

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Elementary
Principal Name:	Dr. Maria Braswell
Date Submitted:	06/01/2026
Revision Date(s):	

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Green Acres Elementary School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Dr. Maria Braswell
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Maria.Braswell@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	678-842-6905
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: We met with the staff to analyze data, then brainstormed root causes and possible actions as a school. The Guiding Coalition has continually reviewed and revised the plan in order to ensure that it aligns with the current needs. We held input sessions so that parents and other community stakeholders could share their opinions related to our plan and how we are progressing toward our goals.	

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	Dr. Maria Braswell	
Assistant Principal	Adrienne Martin	
Teacher	Melissa Gottschalk	
Teacher	Michele Bice	
Teacher	Jen Murchie	
Teacher	Jenny Mitchell	
Teacher	Tara Hope	
Teacher	Leeanne Shirley	
Teacher	Samantha Massey	
Teacher	Cayla Moskal	
Teacher	Emma Snook	
Teacher	Rebecca Pulicare	
Teacher	Ashley Nesmith	
Teacher	Joanne Gauthier	
Teacher	Sean Hayes	
Teacher	Dorothy Reavis	
Teacher	Robin Guthrie	

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	Increase the percentage of students demonstrating reading proficiency: ☐ In Kindergarten, increase from 50% to 55% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 31% to 36% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 27% to 32% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 12% to 17%. ☐ In 4th grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 23% to 28%. ☐ In 5th grade, increase the number of students scoring a 3 or 4 on the Milestones EOG assessment from 21% to 26%.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	72% of kindergarteners are proficient in reading based on the iReady EOY assessment. 17% of 1st graders are proficient in reading based on the iReady EOY assessment. 22% of 2nd graders are proficient in reading based on the iReady EOY assessment. Assessment data has not been received for the Milestones.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	In 1st grade, the Tier 1 instruction was not on par with what students received in kindergarten. The team did not collaborate well together which led to gaps and missed opportunities for students. This team will need to focus on Tier 1 strategies and strengthen the collaboration among the team.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	In kindergarten, the goal was exceeded due to the collective commitment of the teachers. The students were held to a high standard all year. The teachers worked seamlessly together to ensure that students were receiving high quality instruction. Additionally, the team effectively used WIN time to support gaps and extend students who were demonstrating proficiency.

Previous Year's Goal #2	Increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the grade level expectation for math: ☐ In Kindergarten, increase from 34% to 39% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 1st grade, increase from 36% to 41% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 2nd grade, increase from 17% to 22% as measured by the overall placement on iReady by the end of the school year. ☐ In 3rd grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 16% to 21%. ☐ In 4th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 39% to 44%. ☐ In 5th grade, increase the percentage of students who score a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones math EOG from 14% to 19%.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	72% of kindergarteners are proficient in math based on the iReady EOY assessment. 14% of 1st graders are proficient in math based on the iReady EOY assessment. 31% of 2nd graders are proficient in math based on the iReady EOY assessment. 37% of 3rd graders scored a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones. 30% of 4th graders scored a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones. 28% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or 4 on the Georgia Milestones.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Once again, in 1st grade, the Tier 1 instruction was not on par with what students received in kindergarten. The team did not collaborate well together which led to gaps and missed opportunities for students. This team will need to focus on Tier 1 strategies and strengthen the collaboration among the team. In 4th grade, the cohort that was sent to 5th grade was very high. The team had a high target coming into the school year. Additionally, due to personnel issues, one class of students in the grade level received minimal quality math instruction this school year. The majority of students in that class scored a level 1. Any spaces in which solid tier 1 instruction is not happening is detrimental to our overall goals.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	In 4 grade levels, the goals were exceeded. These results further support the idea the importance of quality Tier 1 instruction. In these grade levels, students have been consistently receiving math instruction that focuses on building number sense, concrete understanding, and application. These grade levels utilized assessment effectively and manipulatives with fidelity.

Previous Year's Goal #3	Decrease the percentage of students scoring in the entering and emerging proficiency levels for the speaking domain on the ACCESS from 65% to 56%.
Was the goal met? ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	56% of students at Green Acres are entering and emerging in the speaking domain on the ACCESS.
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?	We have continued to focus on ensuring that speaking is intentionally part of the daily instruction in our building. Turn and talk is being used with fidelity. We also expanded the depth of our academic discourse with strategies such as Hands Down conversations.

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
3 rd Grade	20%	15.6%	11.8%
4 th Grade	18.5%	17.6%	22.8%
5 th Grade	24.7%	22.9%	20.8%

