on the quality of TR prompts provided by coaches during CCCs ○ Increase rigor ○ Require explanation, justification, and reflection • Teachers maintain one routine per week. • Walkthroughs continue. • CCC planning focuses on differentiation while maintaining cognitive demand. • Incorporate student voice through culturally relevant and authentic prompts. • December: • CCC teams review student work and walkthrough data to determine: ○ Which routines most effectively promote student thinking ○ Where adjustments are needed • Share examples of strong implementation and student work across grade levels. • January-February: • CCC Mini PL refresher on leveraging student responses to guide the routine and not lead it. • Teachers continue implementing one routine per week with increased emphasis on: ○ Student-to-student interaction ○ Follow-up questioning	• Analyze student work samples once per month to determine evidence of visible student thinking and depth of reasoning being used (explanations, justifications, reflections). • CCC discussion will focus on: ○ Identifying strengths in implementation ○ Refining prompts to increase rigor and student ownership ○ Adjusting scaffolds while maintaining cognitive demand Walkthrough Data: • Walkthrough data will be reviewed monthly to identify: ○ Percentage of teachers consistently implementing routines ○ Trends in student talk versus teacher talk during routines ○ Quality of implementation (student-to-student interactions, follow-up questioning) Assessment Data: • CCC teams will analyze common assessment data every two weeks. • Data analysis will focus on: ○ Comparison of CFA and CSA results to measure student growth ○ Growth trends by class and standard ○ Reviewing the thinking routines used prior to each assessment to understand their impact on student performance • Assessment results will be triangulated with walkthrough and CCC planning data	
--	--	---	--

	• CCC planning aligns routines to: ○ Writing tasks ○ Multi-step reasoning • Peer observations focus on quality of implementation using the shared walkthrough form. Debrief conversations will take place at the following CCC and will be guided by the following protocol: ○ Glows: What supported strong student thinking? ○ Grows: What could increase rigor or engagement? ○ Next Step: One specific adjustment to implement • March-April: • Consistent use of routines one time per week aligned to: ○ Test-prep questions ○ Analysis of answer choices ○ Constructed responses and justification • CCC teams refine prompts to support independent student thinking. • May: • Use routines to preview next grade-level thinking demands and standards. • Final CCC reflection on: ○ Student engagement ○ Depth of thinking ○ Sustainability of routines • CCC teams identify 2–3 priority routines to carry forward to the next school year. Artifacts to be Collected: • Classroom observation data • CCC lesson plans • Thinking routine tracking logs • Student work samples demonstrating visible thinking	to determine the impact of structured thinking routines on student achievement. Consider creating a data worksheet that has one page for each teacher/period with standards across the top and students down the side. After each common summative assessment, enter student mastery by standard. Reteach and retest student who do not met mastery expectations on first assessment. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Listening and speaking are not intentionally integrated into daily instruction, resulting in limited opportunities for students to engage in meaningful oral language and academic discourse across subjects. - Vertical alignment of language expectations is inconsistent, leading to uneven development of language skills as students progress through grade levels. - Schoolwide structures for oral language, discussion, and student-centered discourse are not clearly established or consistently implemented.		
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 6 th -8 th grade teachers will implement intentional, standards-aligned academic discourse strategies, as evidenced by lesson plans, walkthrough data, and student discussion artifacts.		Evaluation Performance Target: By May, average student scores on each CommonLit and Savvas summative assessment in grades 6–8 Reading and ELA will increase by at least 10 percentage points compared to SY '26 summative assessment averages.
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:		Evaluation Tool(s):
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD	• Preplanning: • Select 4-6 school-wide discussion strategies to be used consistently across classrooms: ○ 5 and 2 as a general rule for teachers to ensure students get time to discuss. ○ Turn and Talk ○ Think/Pair/Share or Think/Write/Pair/Share ○ QSSSA ○ Conversation Grids ○ Echo Echo		• Reading and ELA Common Summative Assessments ○ 1-2 CommonLit Unit Skills Assessments per unit (administered halfway through the unit and at the end of the unit) ○ 1 Savvas Summative Assessments (can be broken into two separate assessments and administered halfway through the unit and at the end of the unit)
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	• Develop a school-wide discussion framework including student discussion norms, sentence stems, student-friendly WIDA speaking rubric, and clear expectations for facilitating academic discussions • Provide professional learning focusing on academic discourse strategies and school-wide expectations for student discussion • Revise CCC template to include intentional student discussion opportunities		
3. 6th–8th grade teachers will implement intentional, standards-aligned academic discourse strategies daily (minimum of 2–4 planned student			Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ 2 times per nine weeks

