

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Middle School
Principal Name:	Chris Salter
Date Submitted:	6/1/2026
Revision Date(s):	

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Smitha Middle School
<i>Team Lead</i>	William Grant
<i>Position</i>	Assistant Principal
<i>Email</i>	William.grant@cobbk12.org
<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: During Spring 2026, Smitha Middle School engaged in a comprehensive needs assessment to guide the development of the FY27 School Improvement Plan. Academic departments began by analyzing multiple data sources, including Georgia Milestones results, BEACON assessments, RI/MI data, ACCESS scores, and internal common assessments. Cardinal Collaborative Communities (CCCs) used this data to identify trends, determine areas of instructional need, and surface potential solutions grounded in classroom practice. To ensure all student groups were represented, input was gathered from specialized instructional staff, including ESOL, SPED, and gifted teachers, along with counselors and academic coaches. The leadership team then synthesized these findings through a series of planning sessions to clarify root causes and prioritize next steps. Family and community perspectives were incorporated through parent surveys, stakeholder meetings, and ongoing communication with community partners, ensuring the plan reflects both academic priorities and the broader needs of the school 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	The percentage of students scoring Prepared will increase from 20% (154 out of 823) to 30% as measured by the 2025–2026 ELA BEACON Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially	

What data supports the outcome of the goal?	On the Spring SY26 ELA Beacon 24%, 182/762, tested as prepared.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Strengthen writing connected to text through daily, standards-aligned tasks requiring evidence-based responses. Use BEACON and CFA data to group students for targeted re-teaching on specific domains (especially comprehension and vocabulary). Increase structured discourse using WICOR strategies and Costa's Levels to deepen thinking. Provide consistent feedback cycles with exemplars and rubrics, and monitor implementation through walkthroughs focused on LT/SC alignment and rigor.
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	The percentage of students scoring Prepared will increase from 6% (46 out of 823) to 16% as measured by the 2025–2026 Math BEACON Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	On the Spring SY26 Math Beacon 8%, 57/755, tested as prepared.
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Implement a consistent high-leverage task in every lesson aligned to grade-level standards and BEACON domains, emphasizing Numerical Reasoning. Use flexible grouping driven by CFA/BEACON data for targeted intervention during core and support classes. Increase use of VNPS and student discourse to promote problem solving and justification. Leverage Progress Learning and DeltaMath for daily targeted practice tied to identified gaps, with ongoing monitoring of usage, accuracy, and impact on prepared student outcomes.
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
6th Grade	24.6%	32.7%	35.2%
7th Grade	29.7%	24.6%	35.3%
8th Grade	32.1%	35.4%	23.3%

	Interpreting Texts	Constructing Texts
--	--------------------	--------------------

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	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	69	109	50	64	106	58	68	112	48	101	87	40	75	104	49	76	102	50	84	106	38
7 th Grade	68	104	88	67	114	79	64	131	65	112	103	45	85	99	76	73	110	77	97	109	54
8 th Grade	68	123	86	59	121	97	73	116	88	101	110	66	71	119	87	64	121	92	84	117	76

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses										
FY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <table><tr><th colspan="2">SY25</th></tr><tr><td colspan="2">% of students scoring proficient & distinguished</td></tr><tr><td>96 out of 273</td><td>35.2%</td></tr><tr><td>103 out of 290</td><td>35.5%</td></tr><tr><td>69 out of 295</td><td>23.4%</td></tr></table> 6th Strengths: Text Types and Purposes had the highest number of Proficient scores, indicating students can express ideas effectively through writing. Research also showed strong performance with a relatively high number	SY25		% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		96 out of 273	35.2%	103 out of 290	35.5%	69 out of 295	23.4%	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 6th Weaknesses: - Vocabulary had a high number of students in Support Needed, suggesting limited word knowledge or context usage. - Informational Text revealed more students needing support than proficient, indicating struggles with non-fiction comprehension. 7th Weaknesses: Research was a weak area with low proficiency, indicating difficulty synthesizing sources or citing evidence. Vocabulary Acquisition and Use had a significant portion in Support Needed, reflecting challenges with academic language.
SY25												
% of students scoring proficient & distinguished												
96 out of 273	35.2%											
103 out of 290	35.5%											
69 out of 295	23.4%											

	of Proficient students, suggesting students are improving in locating and using evidence. 7th Grade ELA Strengths: Craft and Structure and Key Ideas and Details had higher Proficient counts, showing growth in reading comprehension and text analysis. EL: EL students showed relative strength in identifying key ideas in literary texts but needed continued support with vocabulary acquisition in informational passages. Many EL students performed near target in writing conventions, indicating partial mastery of grammar and sentence structure. SWD: SWD students demonstrated improvement in reading comprehension tasks when texts	8th Weaknesses: Vocabulary had one of the lowest Proficient rates, pointing to word acquisition gaps. Informational Text had more Support Needed than Proficient, revealing difficulty unpacking factual or technical content. EL: EL students continue to demonstrate challenges with academic language and communicating understanding through evidence-based, extended responses. SWD: SWD show ongoing challenges with academic language in extended responses.
--	--	---

	were supported with graphic organizers or teacher modeling.	
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): TBD EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): ELA strengths are most evident in Texts: Techniques and Research & Analysis, where higher percentages of students reached prepared across grade levels, indicating stronger performance in analyzing texts and using evidence to support understanding. There is also a clear upward trend from 6th to 8th grade in prepared outcomes, reflecting growing proficiency over time.	Grade Levels (All Students): BEACON data indicates that fewer than 20% of students reached Prepared overall (19.7%), with lower performance in earlier grades (6th: 13.2%, 7th: 19.3%), showing that a majority of students remain below proficiency across grade levels. These results suggest students are not consistently demonstrating the academic language and comprehension skills required to analyze text and produce evidence-based responses, which is limiting movement from Support Needed and Near Target to Prepared.