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	51%	33%	16%	51%	33%	16%	43%	46%	11%	46%	38%	16%	60%	29%	11%
2 nd Grade	56%	29%	56%	54%	28%	18%	43%	42%	15%	54%	28%	18%	47%	46%	7%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade	20%	70%	10%	22%	70%	8%	23%	71%	6%	40%	55%	5%	26%	69%	5%	21%	74%	5%	34%	58%	8%
4 th Grade	36%	55%	9%	30%	62%	8%	37%	55%	8%	53%	39%	8%	35%	62%	3%	30%	60%	10%	40%	52%	8%
5 th Grade	36%	55%	8%	32%	61%	7%	34%	56%	9%	62%	28%	9%	44%	41%	15%	46%	41%	13%	42%	49%	8%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): Interpreting Texts: Techniques has the lowest percentage of students in Support Needed in grades 3–5. The overall percentage of students in Support Needed is decreasing year over year. K–2: A portion of K–2 students are at or near target in Texts and Interpreting Texts. ELs/SWD: Small group instruction is largely targeted and well-executed, with vocabulary instruction consistently explicit and well-modeled.	Grade Levels (all students): Constructing Texts is the weakest domain in 1st grade (60% Support Needed). Foundations is the weakest in 2nd grade (56% Support Needed). In grades 3–5, fewer than 15% of students are proficient in any ELA domain. Listening is 40%+ Support Needed in grades 3–5. K–2: 43% or more of students are in Support Needed across all ELA domains in grades 1 and 2. ELs: EL oral language scaffolds are not consistently embedded during literacy instruction school-wide. SWD: SWD students are heavily represented in Support Needed for Constructing Texts and Foundations across all grade levels.
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	- Teachers were asked to implement new standards, a new curriculum, and a new assessment plan simultaneously. - Teachers do not have a solid grasp of the new standards and curriculum. The required assessments were not aligned to the standards and did not provide the necessary information to drive instruction. - Teachers felt comfortable with teaching foundational standards, so they spent more time on phonics/phonemic awareness than other strands of the rope. Teachers have not mastered how to intertwine the Reading Rope. Each strand is taught in isolation.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	EL: 47 students exited or were reclassified after ACCESS. - More students are developing, expanding, and bridging than entering and emerging. - Listening is our overall strongest domain with 34% of students reaching.	EL: - Reading and speaking are the two domains with the most students in entering and emerging. - K and 1 have the majority of kids in entering
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - The speaking strategies being implemented — primarily turn and talk — produce conversational language participation but not the academic oral language production that ACCESS measures. - Teachers have not been trained to distinguish between social speaking structures and structured academic discourse, and implementation has not been differentiated for EL language levels or aligned to WIDA speaking descriptors. Professional learning on speaking has focused on frequency and participation — getting students talking — rather than on the linguistic complexity, vocabulary demand, and discourse structures that characterize academic oral language at each proficiency level. There is no school-wide definition of what academically rigorous speaking looks like for ELs at each WIDA level, and walkthroughs and coaching have not been calibrated to evaluate the <i>quality</i> of oral language production — only its presence. - Leadership has not connected ACCESS speaking data to specific, observable classroom practices, meaning teachers have no clear target for what growth in speaking should look and sound like from one proficiency level to the next.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	- UFLI implementation is strong and consistent - Learning targets are present in most classrooms - Small group instruction is largely targeted and well-executed - Wonders fidelity is strong during Interpreting Texts - Vocabulary instruction is consistently explicit and well-modeled - Writing engagement is the strongest productive skill	- Student speaking is low - Data collection during small group is low 1st grade inconsistently has learning targets - Independent reading time is nearly absent - Constructing texts shows inconsistent alignment with Wonders - EL oral language scaffolds are not the norm school-wide
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

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

- Teachers have inconsistent understanding of what full implementation looks like across all components — they are implementing the parts they feel most confident in (UFLI, vocabulary, small group structure) while the components that require more intentional design, such as structured speaking, data collection, and oral language scaffolding, are being done partially or not at all.
- Professional learning has focused on individual components in isolation — UFLI training, Wonders rollout, small group structures — rather than building a unified picture of what a fully implemented, high-fidelity literacy block looks and sounds like from start to finish, with speaking and oral language development embedded throughout.
- Coaching cycles, walkthroughs, and feedback have not been calibrated to evaluate the full range of implementation indicators consistently — observers are noting what is present rather than systematically naming what is absent, so teachers are not receiving specific, actionable feedback on the components where fidelity is lowest.
- There is no shared, observable look-for document that defines what fidelity looks like across all components of the literacy block — including structured speaking, data collection during small group, and oral language scaffolds for ELs — that both leaders and teachers can reference as a common target.
- Leadership has not yet established a written, actionable definition of full implementation that connects all components of the literacy block to observable classroom practices, making it impossible to hold all teachers to a consistent standard or to identify with precision where coaching support is most needed.

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	By May 2027, Green Acres Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the ELA Georgia Milestones from 11.8% (3rd grade), 22.8% (4th grade), and 20.8% (5th grade) to 20% (3rd grade), 30% (4th grade), and 28% (5th grade), as measured by the Georgia Milestones Assessment. In grades 1–2, Green Acres Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring Prepared on Beacon ELA across all domains from a current average of 13% (1st grade) and 13% (2nd grade) to 20% in both grades, as measured by the Spring Beacon ELA administration.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers have not mastered how to interweave the Reading Rope. Each strand is taught in isolation. Teachers felt comfortable with foundational standards and spent disproportionate time on phonics/phonemic awareness at the expense of language, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing. Professional learning has focused on individual components in isolation rather than building a unified picture of a fully implemented literacy block.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By May 2027, 80% of classrooms observed will demonstrate intentional integration of at least three Reading Rope strands (e.g., background knowledge, vocabulary, language structures, verbal reasoning, and literacy knowledge connected to decoding and comprehension) within a single lesson or instructional sequence, as documented on the literacy look-for walkthrough tool	Evaluation Performance Target: B By the Winter 2026 Beacon administration, the percentage of students scoring in Support Needed on the Interpreting Texts domain will decrease by 5 percentage points in each grade — from 46% to 41% in 1st grade, 54% to 49% in 2nd grade, 20% to 15% in 3rd grade, 36% to 31% in 4th grade, and 62% to 57% in 5th grade.	Scarborough Reading Rope framework; GaDOE ELA standards K–5; Beacon Assessment reports; Literacy look-for document
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Guiding Coalition will develop a literacy look-for document that defines what each strand of the Reading Rope looks like in observable practice, K–5, and how integration across strands appears in a lesson. August: Full staff professional learning session (half day) introducing the look-fors document and the rationale for integration, using the school's own walkthrough data and Beacon data as the anchor. Teachers identify which strands currently receive the most instructional time and which are underdeveloped. Grade-level teams map their current literacy block schedule against the rope strands and identify gaps. September-December: Biweekly grade-level collaborative planning with Student Support leads—each session includes a 15-minute 'rope connection' protocol where teachers plan one explicit connection point between two or more strands in the upcoming week's lessons. Coach conducts walkthroughs using the look-for document and provides written feedback within 48 hours.	Evaluation Tool(s): Beacon	
☒ All Students ☒ EL ☒ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i> Teachers will implement all components of the literacy block with fidelity and interconnect at least three strands within instruction, as evidenced by monthly walkthrough data.		Data Analysis Plan: After each of the three Beacon administrations, Student Support Leads and Admin will review strand-level data to identify which Reading Rope strands show the weakest student performance and adjust the professional learning focus accordingly. Following each administration, grade-level CCC leads will analyze Beacon strand data at CCC meetings, using results to inform instructional decisions and adjust small group composition.	
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence:	