discussion opportunities per lesson) to increase student talk, reasoning, and collaboration, as measured through classroom walkthrough data and weekly instructional planning artifacts.	• August-September: • Teachers explicitly teach and practice discussion protocols with students and display posters in classrooms (discussion norms, sentence stems, and WIDA speaking rubric) • CCC teams begin embedding two intentional student discussion opportunities per lesson • Academic Coaches model discourse routines during classroom instruction as needed • Begin classroom walkthroughs focusing on teacher-to-student talk ratio, as well as student participation and engagement in classroom academic discussions • October-December: • CCC teams increase intentional student discussion opportunities to three per lesson • Students begin taking defined roles in the discussions (speaker, responder, etc.) as determined by the discussion strategy being used • Classroom walkthroughs continue with timely, targeted feedback focused on classroom discussions • Mini PL during CCCs focusing on increasing the rigor of discussion questions and improving student accountability • CCC Discussions: Glows and grows on implementation of academic discussions, and reflection on effectiveness and adjustments needed for second semester • January-February: • Teachers review and reinforce adjusted discussion protocols with students • Add explicit active listening expectations (tracking the speaker, paraphrasing peer responses before responding, and/or using sentence stems to agree/disagree) • CCC teams continue to embed three intentional student discussion opportunities per lesson	Data Analysis Plan: Walkthrough Data: • Administration and Academic Coach will review biweekly walkthrough data to monitor: ○ Frequency of intentional student discussion opportunities ○ Teacher-to-student talk ratio ○ Student participation/engagement in academic discussions • Walkthrough data will be aggregated monthly to identify trends by grade level and CCC team • Findings will be shared during CCCs to celebrate strengths and identify targeted supports Instructional Planning Artifacts: • Weekly CCC documents and instructional PowerPoints will be reviewed to verify: ○ Planned discussion opportunities aligned to lesson objectives ○ Use of sentence stems and discussion structures • Coaches will track consistency of implementation across classrooms and provide feedback during CCCs. Assessment Data: • CCC teams will analyze CommonLit and Savvas summative assessment data two times per nine weeks. • Data analysis will focus on: ○ Comparison of midpoint and end-of-unit assessment performance ○ Growth trends by class, grade level, and standard ○ Comparison to SY '26 summative assessment averages to monitor progress toward the 10% increase target	
---	--	---	--

	• Increase the complexity of classroom discussions by requiring evidence-based responses and encouraging student-to-student questioning • Implement peer observations focused on teacher-to-student talk ratio, as well as student participation and engagement in classroom academic discussions • March-April: • CCC teams increase intentional student discussion opportunities to four per lesson • Classroom walkthroughs continue with timely, targeted feedback focused on classroom discussions • Provide more extended discussion opportunities such as short debates, collaborative inquiry tasks, etc. • Align discussion opportunities with test-prep and justifying reasoning behind answer choices • May: • CCC Discussions: Final reflection on implementation of academic discussions. Reflect on student engagement, classroom culture, and academic achievement. • Update school-wide discussion strategies and expectations for the upcoming school year Artifacts to be Collected: • CCC Documents/Weekly PowerPoints with Discussion Prompts embedded • Walkthrough Data • Student Discussion Rubrics/Checklists • Student written responses connected to discussion activities and/or discussion recordings (as appropriate) Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches	• Assessment results will be triangulated with walkthrough and planning data to determine the impact of academic discourse on student achievement. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

	Frequency of Monitoring: Biweekly		
--	-----------------------------------	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Lack of explicit and consistent writing instruction limits students’ ability to produce grade-level writing. - Gaps in foundational writing skills (sentence structure, conventions, paragraph structure) hinder students’ ability to meet grade level expectations. - There is not enough consistent use of clear and explicit teaching using gradual release, often due to curriculum demands.		
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 6th–8th grade ELA teachers will implement weekly explicit writing instruction using NoRedInk and Write Score, as evidenced by lesson plans and classroom walkthrough data.		Evaluation Performance Target: By the third administration of the Write Score assessment, students in grades 6–8 will demonstrate at least a 10% increase in the percentage of students scoring in the Proficient and Distinguished categories compared to the first administration.
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:		Evaluation Tool(s):
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD	• Preplanning: • Review SIP action step and expectations with 6th-8th grade ELA teachers • Establish instructional non-negotiables ○ Weekly Grammar Fridays using NoRedInk aligned to ELA frameworks ▪ Explicit instruction of grammar skill using NRI’s “Teach” module ▪ Assigning NRI’s “Practice” lessons to students ▪ Monitoring student progress through NoRedInk data and assigning targeted practice ▪ Connect NRI skills to writing tasks ○ 1-2 Write Score lesson series per nine weeks with each series consisting of 5-7 lessons (these will be mapped out in each grade-level's pacing once the new frameworks are available) ▪ 6th/7th Grade: Peer Revision Lesson Series		• Write Score Assessment Results
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____		NoRedInk lessons incorporated in the expanded frameworks
4. 6th–8th grade ELA teachers will implement weekly explicit writing instruction using NoRedInk for grammar and sentence structure and Write Score for grade-level writing tasks, as measured	Data Analysis Plan: • Beginning of the Year (August/September): ○ Academic coach will analyze baseline Write Score results to determine percentage of students scoring in Proficient and Distinguished categories ○ CCC teams will meet to review the Write Score data and determine		