	Additionally, a substantial Near Target group across domains highlights a strong opportunity to move more students to prepared with targeted support, particularly through writing connected to text and structured discourse. EL: EL strengths are seen in growing progress within reading comprehension and basic text analysis, with many students demonstrating the ability to access grade-level content when appropriate supports are in place. The presence of a strong Near Target group indicates that EL students are making progress and can move to prepared with continued language scaffolds, structured supports, and opportunities for discourse. SWD: BEACON data indicates that some SWDs are approaching proficiency, as reflected in movement into the Near Target range,	EL: BEACON results show that a significant percentage of students remain below Prepared across grade levels, indicating difficulty demonstrating understanding of grade-level standards. For EL students, this suggests challenges with academic language, including vocabulary and written expression, which impact their ability to fully access and communicate understanding of complex texts across content areas. SWD: BEACON data reflects that overall student performance remains below target, with a majority of students not reaching Prepared. For SWDs, this indicates difficulty independently accessing and demonstrating understanding of grade-level content, particularly in tasks requiring comprehension and written responses. While some students are approaching proficiency (Near Target), performance trends suggest a need for more consistent alignment between instruction, scaffolds, and grade-level expectations to support movement to Prepared.
--	--	---

	demonstrating emerging access to grade-level standards. This suggests that when instruction includes consistent scaffolds, modeling, and guided practice, SWDs are better able to engage with grade-level tasks and demonstrate progress toward Prepared outcomes.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: BEACON and classroom data indicate that students are not consistently required to use academic language to explain and justify their thinking in reading and writing tasks. This reflects variability in the implementation of instructional practices that develop vocabulary, comprehension, and evidence-based responses, limiting movement from Support Needed and Near Target to Prepared.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership	Root Cause Explanation:	

☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	Classroom observations show consistent use of learning targets and structured lesson components, with many teachers incorporating writing connected to text and	Rigor is inconsistent, with tasks not always requiring deep analysis or extended writing aligned to grade-level standards. Student discourse is limited, with fewer opportunities for meaningful discussion and higher-level questioning. Vocabulary instruction and explicit focus on language development are not

	opportunities for student engagement. Students are frequently interacting with texts and completing tasks that require evidence-based responses, and there is evidence of supportive classroom environments with scaffolds in place to assist learners.	consistently embedded, and success criteria are not always clearly defined or used to guide student work, limiting movement to prepared student outcomes.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Classroom observations indicate inconsistent implementation of rigorous, standards-aligned ELA instruction. While students are regularly engaged in reading and writing tasks, these tasks do not consistently require deep analysis, extended responses, or meaningful discourse. Instruction does not consistently emphasize vocabulary development or clearly defined success criteria, limiting students' ability to fully demonstrate understanding and progress to prepared student outcomes.	
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	Root Cause Explanation:	

☐ Supportive Learning Environment	
--	--

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	Increase the percentage of students scoring at the Near Target or Prepared levels on the ELA BEACON from 51.8% (396/764) to 61.8% (472/764) during the 2026–2027 school year. ELA Goal – Grade 6 Increase the percentage of students scoring at the Near Target or Prepared levels on the ELA BEACON from 38.1% (88/231) to 48.1% (111/231) during the 2026–2027 school year. ELA Goal – Grade 7 Increase the percentage of students scoring at the Near Target or Prepared levels on the ELA BEACON from 52.4% (133/254) to 62.4% (159/254) during the 2026–2027 school year. ELA Goal – Grade 8 Increase the percentage of students scoring at the Near Target or Prepared levels on the ELA BEACON from 61.2% (169/276) to 71.2% (197/276) during the 2026–2027 school year.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Inconsistent implementation of instructional practices that require students to use academic language to explain and justify their thinking—particularly in writing connected to text—has limited students’ ability to demonstrate comprehension and analysis at higher levels, resulting in limited movement from Support Needed to Near Target and Prepared.		
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 6–8th grade ELA teachers will implement weekly thinking routines to strengthen academic language, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses aligned to BEACON expectations.	Evaluation Performance Target: Use Common Assessments _68_ % of 6th Grade students will perform proficient (GaDOE/CTLS 3-point rubric) on common writing assessments	
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. 6–8th grade ELA teachers will implement at least weekly thinking routines to strengthen academic language, vocabulary, and evidence-based responses aligned to BEACON expectations.	Implementation Plan: October 12, 2026 – Digital Learning Day: CCSD Advanced Learning (ALP) staff will provide professional learning for ELA teachers to establish expectations for implementing thinking routines aligned to academic language, vocabulary development, and evidence-based responses. Teachers will be introduced to Project Zero thinking routines and aligned strategies that support informational text analysis and structured written responses. Teachers will receive tools including vocabulary routines, response-to-text frameworks, and scaffold menus for EL/SWD students. CCC expectations will be established for bringing student work samples to monitor implementation and refine instructional practices. September 2026 – March 2027: ELA teachers will implement thinking routines weekly to support vocabulary development and evidence-based responses in reading and writing. Teachers will bring student work (writing) samples to CCC meetings for analysis,	_68__% of 7th Grade students will perform proficient (3-point on rubric) on common writing assessments. _68__% of 8th Grade students will perform proficient (3-point rubric) on common writing assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): Monthly Common Writing Assessments scored with standards-aligned rubrics to measure academic vocabulary, evidence-based responses, and clarity of student reasoning, with results compared to BEACON Vocabulary and Informational Text domains to monitor growth. Evaluation Plan: Student progress in writing will be measured monthly through common assessments scored with Milestones-aligned rubrics and compared to BEACON Vocabulary and Informational Text domain data to monitor growth toward Near Target and Prepared. Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year	

