

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Elementary
Principal Name:	Shayna Clinkscales
Date Submitted:	June 1, 2026
Revision Date(s):	July 25, 2026, September 16, 2026

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Riverside Elementary
<i>Team Lead</i>	Shayna Clinkscales
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Shayna.clinkscales@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	770.819.5851
Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems ONLY
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only
Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>
School Response: Administration met with teachers and discussed school-wide data and next steps for improving our school-wide achievement. Data was shared with parents and stakeholders during our Spring Input meeting and Principal Advisory Committee, and feedback ideas were discussed and implemented in the plan.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:			
-----------------------	--	--	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Shayna Clinkscales	
Assistant Principal	Brandy Brown	
Academic Coach	Michelle Garner	
Academic Coach	Malissa Ocean	
CSOS Coach	Maticka Watkins	
Teacher	Johnny Ramirez Sanchez	
Teacher	Lorette Dessieux	
Teacher	Nicole Edgecombe	
Teacher	Samantha Hamilton	
Teacher	Tracy Mewborn	
Parent Facilitator	Annette Dangerfield-Lewis	
Parent		
District Academic Coach	Brittany Matthews	
District Academic Coach	Wendy Torres	

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	K-2: The percentage of students in kindergarten through second grade with an Amira ARM score at the 50th percentile or higher will increase from 33% (56 students) to 60% (103 students) by the end of the 2025-2026 school year. 3-5: The percentage of third-fifth grade students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 16.4% (31 students) to 40% (79 students) on the Milestones ELA Assessment by the end of the 2025-2026 school year.																																												
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially																																													
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Amira (K-2): Did not meet <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <tr style="background-color: #ffe4c4;"> <th style="text-align: left;">Grade Level</th><th colspan="3">Amira % at or above the 50th Percentile</th></tr> <tr> <th></th><th style="text-align: center;">BOY</th><th style="text-align: center;">MOY</th><th style="text-align: center;">EOY</th></tr> <tr> <td>Kindergarten</td><td style="text-align: center;">34% (13/38)</td><td style="text-align: center;">42% (16/38)</td><td style="text-align: center;">61% (25/41)</td></tr> <tr> <td>First Grade</td><td style="text-align: center;">36% (20/55)</td><td style="text-align: center;">32% (19/60)</td><td style="text-align: center;">45% (25/56)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Second Grade</td><td style="text-align: center;">35% (18/51)</td><td style="text-align: center;">45% (20/44)</td><td style="text-align: center;">30% (12/41)</td></tr> <tr> <td>K-2 Totals</td><td style="text-align: center;">35% (51/144)</td><td style="text-align: center;">39% (55/142)</td><td style="text-align: center;">45% (62/138)</td></tr> </table> We don't have ELA EOG data at this point so we are using Beacon data. <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <tr style="background-color: #ffe4c4;"> <th colspan="4">3-5 Spring Beacon Data- ELA</th></tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Grade Level</th><th style="text-align: center;">Support Needed</th><th style="text-align: center;">Near Target</th><th style="text-align: center;">Prepared</th></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td><td style="text-align: center;">17%</td><td style="text-align: center;">77%</td><td style="text-align: center;">6%</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td><td style="text-align: center;">33%</td><td style="text-align: center;">59%</td><td style="text-align: center;">8%</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td><td style="text-align: center;">43%</td><td style="text-align: center;">48%</td><td style="text-align: center;">9%</td></tr> </table> Grade 3 Near Target and Prepared= 83%- projected to reach a 3 or higher on ELA EOG. Grade 4 Near Target and Prepared= 67%- projected to reach a 3 or higher on ELA EOG. Grade 5 Near Target and Prepared= 57%- projected to reach a 3 or higher on ELA EOG. **Based on this data for grade 3-5 we could reach our ELA goal (40% of students earning a 3 or higher).	Grade Level	Amira % at or above the 50 th Percentile				BOY	MOY	EOY	Kindergarten	34% (13/38)	42% (16/38)	61% (25/41)	First Grade	36% (20/55)	32% (19/60)	45% (25/56)	Second Grade	35% (18/51)	45% (20/44)	30% (12/41)	K-2 Totals	35% (51/144)	39% (55/142)	45% (62/138)	3-5 Spring Beacon Data- ELA				Grade Level	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	3	17%	77%	6%	4	33%	59%	8%	5	43%	48%	9%
Grade Level	Amira % at or above the 50 th Percentile																																												
	BOY	MOY	EOY																																										
Kindergarten	34% (13/38)	42% (16/38)	61% (25/41)																																										
First Grade	36% (20/55)	32% (19/60)	45% (25/56)																																										
Second Grade	35% (18/51)	45% (20/44)	30% (12/41)																																										
K-2 Totals	35% (51/144)	39% (55/142)	45% (62/138)																																										
3-5 Spring Beacon Data- ELA																																													
Grade Level	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared																																										
3	17%	77%	6%																																										
4	33%	59%	8%																																										
5	43%	48%	9%																																										
Reflecting on Outcomes																																													

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Based on the data we have now, we did not meet our ELA SIP goal. • Actionable strategies to implement that would address this: Consistent small group instruction that is targeted, formed based on data, and implemented with fidelity • Progress monitoring used consistently to adjust instruction • Emphasis placed on mastery vs. coverage due to pacing demands • Focus on accurate/timely decoding • Focus on fluency and reading/writing stamina • School wide routines for constructed response questions • Data driven CCC's
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