by classroom walkthrough data and instructional planning artifacts.	▪ 8th Grade: Writing Task Lesson Series • August-September: • Provide refresher PL on NoRedInk and Write Score platforms • Administer Write Score Pre-Assessments (6th/7th Grade Peer Revision Task and 8th Grade Writing Task) • Teachers begin weekly Grammar Fridays using NoRedInk • Complete the first Write Score lesson series (5–7 lessons delivered across multiple instructional days during the week, not limited to Fridays) • Classroom walkthroughs begin focusing on explicit writing instruction • October-December: • Provide mini-PL during CCC meetings on effective writing conferences • Continue implementing weekly Grammar Fridays using NoRedInk and complete Write Score lesson series based on unit pacing completed with the academic coach • CCCs review student writing and NoRedInk data to adjust instruction • Academic coaches provide targeted feedback and support as needed • Complete Write Score Assessment #2 (End of November or Early December) • January-February: • Conduct midyear review of Write Score and NoRedInk data • Teachers refine instruction based on student progress • Continue implementing weekly Grammar Fridays using NoRedInk and complete Write Score lesson series based on unit pacing completed with the academic coach	strengths and weaknesses among the grade level ○ CCC teams will review NoRedInk diagnostic results to identify foundational grammar and sentence-structure gaps • Midyear (December/January): ○ Academic coach will analyze midyear Write Score results to determine growth ○ CCC teams will meet to review the Write Score data and determine new strengths and weaknesses and create a plan of action for the second half of the year ○ CCC teams will review NoRedInk progress data to monitor improvements in grammar and sentence-level skills. • End of the Year (March/April): ○ Academic coach will analyze final Write Score results and compare them with the first and second administrations to measure overall growth ○ CCC teams will meet to review the Write Score data and determine final growth outcomes and priority writing skills for reinforcement prior to EOG testing Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	• Provide mini-PL during CCC meetings on using Write Score data to create writing small groups during the next writing cycles • Increase emphasis on guided practice and student independence in writing • Begin incorporating EOG-style Constructing Texts questions • Complete Write Score Assessment #3 (End of February or Early March) • March-April: • Final review of Write Score and NoRedInk data • Teachers refine instruction based on most recent results • Continue implementing weekly Grammar Fridays using NoRedInk and complete Write Score lesson series based on unit pacing completed with the academic coach • Added emphasis on grade-level rigor and writing stamina • Monitoring focuses on evidence of skill transfer from NoRedInk to student writing samples • Continue incorporating EOG-style constructing texts questions in all grade levels • May: • Celebrate student writing growth through writing showcases, recognition certificates, or classroom celebrations aligned to rubric improvements • CCC reflections on effective strategies to inform planning for the following school year Artifacts to be Collected: • CCC Documents and/or Weekly Instructional PowerPoints • Classroom Walkthrough Forms • NoRedInk Reports • Student Writing Samples		
--	---	--	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Biweekly		
--	---	--	--

MATH DATA			
MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	11.7%	16%	18%
7 th Grade	14%	10.8%	14%
8 th Grade	7.8%	18.1%	15%