	calibration, and identification of instructional adjustments aligned to BEACON domains. Title I Academic Coaches and CCC leads will provide ongoing support and monitor implementation. CCC documentation will reflect instructional adjustments tied to Vocabulary and Informational Text performance. December 1, 2026 – Rigor + Scaffolding PL: ALP staff will provide follow-up professional learning focused on refining thinking routine implementation, with emphasis on questioning strategies, text evidence use, and academic language development. October – December 2026: Administrators, Academic Coaches, and CCC leads will conduct walkthroughs every six weeks to monitor implementation of thinking routines, academic language use, and structured student responses. Follow-up coaching will be provided based on observed instructional needs. December 15, 2026 – Through CCC's: Midyear data review: Teachers and instructional	☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	--	--

	leaders will analyze BEACON domain data, student work samples, and CCC documentation. Instructional adjustments will be made to strengthen vocabulary, informational text comprehension, and evidence-based responses. March 1, 2027 – Digital Learning Day: ALP staff will provide targeted professional learning based on midyear data, focusing on areas of need in vocabulary and informational text performance. May 2027 – Teacher Workdays: End-of-year review: Teachers will analyze student work, BEACON results, and instructional practices to evaluate the impact of thinking routines. Teams will identify next steps and set instructional priorities for SY28. Artifacts to be Collected: We will collect lesson plans, student work samples, and walkthrough observation data that reflect the use of thinking routines. Student work will show evidence of structured responses (e.g., use of academic language, justification of thinking, text evidence), and walkthroughs will document the presence of questioning,		
--	---	--	--

	discourse, and routine-based tasks aligned to the action step. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	While scaffolding strategies are in place and supporting some student success, their implementation is not yet consistent or sufficiently aligned to vocabulary development and informational text demands across classrooms. This variability limits EL and SWD students' ability to consistently engage in extended responses using academic language, resulting in lower Prepared student outcomes on BEACON.		
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 6–8th grade ELA teachers will implement scaffolds for EL and SPED students to support vocabulary and informational text comprehension aligned to BEACON expectations.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of EL and SPED students in grades 6–8 will demonstrate proficiency (75%+) on scaffolded reading and writing tasks aligned to Vocabulary and Informational Text standards.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: CCSD English Learner Programs and CCSD Teaching & Learning Support and Specialized Services staff will introduce expectations for scaffolding instruction for EL and SPED students, including language supports, chunking strategies, and structured response scaffolds aligned to ELA standards. August–September: Teachers will begin implementing scaffolds during reading and writing instruction, focusing on vocabulary development and access to informational text. Title I Academic Coaches and support staff will provide initial coaching and modeling.	Evaluation Tool(s): - Standards-based ELA rubrics aligned to Georgia Milestones Achievement Level Descriptors to measure students' use of academic vocabulary and ability to produce evidence-based responses to informational text - Student work samples from scaffolded reading and writing tasks to demonstrate growth in comprehension and written responses - BEACON domain reports (Vocabulary and Informational Text) to track movement from Support Needed to Near Target and Prepared - Walkthrough observation data to monitor implementation of scaffolds aligned to student outcomes	
☐ 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. 6–8th grade ELA teachers will implement scaffolding strategies to support EL and SPED students' access to vocabulary and informational text aligned to BEACON expectations on a weekly basis.		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly	

	October–December: October 12, 2026 – Digital Learning Day: CCSD support staff will provide professional learning focused on refining scaffolds, including academic language supports, sentence frames, and structured response strategies. Walkthroughs will monitor scaffold implementation and student access to grade-level text. Follow-up coaching will be provided based on observed needs. December 1, 2026 – Rigor + Scaffolding PL: Teachers will analyze EL and SPED student work to determine the effectiveness of implemented scaffolds, identifying where supports enabled or limited access to grade-level tasks. Findings will be used to refine scaffolds and inform targeted feedback and revision practices aligned to student needs. January–February: Midyear data review (January 2027): Teachers and instructional leaders will analyze BEACON domain data and student work to evaluate scaffold effectiveness and adjust instruction. March–April: March 1, 2027 – Digital Learning Day:	☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Student work from scaffolded tasks will be analyzed monthly using standards-aligned rubrics to monitor vocabulary development and comprehension of informational text, and BEACON domain data will be reviewed each administration window to track progress of EL and SPED students and identify performance trends. End-of-year review: Teachers will analyze student work and BEACON results to evaluate the impact of scaffolding strategies and identify next steps. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

	Targeted professional learning will address remaining gaps in vocabulary and informational text access for EL and SPED students. Continued walkthroughs and coaching will monitor implementation. Artifacts to be Collected: • Lesson plans reflecting scaffolded instruction • Student work samples demonstrating scaffold use • Coaching logs • Walkthrough data • BEACON domain reports • CCC documentation of instructional adjustments Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Walkthroughs every 6 weeks; CCC review of student work monthly; BEACON data reviewed at midyear and end-of-year		
--	--	--	--

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.			