Previous Year's Goal #2	K-2 Math Goal: The percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring Overall "Prepared" will increase from 2% (2 students out of 132 students) to 25% (33 students out of 132 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 Spring Beacon Math Assessment.																							
	3-5 Math Goal: The percent of 3rd through 5th grade students scoring in the Proficient and/or Distinguished Learner Range will increase from 16.4% (31 students out of 189 students) to 32% (60 students out of 189 students) as measured by the 2025-2026 EOG Math Assessment.																							
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially																								
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">First and Second Grade Math Beacon Data – % Prepared 2025 - 2026</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>BOY</th> <th>MOY</th> <th>EOY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1st Grade</td> <td>1%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd Grade</td> <td>1%</td> <td>4%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2%</td> <td>5%</td> <td>26%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				First and Second Grade Math Beacon Data – % Prepared 2025 - 2026					BOY	MOY	EOY	1 st Grade	1%	6%	35%	2 nd Grade	1%	4%	15%	Total	2%	5%	26%
First and Second Grade Math Beacon Data – % Prepared 2025 - 2026																								
	BOY	MOY	EOY																					
1 st Grade	1%	6%	35%																					
2 nd Grade	1%	4%	15%																					
Total	2%	5%	26%																					

First and Second Grade met their Math goal, with 26% (31 out of 120) students scoring Overall “Prepared” as measured by the 2025 – 2026 Spring Beacon Math Assessment.

2024 – 2026 End of Grade Math Data		
	2024 -2025	2025 - 2026
	Proficient/Distinguished	Proficient/Distinguished
3 rd Grade	21.9%	30%
4 th Grade	11.7%	38%
5 th Grade	13.7%	17%
Total	16.4%	28%

3rd–5th grade did not meet their End-of-Grade Math goal. We increased from 16.4% to 28% proficient and distinguished on the End-of-Grade Math Assessment. We had 34 5th graders retake the test, and we are hopeful that the percentage will increase once scores are back. To reach our goal, 6 additional 5th graders will need to score proficiently on the End of Grade Math Retake Assessment.

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?

Based on the data we have now, we did not meet our Math 3rd-5th SIP goal.

Actionable strategies to implement that would address this:

- Embed daily academic vocabulary and application tasks: Require every math lesson to include 3–5 key vocabulary terms with explicit instruction and at least one real-world problem that applies the skill being taught.
- Implement consistent routines for vocabulary and discourse: Use structured strategies (word walls, sentence stems, turn-and-talk), so students regularly explain their thinking using precise math language.
- Increase rigor through multi-step, real-world problem-solving: Incorporate weekly performance tasks that require students to solve, model, and justify solutions in authentic contexts.
- Strengthen planning and resource alignment: Provide teachers with standards-aligned vocabulary support and real-world task banks and require intentional planning for both vocabulary development and application.
- Use data and student work to drive instruction: Analyze student responses in PLCs to identify gaps in vocabulary use and problem-solving, and plan targeted reteaching accordingly.
- Build teacher capacity and monitor implementation: Provide ongoing professional learning and conduct walkthroughs focusing on student use of academic vocabulary, engagement in problem-solving, and quality of mathematical explanations.

If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the

Based on the data we have now, we have met our 1st–2nd-grade SIP Math Goal. Below are actions that contributed to this.

- Implemented targeted small-group instruction: Teachers used data to group students by specific skill needs and provided focused, differentiated support during daily math instruction.
- Increased rigor through use of state learning plans: Lessons were aligned to state expectations, ensuring students engaged with grade-level standards and higher-order thinking tasks consistently.
- Enhanced use of math strategies and manipulatives: Teachers incorporated hands-on tools and multiple problem-solving strategies to deepen conceptual understanding.
- Provided consistent opportunities for guided and independent practice: Students engaged in structured practice that reinforced skills and built confidence toward mastery.

success of the goal?	- Used ongoing data monitoring to adjust instruction: Teachers regularly assessed student progress and made timely instructional adjustments to address gaps. - Strengthened Tier 1 instruction: Core math instruction became more intentional, engaging, and aligned, reducing the number of students needing intensive intervention.
----------------------	---

Previous Year's Goal #3	By the end of the academic year, our school will increase positive student behavior and engagement by implementing the Ron Clark Experience House System as part of our PBIS framework, aiming for a 20% reduction in behavior referrals.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

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	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	8.4%	10.5%	17.8%	
4 th Grade	14.4%	14.4%	11.4%	
5 th Grade	5.6%	20.4%	17.2%	

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Foundations			Language			Texts			Interpreting Texts			Constructing Texts		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	15%	46%	39%	27%	57%	16%	33%	46%	21%	16%	60%	24%	45%	36%	19%
2 nd Grade	21%	47%	32%	38%	43%	19%	51%	26%	23%	34%	40%	26%	43%	47%	9%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade	27%	68%	5%	19%	69%	12%	19%	70%	10%	44%	49%	6%	29%	65%	6%	12%	82%	6%	35%	60%	5%
4 th Grade	30%	56%	15%	23%	61%	16%	33%	56%	11%	56%	39%	5%	41%	49%	10%	36%	52%	11%	38%	52%	10%
5 th Grade	40%	48%	12%	31%	55%	14%	36%	53%	10%	52%	40%	9%	47%	43%	10%	43%	45%	12%	41%	45%	14%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Student Groups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): No data available yet EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): No data available yet EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Student groups)	Grade Levels (all students): Listening comprehension, literal comprehension/ recall, basic vocabulary in context 39% prepared in Foundations- 1 st grade 32% prepared in Foundations- 2 nd grade 12% prepared in IT: Texts: Techniques- 3 rd grade 16% prepared in IT: Texts: Techniques- 4 th grade 14% prepared in IT: Texts: Techniques- 5 th grade EL: 1 ST and 2 nd grade were the only grades to have prepared students- 7% in 1 st and 5% in 2 nd SWD: Listening comprehension tasks Literal comprehension / recall	Grade Levels (all students): Higher-order comprehension skills, text-based responses (constructed response), reading stamina and independence, fluency 45% support needed in Constructing Texts- 1 st grade 51% support needed in Texts- 2 nd grade 44% support needed in Interpreting Texts: Listening- 3 rd grade 56% support needed in Interpreting Texts: Listening- 4 th grade 52% support needed in Interpreting Texts: Listening- 5 th grade EL: 5 th grade had highest amount of students scoring support needed- 61% 3 rd , 4 th , and 5 th grades had no prepared students SWD: Decoding and word recognition (especially in upper grades) Reading fluency Complex text comprehension Text-based responses / constructed response
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Teacher teams demonstrate a need for increased capacity in analyzing multiple data sources, aligning appropriate instructional resources, and determining effective time allocation for small group and intervention instruction.	

ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: Listening was the highest-scoring category for the school. 25% students scored in the developing category (3.0-3.9)- Up from last year 21% scored in the approaching category (4.0-6.0)- up from last year 16 students were exited (twice as many as last year) 14 is very close to exiting SWD: 1 student is close to exiting	Grade Levels (all students): EL: Writing was the lowest-scoring category for the school. 54% of students scored in the entering/emerging category (1.0-2.9) SWD: No students exited - long-term ELs
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Teachers do not closely monitor EL students' data and implement specific instruction using EL strategies across all content areas and in small groups.	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing) Wonders/UFLI Common Assessments	Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten and first grade overall scored higher because teachers were able to read the passages/questions to students. For kindergarten, the odd number unit assessments were higher because only foundational skills were assessed- even number assessments had comprehension, and typically, students scored lower. 1 st grade average: 50% scoring on or beyond 2 nd grade average: 10% scoring on or beyond 3 rd grade average: 11% scoring on or beyond 4 th grade average: 11% scoring on or beyond 5 th grade average: 17% scoring on or beyond Foundational skills, such as phonics, are highest in K-2	Grade Levels (all students): Starting in 2 nd grade, scores were overall low due to lack of ability to independently read the passages and struggles with written responses. In kindergarten, even-numbered assessments included comprehension, and typically, students scored lower. 1 st grade average: 36% scoring below 2 nd grade average: 82% scoring below 3 rd grade average: 79% scoring below 4 th grade average: 75% scoring below 5 th grade average: 73% scoring below EL: EL students scored primarily in the below category- passages hard to read independently, and they struggle with writing SWD:

	UFLI data shows that scores increased once we slowed down the pacing in Q4 to one lesson per week- See chart below for EOY: <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Grade Level</th><th colspan="3">UFLI % of students scoring Proficient</th></tr><tr><th>BOY (end of unit 1)</th><th>MOY</th><th>EOY</th></tr><tr><td>Kindergarten</td><td>28%</td><td>33%</td><td>44%</td></tr><tr><td>First Grade</td><td>29%</td><td>41%</td><td>65%</td></tr><tr><td>Second Grade</td><td>42%</td><td>53%</td><td>62%</td></tr><tr><td>K-2</td><td>33%</td><td>42%</td><td>57%</td></tr></table> EL: Across all ELA common assessments, EL subgroup consistently performed below proficiency levels. SWD: Scores for UFLI increased once we slowed down the pacing in Q4 to one lesson per week	Grade Level	UFLI % of students scoring Proficient			BOY (end of unit 1)	MOY	EOY	Kindergarten	28%	33%	44%	First Grade	29%	41%	65%	Second Grade	42%	53%	62%	K-2	33%	42%	57%	Across all ELA common assessments, the SWD subgroup consistently performed below proficiency levels.
Grade Level	UFLI % of students scoring Proficient																								
	BOY (end of unit 1)	MOY	EOY																						
Kindergarten	28%	33%	44%																						
First Grade	29%	41%	65%																						
Second Grade	42%	53%	62%																						
K-2	33%	42%	57%																						
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Instructional pacing that limits opportunities for skill mastery, along with inconsistencies in alignment to Georgia ELA standards, limited use of data-driven differentiation, and a lack of effective small group instruction, have contributed to low student performance on Wonders unit assessments.																								
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) What instructional practices/processes are consistently observed during ELA walks?	Instructional strengths observed include clearly posted learning targets aligned to student activities, increased opportunities for student discourse, and consistent use of county Tier 1 instructional resources.	Walkthrough data indicate a need for improved instructional preparation, greater clarity on the new Georgia ELA standards, and more consistent use of student data to guide small-group instruction.																							