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
6 th Grade	72%	26%	3%	56%	34%	10%	55%	32%	13%	59%	32%	9%
7 th Grade	67%	29%	3%	60%	30%	10%	62%	28%	9%	56%	31%	13%
8 th Grade	77%	19%	4%	67%	25%	8%	60%	30%	10%	67%	28%	5%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses															
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): The 6th grade cohort from SY 25 to SY 26 increased their proficient and distinguished percent from 18% to 23%. <table> <tr> <th>Level/Year</th><th>2026</th><th>2025</th></tr> <tr> <td>Level I</td><td>84</td><td>108</td></tr> <tr> <td>Level II</td><td>90</td><td>72</td></tr> <tr> <td>Level III</td><td>38</td><td>32</td></tr> <tr> <td>Level IV</td><td>13</td><td>7</td></tr> </table> There was a 4% gain in the levels of proficient and distinguished levels for 7th grade from 14% to 18%. 8th grade 135 students increased their scale score 52 students went up a level	Level/Year	2026	2025	Level I	84	108	Level II	90	72	Level III	38	32	Level IV	13	7	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 8th Grade - 135 students increased their scale score 33 students dropped a level
Level/Year	2026	2025															
Level I	84	108															
Level II	90	72															
Level III	38	32															
Level IV	13	7															
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	6-8 (all students): Based on the 6th grade Beacon results in Math, our 6th grade students have demonstrated strengths in Measurement and Data Reasoning, with 45% scoring	6-8 (all students): Based on the 6th-grade Beacon results in Math, our 6th grade															

	Near Target or Prepared. - Based on the 7th grade Beacon results in Math, our 7th grade students have demonstrated strengths in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning with 44% scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas. - Based on the 8th grade Beacon results in Math, our 8th grade students have demonstrated strengths in Measurement and Data Reasoning with 40% scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas. EL: - The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 11% are scoring in the Near Target area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 12% are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. - The Beacon scores for our 8th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 10% are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. SWD: - The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 14% are scoring in the Near Target area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 13% are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. - The Bacon scores for our 8th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 14% are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall.	students have demonstrated weaknesses in Numerical Reasoning, with 72% scoring Support Needed. - Based on the 7th grade Beacon results in Math, our student's 7th grade students have demonstrated a weakness in Numerical Reasoning with 67% scoring Support Needed. - Based on the 8th grade Beacon results in Math, our student's 8th grade students have demonstrated a weakness in Numerical Reasoning with 77% scoring Support Needed. - The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 89% are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 88% are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 8th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 90% are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 86% are scoring in the Support Needed area. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 87% are scoring in the Support Needed area. - The Beacon scores for our 8th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 86% are scoring in the Support Needed area.
--	---	---

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	Lack of Differentiation • Instruction consistently doesn't meet the cognitive needs of ELLs and SWDs. • ELlevation platform was not used as effectively as previous year. Insufficient Collaboration Between General and Specialized Educators • Limited co-planning between ESL, special education, and general education teachers leads to fragmented support. Math Number Sense and Self-Efficacy when solving the following: • Word problems • Academic vocabulary (e.g., <i>sum</i>, <i>difference</i>, <i>evaluate</i>, <i>factor</i>) • Multi-step directions Professional Learning Provide more opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning that is centered around creating a student-focused learning environment. Inconsistent math department, teacher teams in each grade level have not been together for more than one year.	
MATH Common Assessments	6th Grade Students in 6 th grade averaged 60% or higher on common assessments focused on Numerical Reasoning . 7th Grade Students in 7 th grade averaged 70% or higher on common assessments focused Numerical Reasoning 8th Grade	Grade Levels (all students): • Less than 50% of students in each grade level scored 75% or higher on most unit assessments EL: Pearson common assessment data shows ELL students struggle with math assessments that are heavily language-dependent. Complex vocabulary, word problems, and unfamiliar sentence structures can create barriers that prevent ELLs from

	Students in 8th grade averaged 70% or higher on common assessments focused on Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning EL: The assessment scores for our EL students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages lower than their non-EL peers. SWD: The assessment scores for our SWD students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages similar to those of their non-SWD peers.	fully demonstrating their knowledge. Additionally, many assessments do not provide appropriate language supports or accommodations, putting ELLs at a disadvantage. As a result, their scores may not reflect their true mathematical ability. SWD: Pearson common assessment data shows that SWD students at Pearson is similar to their peers, consistently staying within a 5% range of non SWD common assessments average.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Vocabulary Knowledge - Math-specific terms like “altogether,” “difference,” “less than,” or “per” can be confusing without explicit instruction. Background Knowledge and Cultural Context - Word problems may include unfamiliar contexts (e.g., baseball stats, below sea level, etc) that disadvantage ELLs. - SWDs may also lack real-world experience that helps with problem interpretation. Language Proficiency ELLs: Students struggle with understanding academic vocabulary, complex sentence structures, or expressions in word problems. SWDs Students struggling with decoding or interpreting text accurately. Impact: Misunderstanding the problem leads to errors unrelated to mathematical reasoning. Professional Development - Create opportunities for teachers to learn professional development related to pre-teaching vocabulary and numerical reasoning strategies.	