	• January-February: Mid-year reflection: Pull walkthrough data and share trends with grade-level teams. Teams self-assess against the look-for document. Coaching focus adjusts to the strands with the least integration based on walkthrough data. One full staff learning session to share bright spots and troubleshoot common challenges. • March-April: Instructional rounds - Teachers design at least one observed lesson that demonstrates intentional multi-strand integration. • May: End-of-year reflection using walkthrough data, Beacon data, and Milestones results. Teams document what strand integration looks like at their grade level and what they will carry into FY28. Artifacts to be Collected: Literacy look-for walkthrough tool; walkthrough observation records (monthly); grade-level planning agendas with rope connection notes; professional learning agendas and sign-in sheets; mid-year and end-of-year strand integration data summaries. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Biweekly collaborative planning; monthly walkthrough data review	☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Teachers have not built an understanding of what standards-aligned writing instruction looks like under the new Georgia ELA framework. Writing instruction has been driven by the Wonders curriculum and taught largely in isolation from reading. Beacon data shows Constructing Texts is the lowest domain in grades 1–2 and among the weakest in grades 3–5.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By December 2026, every grade level will have a written writing instructional sequence aligned to the Constructing Texts domain of the Georgia ELA standards (Grammar Conventions; Constructing Texts: Context, Structure & Style, Techniques; and Research & Analysis).	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, student writing samples scored on a standards-aligned rubric (Milestones 3-5) will show that the percentage of students meeting standard on Constructing Texts increases from the January 2027 baseline sample to the end-of-year sample.	
Target Student Group	By May 2027, 80% of observed writing lessons will demonstrate alignment to specific Georgia ELA Constructing Texts standards.	Beacon Constructing Texts data (Spring 2027) will show a 10-percentage-point decrease in 'Support Needed' compared to Spring 2026 across grades 1–5.	
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: Admin conducts a deep read of the Georgia ELA Constructing Texts standards K–5, with attention to how expectations build across grade levels and how writing connects to the Texts and Language domains. Identify the gap between current writing instruction (Wonders-driven, largely isolated from reading) and what the new standards expect. • August-September: Teachers annotate student writing samples against the Constructing Texts standards to see the gap between current performance and the standard. Grade-level teams identify two priority Constructing Texts standards to focus on for the first semester. • October-December: Monthly collaborative planning focused on writing: teachers bring student writing samples, analyze them against the standard, and plan the next instructional move. Student Support Leads models writing lessons and co-teach at least once per grade level per quarter. Walkthroughs include a writing look-for: Is the writing task connected to a text? Is the standard explicit? Is grammar/conventions instruction embedded in the writing rather than taught in isolation? • January-February: Collect a writing sample from every student K–5 on a common prompt tied to the Constructing Texts standards. Conduct collaborative scoring using a standards-aligned rubric. Share results with grade-level teams — identify patterns and adjust second semester instructional focus accordingly.	Evaluation Tool(s): Common writing prompts (mid-year and end-of-year) scored with a standards-aligned rubric; Beacon Constructing Texts domain data; walkthrough data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ January and May Benchmarks	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i> K-5 teachers will implement targeted writing instruction based on student data and aligned to the Georgia ELA Standards as evidenced by classroom observations.		Data Analysis Plan: Student Support Leads analyze writing samples against the Constructing Texts standards after each collection; results shared in collaborative planning. Beacon Constructing Texts data analyzed after Spring administration and compared to Fall baseline. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches	

	• March-April: Grade levels refine writing instruction based on mid-year data. Coach focuses coaching cycles on the specific Constructing Texts sub-domains with the weakest student performance. Teachers implement at least one research and analysis writing task (aligned to the Texts: Research & Analysis standard) before May. • May: Collect a final writing sample on a common prompt. Score and compare to January samples to measure growth. Document what worked, what the instructional non-negotiables are for FY28, and what professional learning is still needed. Artifacts to be Collected: writing look-for walkthrough tool; student writing samples (mid-year and end-of-year) with rubric scores; collaborative planning agendas; coach modeling/co-teaching logs Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

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
3 rd Grade	25%	27.3%	15.8%	36.8%
4 th Grade	22.2%	20.3%	39.1%	30.4%
5 th Grade	16.5%	8.4%	14.3%	28.4%

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kinder (Spring Administration)	13%	49%	38%	39%	49%	12%	30%	39%	30%	42%	32%	26%
1st Grade	38%	46%	16%	24%	55%	21%	10%	55%	35%	33%	39%	29%
2nd Grade	40%	47%	13%	28%	46%	26%	49%	35%	17%	14%	47%	39%
3rd Grade	7%	90%	3%	15%	82%	3%	16%	78%	6%	33%	64%	3%
4th Grade	52%	46%	2%	55%	44%	1%	54%	45%	1%	63%	34%	2%
5th Grade	57%	38%	5%	69%	29%	2%	59%	36%	5%	72%	26%	2%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	Grade Levels (all students): All three tested grades showed meaningful growth from FY25 to FY26. Third grade increased by 21 percentage points (15.8% → 36.7%) and fifth grade nearly doubled (14.3% → 28.2%). These gains occurred in the same year teachers began focusing more intentionally on concrete and representational instruction, providing initial evidence that the CRA approach is working. Third grade produced the strongest results in the building with 36.7% Proficient or Distinguished — the first time a tested grade has exceeded 35% in four years. The classrooms driving this result shared identifiable practices: Number Talks, manipulatives with purpose, and assessment-driven small groups. Classroom-level bright spots are significant: Massey (Grade 3): 84% P+D; Moskal (Grade 4): 59% P+D; Snook (Grade 5): 64% P+D. These classrooms demonstrate that strong math outcomes are achievable for Green Acres students with quality Tier 1 instruction.	Grade Levels (all students): Fewer than 37% of students in any tested grade scored Proficient or Distinguished — meaning more than 63% of students in every tested grade are below grade level in math. Grade 4 declined from 39.1% to 30.3%, tied directly to the identified personnel gap in one classroom where zero students scored Proficient or Distinguished. That cohort is now in Grade 5 — the lowest-performing tested grade (28.2% P+D) with the highest concentration of Beginning learners (38.8%). The classroom-level variance is the most urgent finding: in every tested grade, at least one classroom had 0% P+D (Meyers-Gr3, Purvis-Gr4, Hunter-Gr5) while another classroom in the same grade exceeded 59%. This is not a curriculum problem — it is a Tier 1 instruction consistency problem. Numerical Reasoning is the most critical domain weakness: 65% of students in both Grades 4 and 5 scored Below Target. Fractions and Decimals sub-domains are severely weak across all three grades (53–60% Below Target).