• What instructional practices/processes are consistently missing or ineffective during ELA walks?		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: While teachers are effectively implementing core instructional structures, the need for a deeper understanding of the new Georgia ELA standards and data-driven differentiation has led to inconsistencies in lesson preparation and small-group instruction.	
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: 	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	K-2: The percentage of students in kindergarten through second grade with an Amira ARM score at the 50th percentile or higher will increase from 45% (62/138) to 60% (103 students) by the end of the 2026-2027 school year. 3-5: The percentage of third-fifth grade students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 16.4% (31 students) to 40% (79 students) on the Milestones ELA Assessment by the end of the 2026-2027 school year.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teacher teams demonstrate a need for increased capacity in aligning appropriate instructional resources used to determine effective small group instruction.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 75% of K-2 teachers will provide small-group phonics instruction 3 times per week for 20 minutes using UFLI resources and tiered resources from Wonders by October 1, 2026. 100% of K-2 teachers will provide small-group phonics instruction 3 times per week for 20 minutes using UFLI resources and tiered resources by Wonders by December 1, 2026 Implementation Plan: • Early August: Facilitate refresher professional learning for all K-2 teachers focused on small-group instruction practices, UFLI and Wonders resources.	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 65% of students in grades K-2 will score 80% or higher on the weekly UFLI assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): • UFLI weekly assessments • Small Group Look Fors Forms Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ <u>weekly</u>	Wonders UFLI Handwriting Without Tears and Building Writers resources. Academic ORF Assessment
Target Student Group			
☒ All Students ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. K-2 teachers will provide small group phonics instruction 3 times per week for 20 minutes using UFLI foundations and tiered resources from Wonders, as measured by classroom observations and UFLI assessment checks.	Review small-group instructional look-for form (checklist). • August-September: • Use diagnostic assessment data to identify student needs and form small groups for phonics instruction. • Begin small group phonics instruction and use formative assessment data to adjust groups as needed (UFLI weekly formative assessments). • October-December: • Implement weekly collaborative small group planning. • January-February: • Team leads conduct teacher rounds to support identified teachers with implementing small group instruction or using UFLI resources with fidelity. • Provide PL based on what is needed from teacher rounds/classroom observations. • March-April: • Teachers self-reflect to identify areas of need for future PL. Artifacts to be Collected: Formative assessment samples- teachers bring formative assessment samples to data meetings Small Group Planning Minutes UFLI data- weekly data spreadsheet Small Group Look Fors Form- checklist of expected small group elements Small Group student samples Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ EIP Lead Teachers ☒ Teacher Leaders	Data Analysis Plan: • CCC: Grade level teachers will give UFLI assessments weekly which will be looked at each week to plan for small groups. One data meeting a month will address UFLI data overall. • Leadership Team to analyze small groups and look for form data monthly. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ EIP Lead Teachers ☒ Classroom Teachers	
---	--	--	--

	Frequency of Monitoring: Teachers review student data weekly to plan small groups, and CCC teams monitor student UFLI data monthly.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teacher teams demonstrate a need for increased capacity to align appropriate instructional resources to determine effective small-group instruction.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 75% of 3-5 teachers will provide small-group comprehension instruction for 20 minutes, 3 times per week, by October 1, 2026. 100% of 3-5 teachers will provide small-group comprehension instruction 3 times per week for 20 minutes by December 1, 2026	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 65% of students in grades 3-5 will score 80% or higher on our common assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): • Common Assessments • Small Group Look Fors Form	CTLS Wonders UFLI
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. 3-5 teachers will provide small group instruction at least 3 times per week for 20 minutes using data-informed strategies with progress monitored by	Implementation Plan: Early August: Facilitate refresher professional learning for all 3-5 teachers focused on small-group instructional strategies. Review the small-group instructional look-for form. August-September: • Use diagnostic assessment data to identify student needs and form small groups. • Begin small group planning and instruction and use formative assessment data to adjust groups as needed. October-December:	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: • CCC: Grade-level teachers will give common assessments biweekly, which will be looked at to plan for small groups. One data meeting a month will address overall data. • The Leadership Team analyzes the small group, look-for form data monthly.	

classroom observations and common assessments.	- Continue small group planning and instruction and use formative assessment data to adjust groups as needed. January-February: - Conduct teacher rounds to support identified teachers with implementing small group instruction with fidelity. - Provide PL based on what is needed from teacher rounds/classroom observations. March-April: - Teachers self-reflect to identify areas of need for future PL. Artifacts to be Collected: - Small Group Planning/Rotation Schedules and groupings/Anecdotal Notes - Small Group Look Fors Form - Formative Assessment Data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ EIP Lead Teachers ☒ Teacher Leaders Frequency of Monitoring: Teachers review student data weekly to plan small groups and CCC teams monitor student data monthly.	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ EIP Lead Teachers ☒ Classroom Teachers	
---	---	---	--

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	10.1%	21.9%	30%
4 th Grade	17.5%	11.7%	38%
5 th Grade	14.6%	13.7%	17%

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
Kindergarten (Winter Administration)	37	53	10	41	45	14	53	27	20	55	25	10
1 st Grade	17	50	33	17	39	44	11	39	50	23	52	26
2 nd Grade	43	46	11	39	41	20	56	30	15	17	39	44
3 rd Grade	18	78	4	11	86	3	14	85	1	26	74	9
4 th Grade	44	51	5	49	43	8	51	49		39	51	10
5 th Grade	66	29	5	66	34		57	38	5	67	29	3

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Grade Level & Student Groups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Students in grades 3rd – 5th scored the highest percentage of met or exceeded target in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning. The overall average of 21% of students scored proficient in this math domain. 3rd-grade students from FY25 increased their math proficiency from 21.9% proficient to 38% proficient in 4th grade for FY26. 4th-grade students in FY25 increased their math proficiency from 11.7% to 17% in 5th-grade FY26. The percentage of 5th graders scoring proficient increased from 13.7% to 17% from FY25 to FY26.	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Over 80% of students scored below target in all math areas of the End of Grade Math Assessment. Students scored the lowest in Measurement and Data Reasoning, with an overall average of 14% proficient in this math domain. Students struggle to reason through problems to understand what operation they need to use to solve word problems. Students struggle with applying strategies to solve problems correctly.