School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	Based on the results from our school-developed Instructional Walks: • CCC Calendar pacing is consistent across grade levels. • 6-8 Math teachers have shown consistency in using district resources provided via CTLS. Based on data/documentation teachers have consistently used manipulatives to address student math learning needs • Small-group instruction is evident in Pearson math classes.	Based on the results from our school-developed Instructional Walks: • Learning targets and success criteria are posted but not used with students on a consistent basis. • How can we use students talking to build student to student academic discourse?
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Limited opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning focused on using student dialogue to create an academic conversation. Success criteria implemented mid-year possibly caused some teacher confusion about expectations of how to implement.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	6th Grade: By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, at least 65% of 6th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2027. 7th Grade: By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, at least 60% of 7th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2027. 8th Grade: By the end of the 2026–2027 school year, at least 60% of 8th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2027.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Vocabulary Knowledge - Math-specific terms like “reciprocal,” “expression,” “equation,” or “solution” can be confusing without explicit instruction. Background Knowledge and Cultural Context - Word problems may include unfamiliar contexts (e.g., baseball stats, below sea level, etc) that disadvantage ELLs. - SWDs may also lack real-world experience that helps with problem interpretation. Additional instructional time is needed for explicit vocabulary on math-specific terms and problems in context.		
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 math teachers will implement math vocabulary instruction weekly as measured by CCC lesson plans, teacher ppts, and CTLS assessments.	Evaluation Performance Target: By December 2026, at least 50% of students in each grade level will score 50% or higher on vocabulary assessments/questions.	CTLS-moving the needle GADOE.ORG
Target Student Group			

☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Teachers will identify vocabulary for each unit that will be implemented into CTLS assessments. Plan instructional routines and create grade level word lists. August-September: - Create a consistent system for vocabulary instruction. - Integrate words into bell ringers and exit tickets. - Introduce a math word wall—update weekly/biweekly. - Use visuals, manipulatives, and real-life contexts for abstract terms. October-December: - Administer a mid-point vocabulary quiz/test. - Use exit tickets to assess the use of vocabulary in math reasoning. January-February: - Possible refresher PL on CCC processes by local academic coach. - Department meeting to discuss implementation and adjustments as needed. March-April: - Implement vocabulary writing tasks (explain a term in your own words, math vocabulary stories). - Continue weekly/biweekly formative checks May: - Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation. Artifacts to be Collected: CTLS assessment data and CCC minutes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals	
Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v) 6-8th grade math teachers will implement Tier 2 math vocabulary instruction weekly as measured by CCC lesson plans, teacher ppts, and CTLS assessments.		By May 2027, at least 60% of students in each grade level will score 60% or higher on vocabulary assessments/questions (targets will be adjusted in January 2027 based on December performance). Evaluation Tool(s): - CTLS common assessments - Pilot block vocabulary assessments Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: - Review CCC documents weekly to review implementation of Tier 2 vocabulary to the Georgia Math Standards. - CCC discussion will focus on: - Identifying strengths in implementation and adjustments as needed. - Classroom Observations - Vocab walls aligned to the unit. Assessment Data: - CCC teams will analyze common assessment data every two weeks. - Comparison of CFA and CSA results to measure student growth - Assessment results will be used to determine the student's comprehension of vocabulary and student achievement.

	☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Academic Coach will collect vocabulary data biweekly, quarterly, and at the end of each semester.	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Student performance in grades 6–8 mathematics is impacted by inconsistent implementation of standards-aligned instructional strategies, particularly for multilingual learners.		
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 6th – 8th grade Math teachers will implement instructional strategies and resources that align to priority math standards from the ELlevation	Evaluation Performance Target: 60% of the students will score a 70% or higher grade-level math standards <u>as measured by grade-level common assessments.</u>	ELlevation CCSD ESOL Dept.
Target Student Group	platforms three to four times weekly, as measured by administrative observation of weekly CCC lesson plans and monthly walk forms.	Evaluation Tool(s): • Math Beacon Assessment • CTLS common assessments • Classroom Observation Data	
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☒ SWD	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: • Collaborate with the ESOL district coach to provide professional learning on effective instructional strategies for multilingual learners in mathematics. August-September: • Teachers begin implementing ELlevation strategies and resources at least two to three times weekly within math instruction. • Conduct classroom visits with the ESOL district coach. October-December: • Continue implementation of standards-aligned ELlevation	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: • Review CCC documents weekly to review implementation of ELlevation to Georgia Math Standards, alignment of routines to the lessons objectives, and texts being used. • CCC discussion will focus on: ○ Identifying strengths in implementation & adjustments as needed.	
6 th -8 th grade Math teachers will implement instructional strategies and resources that align to priority math standards from the Ellevation platforms two to three times weekly, as measured by administrative observation of weekly CCC lesson plans and monthly walk forms. 6–8 th grade math teachers will implement ELlevation strategies and resources aligned to priority standards 2–3 times weekly, as evidenced by CCC lesson plans and monthly walk forms.		Assessment Data: • CCC teams will analyze common assessment data every two weeks.	