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>			

MATH DATA				
MATH 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
6 th Grade	15.8%	24.9%	25.6%	25.4%
7 th Grade	17.6%	18.8%	24.3%	30.3%
8 th Grade	24.5%	31.0%	31.1%	34.0%

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	182	38	8	165	52	11	149	61	18	171	44	13
7 th Grade	176	62	22	158	71	31	143	79	38	167	68	25
8 th Grade	169	73	32	151	82	41	138	88	48	160	79	36

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

BUILDING WIDE Beginning Learner: 172 (22.3%) Developing Learner: 352 (45.6%) Proficient Learner: 175 (22.7%) Distinguished Learner: 73 (9.5%) 6th Grade Beginning Learner: 56 (24.3%) Developing Learner: 115 (50.0%) Proficient Learner: 49 (21.3%) Distinguished Learner: 10 (4.3%) 7th Grade Beginning Learner: 69 (26.2%) Developing Learner: 105 (39.9%) Proficient Learner: 58 (22.1%) Distinguished Learner: 31 (11.8%) 8th Grade Beginning Learner: 47 (17.3%) Developing Learner: 132 (48.5%) Proficient Learner: 68 (25.0%) Distinguished Learner: 32 (11.8%)	EL: Some EL students demonstrated success reaching Proficient and Distinguished performance levels across multiple grade levels, particularly within advanced Math sections. In 7th grade Math, one instructional grouping demonstrated 52.7% Proficient/Distinguished combined with only 11.6% Beginning Learners. In 8th grade Math, higher-performing sections demonstrated up to 41.7% Proficient/Distinguished combined, indicating that some EL students are successfully accessing grade-level rigor when provided appropriate supports and scaffolded instruction. SWD: SWD students demonstrated the strongest performance within the Developing performance band across grade levels, with 26 SWD students performing at the Developing level in Math. An additional 2 SWD students reached the Proficient level. By grade level: • 6th Grade SWD students included 7 Developing Learners and 1 Proficient Learner. • 7th Grade SWD students included 3 Developing Learners. • 8th Grade SWD students demonstrated the strongest overall subgroup performance, with 16 Developing Learners and 1 Proficient Learner. These trends indicate that many SWD students are approaching grade-level proficiency and are demonstrating emerging conceptual understanding when provided scaffolded instruction and structured support.	EL: EL students remain disproportionately represented within the Beginning and Developing performance bands across grade levels. In several on-grade-level Math groupings, more than 90% of students fell within the Beginning/Developing range combined, while other sections showed Developing rates exceeding 50%. These trends suggest continued challenges with academic vocabulary, multi-step problem solving, and interpreting mathematical language within rigorous assessment tasks. SWD: SWD students remain heavily concentrated within the Beginning and Developing performance bands across all grade levels, with very limited representation at the Proficient level and no SWD students reaching the Distinguished level in Math. Building wide, 32 SWD students performed at the Beginning level and 26 performed at the Developing level, while only 2 SWD students reached Proficient. By grade level: • 6th Grade included 10 Beginning Learners and 7 Developing Learners among SWD students. • 7th Grade included 7 Beginning Learners and 3 Developing Learners. • 8th Grade included 15 Beginning Learners and 16 Developing Learners, with only 1 Proficient Learner. These trends suggest continued challenges with mathematical reasoning, application of grade-level standards, academic vocabulary, and independent problem solving within rigorous assessment tasks.
---	--	---

Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	Math strengths are most evident in Measurement & Data and Geometric & Spatial Reasoning, where prepared percentages are consistently higher across all grade levels, indicating stronger student performance with visual models, real-world application, and procedural skills. There is also a clear progression from 6th to 8th grade in prepared outcomes across domains, showing that instruction is building over time. Additionally, a sizable Near Target group, particularly in Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning, reflects a strong opportunity to move more students to prepared with targeted support. EL: EL strengths in math are seen in students’ ability to engage with visual models, problem structures, and real-world contexts, with many demonstrating progress into the Near Target range when language supports are in place. Growth is evident when instruction includes scaffolds such as sentence frames, guided discourse, and multiple representations, allowing students to access grade-level concepts. SWD: SPED strengths in math are seen in students’ ability to engage with structured tasks and make progress when instruction includes explicit modeling, guided practice,	Math weaknesses are most evident in Numerical Reasoning and Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning, where the highest percentages of students remain in the Support Needed category across all grade levels, indicating gaps in foundational number sense, operations, and algebraic thinking. These challenges limit students’ ability to access grade-level tasks and transfer understanding across domains. While a Near Target group is present, movement to prepared remains limited, suggesting a need for more consistent, targeted intervention and opportunities for deeper conceptual understanding. EL: EL weaknesses are most evident in academic math vocabulary and language processing, which impact students’ ability to interpret problems, explain reasoning, and fully demonstrate understanding. These language barriers limit performance across domains, particularly in Numerical and Algebraic Reasoning, highlighting the need for consistent integration of language supports within daily math instruction. SWD: SPED weaknesses are most evident in Numerical Reasoning and Algebraic Thinking, where students demonstrate difficulty accessing and performing on grade-level standards. SY26 BEACON data indicates