	EL: SWD: <table><tr><th colspan="5">Spring 2026 EOG Math Data By Category Percentage of Students Who Met or Exceeded</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>NR</th><th>PAR</th><th>MDR</th><th>GSR</th></tr><tr><td>5th</td><td>9%</td><td>21%</td><td>5%</td><td>9%</td></tr><tr><td>4th</td><td>24%</td><td>22%</td><td>28%</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>3rd</td><td>19%</td><td>19%</td><td>10%</td><td>21%</td></tr></table>	Spring 2026 EOG Math Data By Category Percentage of Students Who Met or Exceeded						NR	PAR	MDR	GSR	5 th	9%	21%	5%	9%	4 th	24%	22%	28%	19%	3 rd	19%	19%	10%	21%	EL: SWD: <table><tr><th colspan="5">Spring 2026 EOG Math Data By Category Percentage of Students Who Scored Below</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>NR</th><th>PAR</th><th>MDR</th><th>GSR</th></tr><tr><td>5th</td><td>79%</td><td>55%</td><td>55%</td><td>71%</td></tr><tr><td>4th</td><td>62%</td><td>59%</td><td>55%</td><td>57%</td></tr><tr><td>3rd</td><td>61%</td><td>65%</td><td>53%</td><td>61%</td></tr></table>	Spring 2026 EOG Math Data By Category Percentage of Students Who Scored Below						NR	PAR	MDR	GSR	5 th	79%	55%	55%	71%	4 th	62%	59%	55%	57%	3 rd	61%	65%	53%	61%
Spring 2026 EOG Math Data By Category Percentage of Students Who Met or Exceeded																																																				
	NR	PAR	MDR	GSR																																																
5 th	9%	21%	5%	9%																																																
4 th	24%	22%	28%	19%																																																
3 rd	19%	19%	10%	21%																																																
Spring 2026 EOG Math Data By Category Percentage of Students Who Scored Below																																																				
	NR	PAR	MDR	GSR																																																
5 th	79%	55%	55%	71%																																																
4 th	62%	59%	55%	57%																																																
3 rd	61%	65%	53%	61%																																																
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Student Groups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): There is an increase in students scoring proficient overall from the Fall Beacon to the Spring Beacon Administration in grades 1st, 2nd, and 4th. EL: Our EL students' scores were comparable to county-level scores. Our students overall scored in the same range as other EL students throughout the county. 4th Grade EL students scored 75% in Near Target overall proficiency. SWD: Overall, 2nd-grade IRR students scored higher than regular education 2nd-grade students. <table><tr><th></th><th></th><th>K</th><th>1st</th><th>2nd</th><th>3rd</th><th>4th</th><th>5th</th></tr><tr><td>NR</td><td>SN</td><td>37%</td><td>17%</td><td>43%</td><td>18%</td><td>44%</td><td>66%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>NT</td><td>53%</td><td>50%</td><td>46%</td><td>78%</td><td>51%</td><td>29%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>P</td><td>10%</td><td>33%</td><td>11%</td><td>4%</td><td>5%</td><td>5%</td></tr></table>			K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	NR	SN	37%	17%	43%	18%	44%	66%		NT	53%	50%	46%	78%	51%	29%		P	10%	33%	11%	4%	5%	5%	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Overall, the percentage of students scoring proficient in Numerical Reasoning was lower than the other Math Domains across all grade levels. EL: Kindergarten –EL scored 50%, Support Needed in overall proficiency. SWD: 100% of students in IRR 5th grade scored "Needs Improvement" on their overall proficiency.																		
		K	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th																																													
NR	SN	37%	17%	43%	18%	44%	66%																																													
	NT	53%	50%	46%	78%	51%	29%																																													
	P	10%	33%	11%	4%	5%	5%																																													

PAR	SN	41%	17%	39%	11%	49%	66%
	NT	45%	39%	41%	86%	43%	34%
	P	14%	44%	20%	3%	8%	
MDR	SN	53%	11%	56%	14%	51%	57%
	NT	27%	39%	30%	85%	49%	38%
	P	20%	50%	15%	1%		5%
GSR	SN	55%	23%	17%	26%	39%	67%
	NT	35%	52%	39%	74%	51%	29%
	P	10%	56%	44%	9%	10%	3%

2026 Spring Math Beacon Data												
	K		1 st		2 nd		3 rd		4 th		5 th	
	SWD	EL	SWD	EL	SWD	EL	SWD	EL	SWD	EL	SWD	EL
SN	33%	77%	13%	15%	50%	48%	23%	8%	78%	58%	88%	74%
NT	56%	23%	63%	62%	50%	43%	75%	92%	22%	42%	13%	26%
P	11%		25%	23%		9%						

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

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

Root Cause Explanation:

Teacher teams demonstrated limited integration of academic vocabulary within mathematics instruction due to the absence of intentional planning for vocabulary development and insufficient access to instructional resources that effectively embed vocabulary into math lessons.

MATH Common Assessments

For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD

Grade Levels (all students):

Kindergarten students showed an increase in proficiency in math common assessments throughout the school year.

For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD

Grade Levels (all students):

Overall, the average percentage of students scoring Proficient or higher on each Math Common Assessment was less than 50%.