	instructional strategies with increased consistency and rigor. • Provide targeted professional learning sessions led by the ESOL district coach on scaffolding and adjustments as needed. January-February: • CCC focus on refining instructional strategies connected to priority standards and identifying student weaknesses. ESOL district coach and instructional coach provide differentiated support for teachers based on walkthrough feedback and student performance trends. March-April: • CCC teams continue to review student progress and make instructional adjustments to address remaining learning gaps. • Intensify implementation of high-impact instructional strategies in preparation for GMAS and end-of-year assessments. May: • Review end-of-year student achievement data, walkthrough data, and lesson plan evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of implementation. Artifacts to be Collected: Weekly CCC Lesson Plans, SIP Walk Form	○ Comparison of CFA and CSA results to measure student growth • Assessment results will be used to determine the student's comprehension of vocabulary and student achievement. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly.		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Inconsistent implementation of structured academic discourse routines and purposeful questioning has limited opportunities for students to engage in meaningful, evidence-based discussion. Tasks often emphasize completion over reasoning, and questioning practices do not consistently require students to explain their thinking.		
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 6th – 8th grade Math teachers will implement purposeful questioning protocols (e.g., See, Think, Wonder) as measured by CCC lesson plans and classroom observations.	Evaluation Performance Target: Increase the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency by 8% in Numerical Reasoning as measured by the DRC Beacon by May 2027. Add SY26 ending proficiency	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:	Evaluation Tool(s):	
☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD	• Preplanning: • Provide professional learning on questioning strategies (e.g., <i>See, Think, Wonder</i>, higher-order questioning, wait time, student discourse structures). • Develop a shared resource bank with sentence stems, questioning frameworks, and discussion protocols.	• Math Beacon Assessment • CTLS common assessments • Classroom Observation Data	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	• August-September: • Collaborate with the district coach to develop a walkthrough form to identify and evaluate questioning strategies. • Teachers begin implementing questioning protocols at least 1–2 times per week as a baseline. • Instructional coach provides in-class modeling, co-teaching, and support for initial implementation. • October-December: • Increase implementation to 2–3 times per week with a focus on consistency and quality of questioning	Evaluation Plan: • Instructional leaders and coaches will conduct monthly walkthroughs and feedback cycles focused on the quality of questioning and student discourse. • Monitoring will include the use of a common look-for tool aligned to purposeful questioning and discourse expectations, with trends shared during leadership and CCC meetings to guide support.	
Teachers will implement purposeful questioning protocols (e.g., See, Think, Wonder) to facilitate structured academic discourse at least 2–3 times per week.		Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	

	• Share best practices and highlight effective classrooms during team meetings. • Conduct monthly walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews to monitor the fidelity of implementation. • January-February: • Provide targeted feedback on questioning effectiveness and student participation. • Conduct midyear data review (walkthroughs, student performance, engagement data). • • March-April: • Align implementation of purposeful questioning to deepen critical thinking and discourse aligned to Georgia Milestone Prep. • Conduct focused walkthroughs on student discourse, questioning depth, and engagement. • May: • Review end-of-year data including walkthrough trends, student engagement, and assessment outcomes • Identify strengths, challenges, and successful questioning strategies for future implementation. • Develop recommendations and next steps to sustain purposeful questioning practices for the next school year. Artifacts to be Collected: Artifacts will include CCC lesson plans, student discussion tasks, and teacher-created questioning sequences. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal	Data Analysis Plan: • Review CCC documents weekly to review the implementation of purposeful questioning protocols to Georgia Math Standards. • CCC discussion will focus on: ○ Identifying strengths in implementation and adjustments as needed. Assessment Data: • CCC teams will analyze common assessment data every two weeks. ○ Comparison of CFA and CSA results to measure student growth • Assessment results will be used to determine the student's numerical reasoning and student achievement. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

	☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly. CCC Minutes and classroom observations.		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April: • May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: 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>			
4. (Insert action step here)			

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA/OTHER DATA		
Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
(Name of Assessment) (Data by grade & subgroup)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
(Name of assessment) (Grade Level Reading & Writing)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
(Name of assessment) (Grade Level Reading & Writing)		

Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA / OTHER DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: OTHER			
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. (Insert action step here)	• May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
-------------------------------------	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April: • May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: 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. (Insert action step here)			

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - August-September: - October-December: - January-February: - March-April: - May:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
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. (Insert action step here)	Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<u>Required Components</u>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<u>*Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required: * Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	August 27, 2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026) Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	October 13-16, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	March 18, 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	August 17, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
5. Required: * Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visiting the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. Briefly describe the transition activities here: - Rising 9th grade families are introduced to the expectations and learning opportunities offered in High School. - Rising 6th grade families will have the choice of attending two informational sessions at Pearson.	HS – TBD Pearson – May 6, 2027		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

6. Required: Provide translated information related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u>	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
---	---	---

Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)</i>							
Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(*Must be listed in the school policy)</i>	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
Curriculum in Action Literacy Night (Reading, Language Arts, and Social Studies)	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	District Adopted Resources for MyPerspectives & CommonLit	District Title I	Sept. 10, 2026 @ 5:30 PM	Teachers, Parents, and Students collaborate and work on activities to help improve Reading skills.	Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
English classes for Parents	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Workbooks	Title I	Tuesdays and Thursdays from 6:00 PM - 7:30 PM for the Fall 2026 Semester and the Spring and Summer 2027 Semester .	English classes are offered to all Parents and families in our school community to provide support for student academic success.	Teachers Parent Facilitator
Family Data in Math and Science Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	District Approved Resources BEACON Data	Title I District	March 4, 2027 @ 5:30 PM	Teachers, Parents, and Students collaborate and work on activities to help improve Math and Science skills.	Math Teachers Academic Coach Principal Parent Facilitator

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

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

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

5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. *SWP Checklist 5(e)* **Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)**

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Pearson Middle School will integrate state and local funds and community support in several ways. Title II will provide professional development support, including staff and PL opportunities. Title III will provide language proficiency support. Pearson will utilize Twenty-day funds for tutoring support of our students struggling to meet state standards. The Student Assistance Programs department will continue supporting our Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support program (PBIS). Community Partners (Kennesaw State University, Zaxbys, Chick-fil-A, Georgia Highlands College, Life University, and Gracepoint Church) will provide volunteers and support for our parent nights and our Pearson Parent University monthly nights. These programs will work together to meet the needs of the students and families identified in the CNA and through our parent and family surveys.

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

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

SWP Checklist 4

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - 34 CFR § 200.26

7. Describe how the school regularly monitors and the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement. *SWP Checklist 3(a)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The Pearson administrative team and faculty will regularly monitor the growth of the students through formative, summative and standardized assessments and adjust instructional strategies as needed. The Pearson administrative team will provide the time for and monitor weekly professional learning communities where the teachers regularly monitor and discuss student progress, appropriate strategies, and adjustments to instructional practices.

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: Through pre- and post-assessment scores on local and state assessments, student and parent surveys, classroom observations.

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 Building Leadership Team will review the plan monthly to see if we, as a school, are implementing the strategies in place to ensure student success and parent involvement. If strategies are being followed, but are not successful, revisions will be made as needed to support and promote student achievement and parent involvement.

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

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

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

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The PBIS philosophy involves teaching behavior expectations and reinforcing them with positive rewards. This is implemented school-wide to reduce discipline and promote positive school culture. Various incentives are provided to promote and encourage positive behavior. Some of the incentives include:

- Fresh Air Friday
- Grade level dances

- Monthly/Quarterly celebrations/festivals
- Afterschool clubs and activities
- Field Trips

Also, Pearson Middle implements Restorative Circles and Restorative Conferencing that strengthen relationships between individuals and social connections within communities, thereby reducing traditional discipline. Our counselors provide professional learning based on culturally responsive frameworks to support the whole child. Lastly, Pearson Middle is entering our second year of AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) that provides additional academic and social emotional support to help improve student achievement and peer-to-peer relationships.

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: **Cobb Collaborative Communities-** Focused professional development based on high standards of teaching and learning is essential to improving teaching and increasing student achievement. It must be focused on what teachers' district-wide and in the individual schools need to know and be able to do for their students. Professional development should build "professional communities" committed to higher student learning. Continuous learning opportunities that are focused, reflective, and coherent are essential. The following are research-based practices in professional development that support career-long development of teaching and student learning:

- Provide on-going learning opportunities for all
- Improve teaching and learning
- Target higher student outcomes and instructional goals of schools that fit our profile
- Set time aside to allow teachers to implement new techniques learned and to plan collaboratively
- Involve all teachers including, Special Education, ESOL, paraprofessionals and specialists (music, art, science, math, and physical education)

The following initiatives will be used to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments:

- Mentor support from veteran teachers to those teachers that are new to our building
- Instructional Coaching for any other teacher in need of support
- Weekly collaborative team meetings focused on instruction and common assessment data
- Targeted professional learning, facilitated by the academic coaches, that is aligned to Pearson's academic goals

- Monthly school-wide research-based instructional strategies presented by teacher leaders as needed.
- Monthly instructional technology trainings as needed.
- District – continued ESOL instructional training and support.