	and small group support. Students show the most success with visual representations and scaffolded problem solving, with some movement into the Near Target range when supports are consistently implemented.	that challenges with interpreting problem structures, applying multi-step reasoning, and sustaining understanding over time contribute to a high percentage of students in Support Needed, highlighting the need for more consistent, aligned instruction and supports to ensure access to grade-level tasks.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	Inconsistent implementation of rigorous, grade-level aligned instruction—particularly in Numerical Reasoning and Algebraic Thinking—stems from variability in teachers’ understanding and application of high-leverage strategies such as problem solving, discourse, and multiple representations. While structures and expectations are in place, inconsistent use of these strategies has limited students’ development of deep conceptual understanding and resulted in persistent gaps in foundational skills and limited movement from Near Target to Prepared. Weekly AVID-aligned thinking routines and scaffolded instruction will strengthen students' mathematical reasoning, academic discourse, and justification of solutions in the identified areas of Numerical Reasoning and Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning, as identified through SY26 BEACON strand data and common assessments, with implementation monitored through six-week walkthroughs, monthly CCC analysis of student work, and BEACON strand data reviews.	
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	BEACON data and common formative and summative assessments indicate that students are not consistently demonstrating proficiency in grade-level Numerical and Algebraic Reasoning standards. These trends suggest variability in the delivery of rigorous, standards-aligned instruction—particularly in problem solving, discourse, and use of multiple representations—which is limiting students’ ability to progress beyond Support Needed and fully access grade-level tasks.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	Classroom observations show consistent use of structured lesson components and active student engagement, with many teachers incorporating VNPS, guided practice, and collaborative problem solving. Students are regularly engaged in tasks and supported through modeling and small group instruction, and there is evidence of efforts to align instruction to grade-level standards, particularly in the use of common resources and targeted practice.	Rigor is inconsistent, with many tasks not requiring deep conceptual thinking or extended problem solving. Student discourse is limited, with few opportunities for students to explain reasoning or justify answers. Differentiation is not consistently driven by data, and instruction does not always effectively target gaps in Numerical and Algebraic Reasoning. These inconsistencies limit students’ ability to move from Support Needed to Prepared.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	Classroom observations indicate inconsistent implementation of rigorous, standards-aligned math instruction. While structures are in place, tasks do not consistently require deep thinking, problem solving, or student discourse due to variability in teachers’ use of high-leverage strategies such as task design, questioning, and use of multiple representations. Additionally, differentiation is not consistently driven by BEACON and CFA data, limiting targeted instruction in Numerical and Algebraic Reasoning and resulting in missed opportunities to move students toward prepared student outcomes.	

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	Increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the Math EOG from 30.4% (234/771) to 40.4% (311/771) during the 2026–2027 school year.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Inconsistent implementation of instructional practices that require students to explain and justify their thinking—particularly in Numerical and Algebraic Reasoning—has limited students’ ability to demonstrate conceptual understanding and progress from Support Needed to Near Target and Prepared.		
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 6–8th grade Math teachers will implement weekly thinking routines to strengthen academic language and multi-step reasoning in problem-solving aligned to BEACON expectations. Implementation Plan: October 12, 2026 – Digital Learning Day: CCSD Advanced Learning (ALP) staff will provide professional learning for Math teachers to establish expectations for implementing thinking routines aligned to academic language and multi-step reasoning. Teachers will be introduced to Project Zero thinking routines adapted for mathematical problem solving, reasoning, and explanation. Teachers will receive tools including multi-step problem-solving frameworks, math discourse stems, and scaffolds for EL/SWD students.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of 6th Grade students will perform proficient (75%+) on standards-aligned tasks requiring multi-step reasoning and written explanation. 70% of 7th Grade students will perform proficient (75%+) on standards-aligned tasks requiring multi-step reasoning and written explanation. 70% of 8th Grade students will perform proficient (75%+) on standards-aligned tasks requiring multi-step reasoning and written explanation. Evaluation Tool(s): Student progress in math will be measured using standards-based rubrics, student work	
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>			
6–8th grade Math teachers will implement at least weekly thinking routines to strengthen academic language and multi-step reasoning in problem-solving			