	Math Common Assessment Data 2025 – 2026 - % Proficient or Higher								The overall average of students in grades 3 and 5 who score proficient is around 20% - 25%.
		Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8
	K	33%	50%	32%	63%	66%	67%	70%	
	1 st	46%	30%	48%	37%	34%			
	2 nd	25%	23%	15%	33%	40%	49%	21%	56%
	3 rd	0%	21%	17%	28%	19%	34%	6%	24%
	4 th	19%	16%	32%	26% 46%	63%	47%		
	5 th	26%	27%	26%	12%	28%	9%	19%	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:								
	Teacher teams demonstrated limited integration of real-world problem-solving in daily mathematics instruction, as lessons primarily emphasized teaching math strategies with minimal focus on applying those strategies to authentic, real-world contexts.								
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) - What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during walks? - What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during walks?	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Walkthrough data indicated: Student discourse increased from less than 25% to 50% throughout the school year Increase in student use of manipulatives Teachers using Tier 1 Math Resources with fidelity								For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Walkthrough data indicated: limited use of real-world connections limited lessons that involved student engagement limited usage of anchor charts 10% of teachers pulling small groups with fidelity

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	K-2 Math Goal: The percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring Overall "Prepared" will increase from 25% (43 students out of 170 students) to 50% (85 students out of 170 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 Spring Beacon Math Assessment. 3-5 Math Goal The percent of 3rd through 5th grade students scoring in the Proficient and/or Distinguished Learner Range will increase from 28% (55 students out of 193 students) to 40% (77 students out of 189 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG Math Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teacher teams demonstrated limited integration of real-world problem-solving in daily mathematics instruction, as lessons primarily emphasized teaching math strategies with minimal focus on applying those strategies to authentic, real-world contexts.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100 % of teachers will implement Polya's Word Problem Strategy with fidelity by the end of semester 1. Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • Teachers will receive training on student discourse training at LEI. • August-September: • Teachers will receive training on Polya's Word Problem Solving (all 4 steps) Strategy.	Evaluation Performance Target: 65% (240 out of 370) of students will score proficient 80% or higher on Math Common Unit Assessments Evaluation Tool(s): • Math Common Math Assessments • Baseline walk-through data collected focusing on Polya's Problems Solving and student math discourse • Polya's Walk Through Look-For Form Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks	Math journals for all students Teacher-Friendly Strategy Guides: Question stems aligned to each Polya step Strategy lists (draw a model,
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

All classroom teachers will implement Polya's Mathematical Problem-Solving Strategy daily as evidenced by classroom observations and instructional walk data.	- Teacher will implement Polya's Word Problem Solving Strategy (all 4 steps) by September 1. October-December: - October Walks will focus only on the implementation of the first 2 steps of Polya's Problem Solving Strategy and student discourse: Understand the Problem, Devise A Plan - October Professional Learning will take place as needed for a refresher on "understand the problem", "devise a plan," and "carry out the plan" as needed. - October PL: District Coach will provide additional PL on teacher questioning and student discourse based on walk baseline data. - November Walks will focus on: Understand the Problem, Devise A Plan, Carry Out the Plan - November Professional Learning will take place as needed for a refresher for all 4 steps of the problem-solving strategy and student discourse as needed. - December Walks will focus on: Understand the Problem, Devise A Plan, Carry Out the Plan, Look Back January-February: - January Professional Learning will take place as needed for a refresher for all 4 steps of the problem-solving strategy and student discourse as needed. Re-establish non-negotiables and Look Fors. - January Professional Learning "Equitable Math Discourse Through Polya's Problem-Solving: Supporting ELs and Students with Disabilities" - One-on-one coaching support for teachers who require additional support using Polya's Mathematical Problem-Solving Strategy. - Evaluation of overall Math Common Assessment data. - Revise and Next Steps - March-April:	☒ Monthly – Classroom Student Discourse Look-Fors and Implementation of Polya's Look-Fors Walks ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ ____ Add the end of each unit for Assessments Data Analysis Plan: - CCC: Grade-level teachers will give Math Common assessments for each unit: pre, mid, and post. Data meetings will be held to review pre-, mid-, and post-math data. - Semester 2 data meetings will view Math Common Assessment with a focus on the needs of diverse learners: ELs, SWD. - Leadership Team to analyze Baseline walk-through data for Polya's and math discourse - Leadership Team to analyze Math Common Assessment, Post Data, and Walk-Through Data Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal- Conduct walks, collect data, monitor walk-through data, and provide feedback ☒ Assistant Principals – Conduct walks, collect data, monitor walk-through data, and provide feedback ☒ Academic Coaches – Conduct walks, collect data, provide coaching support, and coaching cycles ☒ Teachers – Daily implementation and reflection ☒ CCC Leads – Conduct walks, analyze data to help inform planning and instruction in the CCCS, analyze student work, and adjust instruction	guess/check, etc.) Sample anchor charts Word walls for problem-solving terms Visual vocabulary cards Sentence frames for explanations Manipulatives Tools for English Learners: Text-to-speech Visual supports Problem-Solving Rubrics Parent-Friendly Guides with simple explanations of Polya's steps and tips to help at home
---	--	--	---

	- Teachers will self-reflect of their own implementation of Polya's Word Problem-Solving Strategy and Identify areas they need additional support. - May: Evaluation and Next Steps - Analyze: Walk-through data trends, Student achievement data - Celebrating successes - Develop a plan for next year - Evidence: End-of-year reports, Teacher reflections - Monitoring: Final implementation rating for each grade level Artifacts to be Collected: Classroom observations and Walk data Transformation Walk Data Math Common Assessments Common formative Assessments PL Attendance Log Lesson Plans Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ Teacher Peers Frequency of Monitoring: Common Formatives – weekly Math Common Assessments – at the beginning, middle, and end of math units		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teacher teams demonstrated limited integration of academic vocabulary within mathematics instruction due to the absence of intentional planning for vocabulary development and insufficient access to instructional resources that effectively embed vocabulary into math lessons.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title By I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: By January 2027, 100% of teachers will include explicit math vocabulary routines in their weekly lesson plans. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: - All teachers will receive PL from school-level coaches on Explicit Vocabulary Routines, which will be a non-negotiable for all teachers in the building from both District and GaDOE State Math Plans into daily math instruction. - K-5 teachers will examine District and GaDOE State Math Plans with a focus on vocabulary and identify priority vocabulary aligned to upcoming math units. August-September: - August: Teachers begin posting and introducing math vocabulary daily. - September: Teachers embed explicit vocabulary instruction into lessons through visuals, and student discourse. October-December: - October walks will focus on the evidence of math vocabulary visuals that are available for students' usage and students using math vocabulary during student discourse. - CCCs will meet to analyze student common assessments and observation walk feedback.	Evaluation Performance Target: 65% (240 out of 370) of students will score proficient 80% or higher on Math Common Unit Assessments Evaluation Tool(s): - Baseline data from previous math common assessments and initial observation walkthrough. - Math Common Unit Assessment - Polya's Walk-Through Form(vocabulary look fors included) Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly – Polya's Walk-Through Form (vocabulary look fors included) ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ ____Add the end of each unit for Assessments Data Analysis Plan: - CCC: Grade level teachers will give Math Common assessments for each unit: pre, mid and post. Data meetings will occur to view pre, mid and post math data. - Semester 2 data meetings will view Math Common Assessment with targeting gaps in vocabulary. - Leadership Team to analyze Baseline walk-through data	Math vocabulary lists Frayer Model Templates Sentence Stems Visual supports Math journals
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(iii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)</i>			
All classroom teachers will explicitly integrate targeted math vocabulary instruction into daily math lessons, as evidenced by weekly classroom observations, as measured through performance trends on math common assessments.			