	EL Students: EL students in Grade 3 showed improvement year over year, consistent with the building-wide upward trend in that grade. The structured math discourse and manipulative use in stronger classrooms has provided EL students additional access to mathematical concepts beyond language alone. SWD Students: Third grade SWD students showed improvement from FY25, consistent with the building-wide upward trend in that grade.	Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning is 53–58% Below Target in grades 3–5. No student scored Exceeded Target in any sub-domain in Grade 4. EL Students: EL students in Grades 4 and 5 are disproportionately concentrated in Level 1 (Beginning), where language demands compound the mathematical access gap. Multi-step word problems on the Milestones require simultaneous mathematical and linguistic decoding, and EL students without mathematical vocabulary instruction are unable to access the problem before they can solve it. SWD Students: SWD students in Grades 4 and 5 are overrepresented in Level 1, consistent with the cumulative gap pattern. The pace of the county unit sequence does not allow adequate time for SWD students to build conceptual understanding at the concrete level before moving to abstract.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten is the strongest grade in the building with 38% Prepared in Numerical Reasoning and 30% Prepared in Measurement & Data Reasoning — reflecting high-quality Tier 1 instruction and effective use of WIN time in that grade level. First grade has 35% Prepared in Measurement & Data Reasoning — the highest Prepared rate among grades 1–5 for that domain — and 29% Prepared in Geometric & Spatial Reasoning. Second grade leads the building in Geometric & Spatial Reasoning (39% Prepared) and shows solid performance in Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (26% Prepared). Third grade has the highest proportion of students Near Target across all four domains in the 3–5 band, indicating proximity to grade-level work and responsiveness to quality instruction. The number of students in Support Needed is decreasing year over year in K–3. EL Students: EL students in Kindergarten and Grade 1 are performing comparably to the overall building in Geometric & Spatial Reasoning, suggesting that the visual and concrete nature of geometry reduces language barriers and provides an important access point for EL learners. SWD Students: Kindergarten SWD students show relative strength in Geometric & Spatial Reasoning and Measurement & Data, consistent with the overall kindergarten pattern of strong CRA-based instruction.	Grade Levels (all students): Grades 4 and 5 have 44% or more students in Support Needed in every single domain — not one Beacon domain in either grade has fewer than 44% Support Needed. This is a pervasive, not isolated, weakness. Fifth grade Geometric & Spatial Reasoning is the single worst sub-domain in the building at 72% Support Needed. Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning is 69% Support Needed in Grade 5. These are the domains most dependent on multi-step application and problem-solving — directly tied to the Milestones findings. Numerical Reasoning is 52% Support Needed in Grade 4 and 57% in Grade 5 — directly mirroring the Milestones domain findings and confirming that foundational number sense gaps are not being closed as students move through the building. In Grades 1 and 2, Constructing Texts is the weakest domain (Beacon ELA). In math, Grade 2 Measurement & Data Reasoning drops to 49% Support Needed despite Grade 1 showing relative strength in that domain — indicating an uneven K–2 instructional transition. No more than 5% of students in grades 3–5 score Prepared in any domain. EL Students: EL students in Grades 4 and 5 are disproportionately in Support Needed across all four domains. Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning and Numerical Reasoning are the two most linguistically demanding domains, and without scaffolded access to mathematical vocabulary and problem contexts, EL students cannot demonstrate their mathematical understanding. SWD Students: SWD students mirror the grade-level patterns with higher concentrations in Support Needed, particularly in Grades 4 and 5. The transition from Near Target to Support Needed between Grade 3 and Grade 4 is especially sharp for SWD students, suggesting that the grade 3–4 transition is a critical vulnerability for this subgroup.
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	• Students are arriving in Grades 4 and 5 without the number sense and operational fluency foundations required for grade-level work in those years — they are not behind because of Grade 4 or 5 instruction alone, but because of cumulative gaps that were not caught and addressed in K–3. • The K–3 pipeline is producing students who are Near Target but not Prepared — meaning students are proximal to the standard but not securing it deeply enough to transfer to the next grade's demands. 'Near Target' is being treated as success when it should be treated as a warning. • Instruction in K–3 has developed procedural familiarity with concepts but has not consistently built the deep conceptual understanding — the 'why behind the how' — that students need to generalize mathematical thinking to new contexts in Grades 4 and 5. • There is no school-wide definition of what number sense development looks like at each grade, no shared K–5 progression of number sense routines, and no vertical articulation between grade levels about what students must be able to do before they leave each grade. • Number sense instruction has been treated as a curriculum delivery task rather than a deliberate, daily instructional routine built on concrete and representational tools. Without daily number sense routines embedded in every classroom K–5 and connected vertically, students accumulate thin procedural understanding that collapses under the demands of upper elementary math.		
MATH Common Assessments	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 475 1276 1474"> Grade Levels (all students): All grade levels administered the full assessment plan on pace with the county sequence across all units — 15 to 24 assessments per grade level completed between August 2025 and May 2026. Kindergarten had the highest average score in the building at 69% across 24 assessments, consistent with strong iReady growth data (66% meeting Typical Growth) and Beacon Numerical Reasoning results (38% Prepared). Second grade's average of 67% is the strongest among K–5, consistent with iReady showing 79% of Grade 2 students meeting Typical Growth — the highest growth rate in the building. First grade showed consistent mid-to-post score improvement across all five units (e.g., U4 Mid: 83% → scores sustained; U3 Mid: 75% → U3 Post: 77%), suggesting that re-teaching between mid and post is working in that grade level. Third grade Unit 3 Mid (75%) and Unit 6 Mid (78%) were among the highest unit-level scores in grades 3–5, showing that students are making progress within units when instruction is strong. Teachers used pre/mid/post data to form intervention groups and reassess — the assessment cycle is being used as intended to identify students for re-teaching. EL Students: Teachers stayed on pace with the county assessment plan for EL students. Mid-assessment data was used to identify EL students for targeted re-teaching, and EL students benefited from the structured assessment cycle when teachers used data to identify specific gaps rather than reteaching entire units. SWD Students: SWD students were assessed with the same pre/mid/post cycle, providing three data points per unit to track progress and inform re-teaching. </td><td data-bbox="1276 475 2011 1474"> Grade Levels (all students): The overall year-end average scores for Grades 3, 4, and 5 are all 57%, 57%, and 59% respectively — consistent with the Milestones proficiency data showing the majority of students below grade level. Grade 4 Unit 4a Pre scored 31% — the single lowest pre-assessment score in the building across all grades and units. This reveals that fraction and decimal concepts were almost entirely unknown to students before instruction began, indicating that foundational number sense work in grades 1–3 did not adequately prepare students for this content. In Grade 5, the final two units of the year — Unit 6 Post (47%) and Unit 7 Post (53%) — were the two lowest post-assessment scores in that grade. Students are least proficient on the most recently taught content, which will be their entering knowledge for 6th grade math. Across Grades 3–5, post-assessment scores consistently fail to reach 75%, with most units ending in the 55–72% range. Re-teaching between mid and post is producing