aligned to BEACON expectations.	CCC expectations will be established for analyzing student work and aligning instruction to BEACON strands.	from multi-step tasks, and BEACON strand data, analyzed through CCCs and walkthroughs to monitor reasoning, academic language, and	
	September 2026 – March 2027: Math teachers will implement thinking routines weekly to support multi-step reasoning and academic language in problem solving. Teachers will bring student work samples to CCC meetings for analysis, identification of strand gaps, and instructional adjustments. Title I Academic Coaches and CCC leads will monitor implementation and provide ongoing support. CCC documentation will reflect instructional adjustments tied to Geometry/Data and reasoning strands.	instructional adjustments aligned to Milestones expectations. Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
	December 1, 2026 – Rigor + Scaffolding PL: ALP staff will provide follow-up professional learning focused on refining thinking routines in math, with emphasis on questioning strategies, student discourse, and reasoning explanations.	Data Analysis Plan: BEACON strand data CCC documentation Walkthrough data Milestones results	
	October – December 2026: Administrators, Academic Coaches, and CCC leads will conduct walkthroughs every six weeks to monitor implementation of thinking routines, student reasoning, and use of academic language. Follow-up coaching will be provided based on observed needs.	End-of-year review: Teachers will analyze student work, BEACON results, and instructional practices to evaluate the impact of thinking routines. Justification: Evaluating student reasoning, academic language, and instructional adjustments	
		ensures alignment to the core SY27 focus of improving multi-step problem solving. Student work provides direct evidence of thinking,	

	December 15, 2026 – Through CCC’s: Midyear data review: Teachers and instructional leaders will analyze BEACON strand data, student work samples, and CCC documentation. Instructional adjustments will target Geometry/Data and multi-step reasoning gaps. March 1, 2027 – Digital Learning Day: ALP staff will provide targeted professional learning based on midyear data, focusing on priority math strands and reasoning gaps. May 2027 – Teacher Workdays: Teams will identify next steps and set instructional priorities for SY28. Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	academic language strengthens conceptual understanding, and instructional adjustments ensure targeted response to BEACON strand data. This approach supports consistent Tier 1 instruction and improved Prepared student outcomes. 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.			

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: 100% of 6–8th grade Math teachers will implement scaffolds for EL and SPED students to support academic language and multi-step reasoning aligned to BEACON expectations. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: CCSD English Learner Programs and CCSD Teaching & Learning Support and Specialized Services staff will introduce expectations for scaffolding instruction in math, including language supports, problem chunking, visual models, and structured reasoning supports. August–September: Teachers will begin implementing scaffolds during math instruction, focusing on academic language and multi-step problem solving. Title I Academic Coaches and support staff will provide initial coaching and modeling. October–December: October 12, 2026 – Digital Learning Day:	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of EL and SPED students in grades 6–8 will demonstrate proficiency (75%+) on scaffolded math tasks requiring multi-step reasoning and academic language aligned to BEACON strands. Evaluation Tool(s): • Standards-based math rubrics aligned to Georgia Milestones Achievement Level Descriptors • Student work samples from scaffolded multi-step problem-solving tasks • BEACON strand reports (Geometry/Data, Algebraic Reasoning) • Walkthrough observation data focused on scaffold implementation 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> 6–8th grade Math teachers will implement scaffolding strategies to support EL and SPED students’ access to academic language and multi-step problem solving aligned to BEACON expectations on a weekly basis.			

	CCSD support staff will provide professional learning focused on refining scaffolds, including math discourse supports, sentence stems, and structured problem-solving frameworks. Walkthroughs will monitor scaffold implementation and student reasoning. Follow-up coaching will be provided based on observed needs. December 1, 2026 – Rigor + Scaffolding PL: Teachers will analyze EL and SPED student work to determine the effectiveness of implemented scaffolds, identifying where supports enabled or limited access to grade-level tasks. Findings will be used to refine scaffolds and inform targeted feedback and revision practices aligned to student needs. January–February: Midyear data review (January 2027): Teachers and instructional leaders will analyze BEACON strand data and student work to evaluate scaffold effectiveness and adjust instruction. March–April: March 1, 2027 – Digital Learning Day: Targeted professional learning will address	Data Analysis Plan: Student work from scaffolded problem-solving tasks will be reviewed monthly using standards-aligned rubrics to monitor reasoning and use of academic language. BEACON strand data will be used to track progress of EL and SPED students and guide instructional adjustments. CCC teams will analyze student work and document scaffold effectiveness, identifying trends and refining strategies. Walkthrough and coaching data will be used to ensure scaffolds are implemented consistently and effectively. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

	remaining gaps in Geometry/Data and multi-step reasoning for EL and SPED students. Continued walkthroughs and coaching will monitor implementation. May: End-of-year review: Teachers will analyze student work and BEACON results to evaluate the impact of scaffolding strategies and identify next steps. Artifacts to be Collected: • Lesson plans reflecting scaffolded math instruction • Student work samples demonstrating scaffold use • Coaching logs • Walkthrough data • BEACON strand reports • CCC documentation of instructional adjustments Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Walkthroughs every 6 weeks; CCC review of student work monthly; BEACON data reviewed at midyear and end-of-year		
--	--	--	--

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>			

--	--	--	--

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:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. (Insert action step here)	• March-April: • May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ 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: 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>			
3. (Insert action step here)			

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<i>*Must be listed in the school policy</i>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required: * Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, 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.	9/10/26		☒ 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.	10/1-30/26		☐ 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.	4/20/26		☐ 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)	9/17/26		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5
	1/21/27		☒ 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 6th Grade Family Night: families receive an overview of middle school environment and expectations, core subjects, adolescent mindset and engage with school staff - Osborne High School Rising 9th Grade Parent Night: An 8th Grade family information session on how to prepare your child for the expectations and learning opportunities offered in high school.	5/7/26 TBD		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