	November: - November Professional Learning will take place as needed for a refresher on explicit vocabulary routines with a focus only on Math vocabulary - Coaching cycles to begin for teachers needing support. January-February: <i>January:</i> School Improvement Team meet for Mid-year reflection on effectiveness of the strategy <i>January:</i> CCCs meet to refine strategies based on walkthrough data. <i>January PD:</i> Targeting gaps in vocabulary understanding - Targeted coaching sessions with teachers needing additional support. <i>February:</i> Refresher PD with advanced strategies that include increase accountable talk and vocabulary usage with a focus on student ownership of using math vocabulary daily. March-April: - Teachers will self-reflect of their own implementation of Math Vocabulary Instruction and identify areas they need additional support. - Continued targeted coaching sessions May: <i>Evaluation and Next Steps</i> <i>Analyze:</i> Walk-through data trends, Student achievement data - Celebrating successes - Develop a plan for next year <i>Evidence:</i> End-of-year reports, Teacher reflections	- Leadership Team to analyze Math Common Assessment Post Data and Walk-Through Data Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal- Conduct walks, collect data, monitor walk-through data and provide feedback ☒ Assistant Principals – Conduct walks, collect data, monitor walk-through data and provide feedback ☒ Academic Coaches – Conduct walks, collect data, Provide coaching support and coaching cycles ☒ Teachers – Daily implementation and reflection ☒ CCC Leads – Conduct walks, analyze data to help inform planning and instruction in the CCCS, analyze student work and adjust instruction	
--	---	---	--

	• <i>Monitoring:</i> Final implementation rating for each grade level Artifacts to be Collected: Classroom observations and Walk data Transformation Walk Data Math Common Assessments Common formative Assessments PL Attendance Log Lesson Plans Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Common Formatives – weekly Math Common Assessments – at the beginning, middle, and end of math units		
--	--	--	--

SCIENCE DATA

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses																																													
End of Grade Assessment 5 th Grade	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD <table><tr><th colspan="4">SCIENCE DATA</th></tr><tr><th>Science Milestones Longitudinal Data</th><th>FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished</th><th>FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished</th><th>FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished</th></tr><tr><td>5th Grade</td><td>13.9%</td><td>22%</td><td>13.7%</td></tr></table>	SCIENCE DATA				Science Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	5 th Grade	13.9%	22%	13.7%	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Decreased number of students scoring proficient from 22% to 13.7%																																	
SCIENCE DATA																																															
Science Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished																																												
5 th Grade	13.9%	22%	13.7%																																												
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:																																														
Science Unit Interims (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Increased number of teachers teaching Science with fidelity. <table><tr><th colspan="9">Science Interim Data 2025 - 2026</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Unit 1</th><th>Unit 2</th><th>Unit 3</th><th>Unit 4</th><th>Unit 5</th><th>Unit 6</th><th>Unit 7</th><th>Unit 8</th></tr><tr><td>K</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1st</td><td>16%</td><td>38%</td><td>29%</td><td>30%</td><td>41%</td><td>74%</td><td>Not Applicable</td><td>Not Applicable</td></tr><tr><td>2nd</td><td>19%</td><td>19%</td><td>34%</td><td>21%</td><td>44%</td><td>34%</td><td></td><td>Not Applicable</td></tr></table>	Science Interim Data 2025 - 2026										Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8	K									1 st	16%	38%	29%	30%	41%	74%	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	2 nd	19%	19%	34%	21%	44%	34%		Not Applicable	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Teacher clarity with Science Standards Teachers lack of resources Short amount of time to implement hands on Science lessons EL: Academic vocabulary comprehension SWD: Lack of differentiation of instruction
Science Interim Data 2025 - 2026																																															
	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4	Unit 5	Unit 6	Unit 7	Unit 8																																							
K																																															
1 st	16%	38%	29%	30%	41%	74%	Not Applicable	Not Applicable																																							
2 nd	19%	19%	34%	21%	44%	34%		Not Applicable																																							

	3 rd	25%	17%	19%	37%	11%	44%	34%	Not Applicable	
	4 th	42%	33%	44%	48%	25%	26%	42%	58%	
	5 th	25%	36%	34%	32%	34%	48%	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Science instruction is not taught in depth regularly across grade levels. - Teachers are not planning collaboratively as a team for science or using data to drive instruction. - Teachers may not understand the science standards for their grade-level. - Students are not being exposed to hands-on science activities in their classrooms.									
(Name of assessment) (Grade Levels & Student Groups)										
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: 									
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) - What instructional practices / processes are consistently observed during walks? - What instructional practices / processes are consistently missing or ineffective during walks?										