only modest gains, indicating that the re-teaching approach mirrors the original instruction (same abstract approach, same pacing) rather than returning to concrete and representational levels to rebuild understanding. Grade 3 Unit 1 Post (40%) and Unit 1 Mid (42%) were the lowest scores in that grade, suggesting students arrive in 3rd grade already behind on foundational 3rd grade concepts — direct evidence of the K–2 pipeline gap. EL Students: Pre-assessment scores in Grades 3–5 reveal EL students entering units with very limited prior knowledge of the content (Grade 4 Unit 4a Pre: 31%; Grade 3 Unit 3 Pre: 44%). Post-assessment scores show that one round of instruction and re-teaching is not sufficient to close that gap. Without scaffolded language supports embedded in unit instruction — not just at assessment time — EL students' scores reflect language access barriers as much as mathematical understanding. SWD Students: SWD students are disproportionately represented among students who do not show meaningful pre-to-post growth, particularly in Grades 4 and 5. The pace of the county unit sequence does not allow adequate time for SWD </td></tr> </table>	Grade Levels (all students): All grade levels administered the full assessment plan on pace with the county sequence across all units — 15 to 24 assessments per grade level completed between August 2025 and May 2026. Kindergarten had the highest average score in the building at 69% across 24 assessments, consistent with strong iReady growth data (66% meeting Typical Growth) and Beacon Numerical Reasoning results (38% Prepared). Second grade's average of 67% is the strongest among K–5, consistent with iReady showing 79% of Grade 2 students meeting Typical Growth — the highest growth rate in the building. First grade showed consistent mid-to-post score improvement across all five units (e.g., U4 Mid: 83% → scores sustained; U3 Mid: 75% → U3 Post: 77%), suggesting that re-teaching between mid and post is working in that grade level. Third grade Unit 3 Mid (75%) and Unit 6 Mid (78%) were among the highest unit-level scores in grades 3–5, showing that students are making progress within units when instruction is strong. Teachers used pre/mid/post data to form intervention groups and reassess — the assessment cycle is being used as intended to identify students for re-teaching. EL Students: Teachers stayed on pace with the county assessment plan for EL students. Mid-assessment data was used to identify EL students for targeted re-teaching, and EL students benefited from the structured assessment cycle when teachers used data to identify specific gaps rather than reteaching entire units. SWD Students: SWD students were assessed with the same pre/mid/post cycle, providing three data points per unit to track progress and inform re-teaching.	Grade Levels (all students): The overall year-end average scores for Grades 3, 4, and 5 are all 57%, 57%, and 59% respectively — consistent with the Milestones proficiency data showing the majority of students below grade level. Grade 4 Unit 4a Pre scored 31% — the single lowest pre-assessment score in the building across all grades and units. This reveals that fraction and decimal concepts were almost entirely unknown to students before instruction began, indicating that foundational number sense work in grades 1–3 did not adequately prepare students for this content. In Grade 5, the final two units of the year — Unit 6 Post (47%) and Unit 7 Post (53%) — were the two lowest post-assessment scores in that grade. Students are least proficient on the most recently taught content, which will be their entering knowledge for 6th grade math. Across Grades 3–5, post-assessment scores consistently fail to reach 75%, with most units ending in the 55–72% range. Re-teaching between mid and post is producing only modest gains, indicating that the re-teaching approach mirrors the original instruction (same abstract approach, same pacing) rather than returning to concrete and representational levels to rebuild understanding. Grade 3 Unit 1 Post (40%) and Unit 1 Mid (42%) were the lowest scores in that grade, suggesting students arrive in 3rd grade already behind on foundational 3rd grade concepts — direct evidence of the K–2 pipeline gap. EL Students: Pre-assessment scores in Grades 3–5 reveal EL students entering units with very limited prior knowledge of the content (Grade 4 Unit 4a Pre: 31%; Grade 3 Unit 3 Pre: 44%). Post-assessment scores show that one round of instruction and re-teaching is not sufficient to close that gap. Without scaffolded language supports embedded in unit instruction — not just at assessment time — EL students' scores reflect language access barriers as much as mathematical understanding. SWD Students: SWD students are disproportionately represented among students who do not show meaningful pre-to-post growth, particularly in Grades 4 and 5. The pace of the county unit sequence does not allow adequate time for SWD
Grade Levels (all students): All grade levels administered the full assessment plan on pace with the county sequence across all units — 15 to 24 assessments per grade level completed between August 2025 and May 2026. Kindergarten had the highest average score in the building at 69% across 24 assessments, consistent with strong iReady growth data (66% meeting Typical Growth) and Beacon Numerical Reasoning results (38% Prepared). Second grade's average of 67% is the strongest among K–5, consistent with iReady showing 79% of Grade 2 students meeting Typical Growth — the highest growth rate in the building. First grade showed consistent mid-to-post score improvement across all five units (e.g., U4 Mid: 83% → scores sustained; U3 Mid: 75% → U3 Post: 77%), suggesting that re-teaching between mid and post is working in that grade level. Third grade Unit 3 Mid (75%) and Unit 6 Mid (78%) were among the highest unit-level scores in grades 3–5, showing that students are making progress within units when instruction is strong. Teachers used pre/mid/post data to form intervention groups and reassess — the assessment cycle is being used as intended to identify students for re-teaching. EL Students: Teachers stayed on pace with the county assessment plan for EL students. Mid-assessment data was used to identify EL students for targeted re-teaching, and EL students benefited from the structured assessment cycle when teachers used data to identify specific gaps rather than reteaching entire units. SWD Students: SWD students were assessed with the same pre/mid/post cycle, providing three data points per unit to track progress and inform re-teaching.	Grade Levels (all students): The overall year-end average scores for Grades 3, 4, and 5 are all 57%, 57%, and 59% respectively — consistent with the Milestones proficiency data showing the majority of students below grade level. Grade 4 Unit 4a Pre scored 31% — the single lowest pre-assessment score in the building across all grades and units. This reveals that fraction and decimal concepts were almost entirely unknown to students before instruction began, indicating that foundational number sense work in grades 1–3 did not adequately prepare students for this content. In Grade 5, the final two units of the year — Unit 6 Post (47%) and Unit 7 Post (53%) — were the two lowest post-assessment scores in that grade. Students are least proficient on the most recently taught content, which will be their entering knowledge for 6th grade math. Across Grades 3–5, post-assessment scores consistently fail to reach 75%, with most units ending in the 55–72% range. Re-teaching between mid and post is producing only modest gains, indicating that the re-teaching approach mirrors the original instruction (same abstract approach, same pacing) rather than returning to concrete and representational levels to rebuild understanding. Grade 3 Unit 1 Post (40%) and Unit 1 Mid (42%) were the lowest scores in that grade, suggesting students arrive in 3rd grade already behind on foundational 3rd grade concepts — direct evidence of the K–2 pipeline gap. EL Students: Pre-assessment scores in Grades 3–5 reveal EL students entering units with very limited prior knowledge of the content (Grade 4 Unit 4a Pre: 31%; Grade 3 Unit 3 Pre: 44%). Post-assessment scores show that one round of instruction and re-teaching is not sufficient to close that gap. Without scaffolded language supports embedded in unit instruction — not just at assessment time — EL students' scores reflect language access barriers as much as mathematical understanding. SWD Students: SWD students are disproportionately represented among students who do not show meaningful pre-to-post growth, particularly in Grades 4 and 5. The pace of the county unit sequence does not allow adequate time for SWD		