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:** 8th Grade Articulation
- Local school counselors will meet with students to discuss high school course offerings, activities, and high school operations
- Vertical Alignment with 9th grade teachers
- 8th and 9th grade Teachers will meet and discuss the student's performance on standards, and which standards students are having trouble mastering and the supports that will need to be put in place to assist students with mastering the standards.
- Families with rising 9th graders are provided the opportunity to attend a Welcome and Orientation evening where graduation requirements, course offerings, CITA (Cobb Innovation and Technology Academy) program opportunities, and general information is provided.
- 8th Grade CTAE Pathways Fair with Osborne and Campbell High Schools
- Pearson offers the following classes to all students in grades 6-8 that will lead into the high school CTAE courses and increase awareness of opportunities for post-secondary education and the workforce.
- Business education and computer science
- Engineering
- Families also can attend the CTAE pathways fairs at both Osborne and Campbell High Schools
- 8th Grade Magnet Presentation
- District leaders' partner with local school counselors to provide students with an overview of the different high school magnet program opportunities and the application process. The High school magnet program curriculums are designed to expose and train students for post-secondary career opportunities and education.
- 8th Grade CITA Presentation (Cobb Innovation and Technology Academy)
- District leaders' partner with local school counselors to provide students with an overview of the different CITA program opportunities and the application process.
- CITA is a state-of-the-art learning environment and a tuition-free Academy for 9th-12th graders, designed to prepare students to lead tomorrow's workforce and increase the awareness of opportunities for post-secondary education. Students at the Academy will have access to work-based learning opportunities and internships, job shadowing, career-specific honor societies & even career certifications.
- Counselors visit students in classrooms throughout the year to assist students in establishing Naviance accounts and review Naviance lessons. Naviance is a planning tool that prepares students for college, career, and life readiness after high school. It creates connections

between their strengths and interests to success after high school. Each year from 6th grade through 12th grade students will participate in various learning activities that will introduce them to both career opportunities, colleges of interest, and life skills. Students can access Naviance from home and school using their school login. (Sample lessons include learning styles inventory, career matchmaker, strengths explorer, dual enrollment, advanced placement, and Individualized Graduation Plan (IGP))

- 6th Grade Open House - End of August
- Families are invited to attend a meeting where they will meet their students' teachers, learn about grade level curriculum, and school wide expectations.
- Rising 6th Grade School Visits in March or April 5th graders from our feeder elementary school will take a bus over to Pearson and take a tour of the building and hear essential information from our faculty and administration.
- Rising 6th Grade Informational Night in May-Hosted by the school administration to provide families with grade level curriculum standards, school wide expectations, and answer questions.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: N/A

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

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

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

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

Position	Supports Goal(s)	Supports which system(s)	How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?
Classroom Teacher(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Develop, implement, and facilitate standard-based instruction that supports students' understanding and mastering grade-level Standards.
Academic Coach(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	ELA/Reading Academic Coach: Supports the School Improvement Plan by leading and facilitating CCCs focused on ELA and reading, ensuring instruction is tightly aligned to standards, common assessments, and student success criteria. This role drives data-informed instruction by analyzing formative and summative data within CTLS, supporting teachers in designing targeted small group instruction, and ensuring consistent implementation of the Workshop Model, SAVVAS, and CommonLit. Additionally, the coach builds teacher capacity through modeling, feedback, and professional learning; while monitoring instructional practices such as vocabulary development, use of text evidence, and alignment between the lesson “Landing” and learning targets, all aimed at increasing student achievement and literacy outcomes. Math Academic Coach: Supports the School Improvement Plan by strengthening math instruction through data-driven decision making, targeted intervention planning, and consistent instructional practices across grade levels. This role leads CCCs with a focus on analyzing Beacon, formative, and summative data to identify trends and support the development of small group instruction, particularly for 911 (bubble) students. The coach ensures alignment to standards and promotes effective use of the Workshop Model in math, while building teacher capacity through modeling, co-planning, and feedback. Emphasis is placed on foundational skill development, problem-solving, and consistency across classrooms to improve overall student performance and growth in math.

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	
Goal #2	
Goal #3	
Goal #4	