6. Required: <u>Provide translated information</u> 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> Family-School Engagement Policy for Shared Student Success School-Parent Compact for Achievement	☐ 1☐ 4 ☐ 2☒ 5 ☐ 3☐ 6
---	---	--

Academic-Related and 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)) SWP Checklist 5.e	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
Making Math Click-See it, Try it! Teachers and families will engage in fun, hands-on math activities, learn grade-level expectations, and gain practical tips to support learning and build confidence at home.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			9/3/26	Parent Activity Evaluation	Principal Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
Know the Score: Using Beacon Results for Student Success Families take a clear and simple look at Beacon scores—moving beyond just the numbers to understand what they mean for their child’s learning and what steps to take next for a strong finish.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			1/14/27	Parent Activity Evaluation	Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4					

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 “shall” and “may”)

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: The FY27 Schoolwide Plan has been developed in alignment with and through integration of multiple Federal, State, and local programs and resources to ensure a coordinated approach to improving academic outcomes for all students, particularly those most at risk. The plan reflects input and coordination across initiatives that address academic intervention, student wellness, and readiness for future success.

Smitha Middle School integrates research-based Tier 2 reading intervention programs to provide targeted support for students identified as below grade level in reading.

Additionally, the schoolwide plan embeds **AVID** instructional strategies schoolwide to build academic behaviors, foster inquiry-based learning, and increase engagement and rigor across content areas. AVID strategies, such as Costa's Levels of Thinking, collaborative study groups, and WICOR, are explicitly referenced in both the ELA and Math improvement plans to support goal implementation and strengthen instructional design for all learners, including ELs and SWDs.

Beyond academic programming, the plan is coordinated with other school-based initiatives and services:

- **Nutrition Services** ensures access to free breakfast and lunch for qualifying students through the National School Lunch Program.
- **School Social Workers** and counselors coordinate with **housing and mental health resources** to support students identified through Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral or attendance interventions.
- Transition planning is aligned with **feeder elementary schools**, particularly for students receiving special education services.
- Career exploration activities are supported through **CCRPI readiness goals** and integrated into REACH lessons and advisory periods.
- Collaboration with the district's **Behavioral Health and Wellness Department** supports Tier 1 violence prevention through PBIS and social-emotional learning lessons embedded in REACH days.

These programs and services are discussed during data team meetings, leadership team planning sessions, and Title I stakeholder meetings to ensure alignment with SIP goals and maximize the impact of available resources. This integrated approach ensures the schoolwide plan reflects a unified effort to meet the needs of all students, especially those requiring additional academic or social-emotional support.

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: Smitha Middle School monitors both the implementation and impact of its schoolwide program through a consistent cycle of assessment, collaboration, and data-driven decision making. The school uses Georgia Milestones, ACCESS for ELs, BEACON benchmarks, and common formative and summative assessments to measure student progress and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices. Implementation is monitored through monthly CCC meetings where teachers, coaches, and administrators analyze assessment data, review instructional artifacts, and track progress toward SIP goals. Leadership conducts quarterly reviews of walkthrough data and instructional trends aligned to action steps, along with focused walkthroughs targeting rigor and relevance, writing connected to text, math problem solving, and ELlevation Tier 2 strategies. Common assessment calendars ensure consistent administration of CFAs and CSAs, and artifacts such as student work, lesson plans, feedback tools, and meeting notes are routinely reviewed to monitor fidelity. Student outcomes are monitored through regular analysis of Georgia Milestones and BEACON data, including disaggregation by grade level and subgroup. Teams continuously review CFA and CSA results to adjust instruction and address priority standards, while progress report grades and grade distributions are analyzed to identify gaps and ensure equitable outcomes. Ongoing review of performance trends across units informs instructional adjustments through CCC collaboration and targeted supports. This continuous cycle of monitoring, reflection, and adjustment ensures alignment to student needs and SIP priorities, while supporting ongoing improvement in instructional practices and student achievement.

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: Smitha Middle School evaluates the effectiveness of its schoolwide program by examining academic growth and achievement trends for all students, with intentional focus on those historically performing below grade level, including English Learners (ELs), Students with Disabilities (SWDs), and economically disadvantaged students.

Effectiveness is measured using multiple data sources. Georgia Milestones results are disaggregated by subgroup to monitor progress toward grade-level proficiency in ELA and Math. BEACON benchmark assessments are analyzed across administration windows to track growth within key domains, especially for students entering below grade level. Common formative and summative assessment data are reviewed during CCC meetings to monitor mastery of priority standards and assess the impact of instruction and interventions. Progress reports and grade profile analyses by grade, subject, and teacher are used to identify trends, gaps, and patterns related to instructional equity.

To determine program impact, the school closely monitors how identified students respond to tiered supports, including targeted interventions such as Read180, math lab, and ELlevation strategies, as well as SPED accommodations, co-teaching structures, and embedded practices like Rigor & Relevance and AVID WICOR.

Data is reviewed monthly in CCC meetings and quarterly by the leadership team to determine whether students are demonstrating growth, accessing grade-level content, and closing achievement gaps. When progress is limited, instructional strategies and intervention plans are adjusted to better meet student needs. This ongoing cycle ensures the schoolwide program remains responsive, targeted, and focused on improving outcomes for students most in need of support.