		students to build conceptual understanding before moving to the next unit. The mid-to-post re-teaching window is too narrow when students entered the unit two or more grade levels below.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers are re-teaching content between mid and post assessments, but the re-teaching mirrors the original instruction — same abstract approach, same pacing — rather than going back to the concrete and representational level to rebuild understanding from the ground up. - Teachers have not been trained to diagnose what type of misunderstanding is driving a low mid-assessment score. Without diagnostic capacity, re-teaching is content repetition rather than targeted conceptual repair — the teacher covers the material again instead of identifying the specific conceptual gap and addressing it through a different representation. - The CRA progression is not embedded as a school-wide expectation. When students don't understand a concept, teachers move forward or repeat the abstract lesson rather than returning to manipulatives and visual models — the instructional moves the building's own data shows produce proficiency. - Collaborative planning uses data to form groups but does not build teacher capacity to design conceptually different re-teaching. Planning conversations answer 'who needs help?' but not 'what is the specific conceptual gap, and what concrete or representational experience would address it?' - The root cause is the absence of a shared instructional framework for what it means to re-teach mathematically. Without a school-wide understanding that 're-teaching means going back to concrete — not repeating the abstract' — low mid-assessment scores will continue to produce only modest post-assessment gains regardless of how diligently teachers use the data.	
	School Instructional Walks (Grade Level) Grade Levels (all students): 81% of observations were rated 'Fully aligned' to the grade-level standard, and an additional 9% were 'Partially aligned.' Only 2 of 100 observations showed lessons that were not aligned to the standard, indicating that teachers are generally teaching grade-appropriate content. The Effective Math Teaching Practice most consistently observed was 'Use and connect mathematical representations' (55% of walks), followed closely by 'Implement tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving' (53%) and 'Establish mathematics goals to focus learning' (50%). These are foundational practices and their presence suggests a baseline of intentional instruction across the building. Manipulatives were observed in use in 46% of all walks — and, importantly, at a higher rate during the Apply (Work Session) portion (57%) than during Engage (32%) or Explore (44%), suggesting that when students have independent work time, some teachers are providing hands-on tools. Qualitative comments document exemplary manipulative use in multiple classrooms: ten-frames and cubes for place value (K–1), place value blocks for bundling and decimals (2–3), dice and number lines for rounding (3), area models (4–5), and coins/money (K–2). Number Talks were the most frequently observed Engage activity (10 of 22 Engage observations), and qualitative comments describe strong implementation in multiple classrooms: sentence stems for responses, open-ended questioning, real-world connections, and student turn-and-talk. Walk #14 described a teacher who 'modeled sentence stems, repeatedly stated goals, asked open-ended questions, and tied purpose to real world experiences.' Walk #23 documented a 4th grade Number Talk where students used 'elbow partners to discuss patterns' with the teacher asking 'What do you notice or wonder? What do you think is next and why?' 'Facilitate meaningful mathematical discourse' was observed in 44% of walks, and qualitative comments	Grade Levels (all students): Manipulatives were absent in 54% of all observations — more than half the time. During the Explore (Mini-Lesson), which is when new concepts are introduced and the CRA progression most critically requires a concrete entry point, manipulatives were present in only 44% of observations. This directly contradicts the school's own Milestones data showing that classrooms with manipulative use produced significantly higher proficiency rates. The Reflect (Closing) portion of the math block was observed in only 2 of 100 walks (2%). This is the most severely under implemented component of the instructional framework. The closing is where students consolidate their learning, teachers conduct formative assessment, and mathematical discourse culminates — its near-total absence means teachers are losing the most powerful data collection and meaning-making moment in the lesson. Walk #54 explicitly flagged this: 'Including the reflection portion of the math block rather than moving straight into science could be another opportunity for meaningful student discourse.' Polya's 4-Step Problem Solving framework was observed in only 23 of 100 walks (23%), and of those, only 3 documented genuine Polya implementation by name. The majority of the 23 used 'Other' as the strategy label, with idiosyncratic approaches (graphic organizers, guided drawing, etc.) rather than the shared school-wide framework. Walk #52 documented the strongest Polya use: 'The teacher was thinking aloud using Polya's strategy to solve a word problem — students contributing with a shared pen.' This level of implementation was the exception, not the norm. Success criteria were posted or referenced in only 58% of observations — 42% of walks found no success criteria communicated to students at all. The learning target was not posted or referenced in 20% of walks. In multiple observations, the posted learning target did not match the observed lesson:

	document rich examples of student mathematical discourse — students justifying reasoning, constructing arguments, comparing strategies, and explaining their thinking using academic language. Bright spot classrooms are documented throughout the walk data: Walk #53 noted 'Ms. Davalos would be an excellent model teacher for others to observe.' Walk #38 documented a teacher who 'noticed an area of need from a formative assessment and used small-group to re-teach using white boards — direct response to data.' Walk #100 documented a teacher who mid-lesson created two groups when students finished an assessment at different times, demonstrating seamless differentiation. EL Students: Walk #77 documented explicit bilingual vocabulary instruction: 'The teacher developed students' vocabulary by incorporating the use of English and Spanish cognates' during a place value lesson using physical base-ten blocks. Walk #95 noted 'visuals and connecting visuals to vocabulary was done throughout the small group, and done very effectively' for EL students in an intervention group on decimals. SWD Students: Walk #96 documented a teacher and paraprofessional each facilitating targeted small groups simultaneously — the teacher using counters and coin identification with two students, the para using ten-frames and counters for teen numbers with three students. This level of structured, differentiated small-group delivery for SWD students is a documented strength.	Walk #29 noted 'the learning target posted did not match what students were doing'; Walk #73 found 'the standard rewritten with 6 success criteria that appeared to stay up for a while' alongside a lesson misaligned to the stated target. When problem-solving was observed, the dominant approach was procedural modeling followed by independent practice — students copying teacher work, completing worksheets independently, or practicing basic skills. Walk #1 is representative: 'Students copied what the teacher was doing on the board into their notebooks. Students were not given opportunities to reason about the numbers or engage in discussion to justify their thinking.' Walk #40 noted 'all students were working on the same thing' on a complex worksheet without differentiation. Walk #28 observed a 'lengthy mini-lesson with only a short time for independent work and everyone doing the same assignment — missed opportunity for differentiation.' Core package fidelity is inconsistent. Walk #2 found a teacher 'not prepared to teach the lesson as outlined in the plan — did not know that materials were needed for the exploration portion.' Walk #49 observed 'station activities not from CTLS — looked like TPT.' Walk #50 noted 'workbook or CTLS resources not used' and a success criteria that was 'just the learning target rewritten.' This suggests some teachers are not internalizing lessons during collaborative planning and are substituting outside resources without curricular coherence. 360 boards are available in 22 classrooms but were in active use with students in only 4 observations (4 out of 100 total; 4 out of 22 classrooms with boards). In 22 classrooms the boards existed but were not in use during the observation. EL Students: Across 100 walks, EL-specific instructional strategies — differentiated sentence frames, visual word walls with mathematical vocabulary, home language connections — were observed and documented in only a handful of classrooms. The building lacks a school-wide expectation for what mathematical language scaffolding looks like in every classroom, and walkthroughs are not currently calibrated to observe or document it. SWD Students: Differentiation was the most frequently cited growth area in qualitative comments.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Teachers are implementing parts of the math instructional framework but not all of it — the Reflect/Closing (2% of observations), consistent manipulative use during Explore (44%), and Polya fidelity (23%) are all significantly below what would be expected if teachers understood these components as non-negotiable. Teachers are making individual decisions about which parts of the framework to use based on time, comfort, and habit. - There is no written set of Tier 1 Math Instructional Non-Negotiables that defines which components of the framework must be present in every lesson, every day. Without a written expectation, 'implementation' is whatever each teacher decides to do.	