Check the system 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:	

SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: SCIENCE	5 TH Grade Science Goal: The percent of 5th grade students scoring in the Proficient and/or Distinguished Learner Range will increase from 13.7% (8 students out of 58 students) to 22% (13 students out of 58 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG Science Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Science instruction is not taught in depth regularly across grade levels. Teachers are not planning collaboratively as a team for science or using data to drive instruction. Teachers may not understand the science standards for their grade-level. Students are not being exposed to hands-on science activities in their classrooms.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Data Collection	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of K-5 teachers will use the science workshop model for the science block and implement at least one hands-on activity for each science unit. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: During preplanning, teachers will receive training on unpacking the science standards, watch the unit preview videos on CTLS, and create a grade-level scope and sequence for each unit from science district coaches. August-September:	Evaluation Performance Target: 65% (240 out of 370) of students in grades 1st - 5th will score 80% or higher on Science Unit Interims. Evaluation Tool(s): - Grade – level common summative assessments for each science unit. Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ __At the end of each science unit_____	CTLS/GaDOE resources District Coaches
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. All teachers will use the Science workshop model during the daily science block, including one hands-on activity per science unit as measured by unit assessments.	- District Science coaches will facilitate training using the Workshop Model for science to improve K-5 science instruction. - Grade-level teams will engage in collaborative planning to choose hands-on activities for each science unit and a list of needed supplies. October-December: - Oct.-Science instructional walks to monitor the implementation of the workshop model will begin. The Science Department will create a walkthrough form to use that aligns with our plan. - Nov.- District Science coaches will facilitate professional learning to discuss the instructional walk feedback. Professional learning will focus on the needs from the walk data. - Dec.- Grade level teams will meet for collaborative planning for quarter 3 to select the activities, lessons, and assessments for upcoming science units. January-February: - Jan.- Instructional science walks will continue. Data will be collected through the walkthrough form. - Feb.- District Science coaches will facilitate professional learning to discuss the instructional walk feedback. The professional learning will focus on the needs from the walk data. March-April: - Mar.-Grade level teams will meet for collaborative planning for quarter 4 to select activities, lessons, and assessments for upcoming science units. - Mar./Apr.-District science coaches will facilitate professional learning to review Milestone prep resources available through CTLS. May: - Data meetings to discuss needs for the following school year. Artifacts to be Collected:	Data Analysis Plan: Results from unit assessments will be analyzed during grade-level CCCs to determine the next steps for student instructional needs. Leadership Team to analyze Science Common Assessment Post Data. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ EIP Lead Teachers ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	--	--

	• Walk through form/data • Scope and sequence-unit plan • Grade Level Hands-On Activity List • Interim (1st -5th) • Kindergarten Common Unit Assessment Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ EIP Teachers ☒ Lead Teachers Frequency of Monitoring: each science unit		
--	---	--	--

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

Academic-Related School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)

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

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

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

School Improvement Plan Required Questions

Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)

1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)**
2. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)**
3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)**
4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)**
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. **SWP Checklist 5(e) Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)**

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

ESSA Requirements to Include in the Schoolwide Plan – Section 1116(B)(1)
6. Jointly develop with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parental and family engagement involvement policy, agreed on by such parents, that shall describe the means for carrying out the requirements of Subsections (c) through (f). Parents shall be notified of the policy in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language the parents can understand. Such policy shall be made available to the local community and updated periodically to meet the changing needs of parents and the school. Evidence to support this statement includes Posting every Title I school’s parent policy on the school’s website in multiple languages where practicable, Fall and Spring input meeting agendas and sign in sheets providing parents the opportunity to assist in the development of the school’s parent policy, compact and parent engagement budget. <i>SWP Checklist 4</i>
Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - 34 CFR § 200.26
7. Describe how the school regularly monitors and the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State’s annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement. <i>SWP Checklist 3(a)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE:
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(b)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE:
9. Describe how the schoolwide plan will be revised, as necessary, based on regular monitoring to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program. <i>SWP Checklist 3(c)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE:
Schoolwide Plan Reform Strategies – Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)
10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all student groups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State’s challenging academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State’s challenging academic standards, where applicable. <i>SWP Checklist 2(a)</i>
11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable. <i>SWP Checklist 2(b)</i>

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

14. Describe professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

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

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

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

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

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

School Improvement Goals
Include goals on the parent compact and policy

Goal #1	K-2: The percentage of students in kindergarten through second grade with an Amira ARM score at the 50th percentile or higher will increase from 45% (62/138) to 60% (103 students) by the end of the 2026-2027 school year. 3-5: The percentage of third-fifth grade students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 16.4% (31 students) to 40% (79 students) on the Milestones ELA Assessment by the end of the 2026-2027 school year.
Goal #2	K-2 Math Goal: The percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring Overall "Prepared" will increase from 25% (43 students out of 170 students) to 50% (85 students out of 170 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 Spring Beacon Math Assessment. 3-5 Math Goal The percent of 3rd through 5th grade students scoring in the Proficient and/or Distinguished Learner Range will increase from 28% (55 students out of 193 students) to 40% (77 students out of 189 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG Math Assessment.
Goal #3	5TH Grade Science Goal: The percent of 5th grade students scoring in the Proficient and/or Distinguished Learner Range will increase from 13.7% (8 students out of 58 students) to 22% (13 students out of 58 students) as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG Math Assessment.
Goal #4	