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: Smitha Middle School revises its schoolwide plan through a continuous cycle of monitoring, reflection, and collaboration with stakeholders. Ongoing review of implementation, student performance data, and instructional impact ensures the plan remains responsive to changing student needs.

Revisions are driven by weekly CCC meetings where teachers, the academic coach, and administrators analyze assessment data, student work, and walkthrough feedback to evaluate instructional effectiveness. The leadership team conducts regular reviews of BEACON trends, grade distributions, and subgroup performance to identify areas needing adjustment. Focused walkthroughs monitor alignment to key strategies such as writing connected to text, math problem solving, and the use of AVID/WICOR and ELlevation supports. Additional artifacts, including CFA/CSA results, progress reports, and engagement indicators, are used to track implementation and outcomes.

When data shows limited impact—particularly for students below grade level or within targeted subgroups—the school adjusts professional learning, refines instructional expectations, and strengthens coaching supports. These changes are documented through updated action steps, revised timelines, and targeted interventions.

Input from teachers, SPED and ESOL staff, and families is also incorporated to ensure shared ownership and alignment of improvement efforts. This ongoing, data-informed process allows Smitha to continuously refine its approach and strengthen the connection between student needs, instruction, and desired outcomes.

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: Smitha Middle School implements a comprehensive, tiered system of behavioral supports aligned to PBIS and coordinated with IDEA requirements to both prevent and address student behavior.
 At Tier 1, all students are taught clear, schoolwide expectations through the PBIS framework, with a focus on consistent routines, visible norms, and positive reinforcement. Expectations are explicitly taught during REACH and revisited as needed based on behavior trends. Schoolwide recognition systems, including incentives and acknowledgments, promote positive behavior, while teachers use proactive strategies such as reteaching, proximity, and restorative practices to address concerns early.
 At Tier 2, students demonstrating repeated low- to moderate-level behaviors receive targeted supports such as behavior contracts, check-in/check-out systems, and small group social-emotional interventions facilitated by counselors or support staff. Behavior data is regularly reviewed in team meetings, and progress is monitored using schoolwide tracking systems.
 At Tier 3, students with significant behavioral needs, including those served under IDEA, receive individualized support through Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs) developed by IEP teams. Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs) guide these plans, which include specific goals, accommodations, and ongoing data monitoring. Collaboration among general education, SPED, and support staff ensures consistent implementation across settings.
 The school’s behavior team routinely reviews implementation and analyzes behavior data to adjust supports across all tiers. This structured system allows for early intervention while ensuring compliance with IDEA and meeting the individualized needs of students.

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: CCSD Advanced Learning will facilitate a series of targeted professional learning sessions designed around identified staff needs, with a focus on strengthening instructional practices through key areas of emphasis. This work will draw heavily from Project Zero thinking routines and the ELlevation framework to support deeper student thinking and language development. In coordination, the Assessment and Personalized Learning Department, in partnership with Title I, will lead aligned sessions focused on improving assessment practices, including the development and use of learning targets and success criteria, alignment of tasks to cognitive demand, and the use of item analysis to inform instructional decisions and improve student outcomes.

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: Smitha Middle School offers a range of intentional transition supports to help students and families navigate entry into and exit from the middle school environment. These efforts are designed to ease both academic and social-emotional adjustments while strengthening connections between home and school.
For rising 6th graders, Smitha provides a “Bridge to Middle School” summer experience that introduces students to expectations, routines, and available supports. Students participate in sample learning activities, collaborative experiences, and opportunities to connect with staff. During the spring, feeder school visits allow 5th grade students to tour the campus, hear from current students, and observe classroom environments. Open House events for incoming families offer time to meet teachers, explore courses, and learn about scheduling and school procedures. Families also have the option to schedule individual tours throughout the year to support a smooth transition.
For 8th grade students preparing for high school, Smitha works closely with receiving schools to support a seamless transition. This includes academic planning, counselor-led sessions on high school expectations, and opportunities to explore elective pathways. Families are invited to participate in high school information nights in partnership with local schools.
For students with disabilities, transition planning is coordinated through the IEP process in collaboration with both elementary and high school teams. This ensures that services, supports, and goals are aligned and in place prior to each transition.
Together, these efforts create a supportive and well-structured transition process, helping students and families feel prepared and confident as they move into new learning environments.

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	Implement rigorous, standards-aligned instruction with clear learning targets and success criteria to improve prepared student outcomes. Use data from BEACON and common assessments to differentiate instruction, provide targeted support, and monitor student progress. Incorporate structured discourse, writing connected to text, and problem-solving tasks to increase rigor and engagement.
Academic Coach(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Support teachers through ongoing coaching, modeling, and professional learning aligned to SIP priorities. Facilitate CCC meetings to analyze data, plan targeted instruction, and monitor implementation of strategies. Provide feedback from walkthroughs, support the use of high-impact instructional practices, and build teacher capacity to improve student outcomes.
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	Increase the percentage of students scoring at the Near Target or Prepared levels on the ELA BEACON from 51.8% (396/764) to 61.8% (472/764) during the 2026–2027 school year.
Goal #2	Increase the percentage of students scoring at the Near Target or Prepared levels on the Math BEACON from 39.3% (297/755) to 49.3% (372/755) during the 2026–2027 school year.
Goal #3	
Goal #4	

--	--