	• Walkthroughs and coaching feedback have not been calibrated to a shared standard. The walkthrough data shows feedback that is encouraging and observational but does not consistently identify missing non-negotiables as problems to be corrected — the absence of the Reflect/Closing, for example, appeared in only one qualitative comment despite being missing in 98% of walks. • Collaborative planning is previewing content but not building the instructional execution. Teachers who were observed unprepared to use materials from the lesson plan, misaligning learning targets to observed lessons, or substituting outside resources for the core package suggest that planning time is not translating into internalized, ready-to-deliver instruction. • The school has not yet established written, observable, non-negotiable definitions of what quality Tier 1 math instruction must look like at Green Acres. Without that foundation — and without walkthroughs calibrated to evaluate it — implementation will remain dependent on individual teacher initiative rather than school-wide standard.
--	--

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	By May 2027, Green Acres Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the Math Georgia Milestones from 36.7% (3rd), 30.3% (4th), and 28.2% (5th) to 44% (3rd), 37% (4th), and 35% (5th). The school will also decrease the percentage of K–2 students in Support Needed for Numerical Reasoning on Beacon Math from 38% (K), 38% (Grade 1), and 40% (Grade 2) to 28% (K), 28% (Grade 1), and 30% (Grade 2), as measured by the Georgia Milestones Assessment and the Beacon Math Spring Administration.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Numerical Reasoning is the most severe weakness across grades 3–5, with 65% of students in grades 4 and 5 scoring Below Target on Milestones. The CTLS Unit 4a Pre assessment in Grade 4 scored 31%, revealing fraction and decimal concepts were nearly unknown before instruction — indicating foundational gaps from prior grades. iReady data shows 48% of fifth graders are two or more grade levels below. Grade 1 continues to show the weakest growth in the building (48% met Typical Growth), creating a pipeline gap that compounds annually. Research establishes that students from low-income families who enter first grade with weak number competencies rarely catch up without intentional intervention. EL students face the compounding challenge of developing mathematical understanding while simultaneously acquiring academic English, requiring both language scaffolds and conceptual representations simultaneously.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, every classroom K–5 will have a daily two-component number sense block running with fidelity. Implementation Plan: August–September: Full staff professional learning session (half day) — experiential, not theoretical. Every teacher participates as a student in a grade-appropriate Number Talk and BFF Image Talk. Teachers experience productive struggle, the moment a representation clicks, and the power of hearing multiple strategies. Student Support Leads unpack the research grounding: why economically disadvantaged students disproportionately lack informal math experiences; why MLRs enable EL participation without reducing cognitive demand; what the K–5 progression looks like. Grade-level teams plan their first two weeks of both components using the Framework. Every teacher leaves with a ready-to-implement routine and BFF Lesson String for day one. October–December: Both components run daily in every classroom. Student Support Leads conduct brief (5-minute) weekly observation rounds using a three-column snapshot tool: What routine? What model/manipulative? How did ELs participate? BFF-specific look-for: Is the teacher running the full Lesson String sequence (Image Talk → context task → abstract game), or skipping to the abstract phase before concrete/representational stages	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027, the % of students in Support Needed for Numerical Reasoning on Beacon decreases by at least 8 percentage points in grades 1–5 vs. Spring 2026, and K–2 students specifically reduce Support Needed in Numerical Reasoning: K 38%→28%; Grade 1 38%→28%; Grade 2 40%→30%. <i>Evaluation plan for 3rd-5th?</i> Evaluation Tool(s): Beacon Math Numerical Reasoning sub-domain data (3 windows, all grades K–5); weekly routine observation snapshots; CTLS unit pre-assessment scores (year-over-year); BFF Lesson String pacing tracker Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____	Number Talks K–5 Problem Strings Building Fact Fluency Addition & Subtraction kit (K–2) Building Fact Fluency Multiplication & Division kit (3–5) Stanford SCALE Math Language Routines Manipulatives (rekenreks, ten frames, fraction tiles, decimal grids)
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>			
Teachers will implement a structured daily two-component number sense block: (1) Number Sense Routine (Number Talks/Counting Collections/Problem Strings) and (2) Building Fact Fluency Lesson String, embedded in every math block K–5 with Math Language Routines for EL access Daily (number sense block).			

	are complete? This snapshot data is compiled weekly and shared with grade levels. Biweekly collaborative planning includes a 20-minute number sense component: (1) teachers bring student work or an exit ticket from the routine, (2) the group identifies one understanding and one misconception, (3) coach and team plan the next two weeks of routines to address the misconception. Planning starts with what the data shows students don't yet understand — not with what the next unit requires. Coach models at least one Number Talk and one BFF Lesson String per grade per quarter, live with students, with teachers observing and debriefing immediately. <i>EL-specific:</i> Each grade level identifies its two highest-density WIDA level groups and ensures tiered sentence frames match those levels. ESOL teacher co-plans one number sense routine per month and observes implementation. ESOL's expertise on language scaffolding is treated as instructional content knowledge, not a pull-out function. • January–February: Mid-year Beacon Numerical Reasoning sub-domain data analyzed with coach. Each grade level answers four questions: (1) Which sub-domain shows the least improvement? (2) What routine have we been running for that concept? (3) What model or manipulative have we been using? (4) Have we stayed at the concrete or representational stage long enough, or have we moved to abstract too quickly? Each grade level adjusts its routine focus and BFF Lesson String focus for the second semester based on those answers. Full staff session: each grade level presents a 5-minute 'number sense story' — one routine they ran, what students said, what the data showed, and what they changed. • March–April: Student Support Leads facilitate one instructional rounds cycle focused exclusively on the number sense block. Every teacher in a grade level observes every other classroom for 5 minutes during the routine window, then the team debriefs against two questions: 'Where do we see students thinking flexibly about numbers?' and 'Where do we see students still retrieving procedures rather than reasoning?' Grade levels also conduct a student perception check — two questions asked orally: 'What do you do when you don't know how to start a math problem?' and 'Can you show me a different way to think about ____?' Student responses are documented as a qualitative data point about whether number sense is taking root. • May: End-of-year Beacon Numerical Reasoning sub-domain comparison to Fall baseline for all grades K–5. Grade levels identify whether K–2 students have reduced	Data Analysis Plan: Team compares Beacon Numerical Reasoning sub-domain data after each administration across all grades K–5; adjusts routine focus in collaborative planning accordingly, with particular attention to the Grade 1 trajectory. CTLS unit pre-assessment scores reviewed at the start of each unit — a pre-score below 50% triggers a number sense routine shift to the prerequisite concept for that unit. BFF pacing tracker reviewed monthly to ensure no grade level is skipping concrete/representational stages. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	--	--

	their Support Needed rate toward the target. Student Support Leads and grade-level teams update the Number Sense Routine Framework for FY28, including the routines that worked best, the BFF Lesson Strings that produced the most growth, and the MLRs that best supported EL access. This document becomes the onboarding reference for any new teachers in FY28. Artifacts to be Collected: Number Sense Routine Framework (grade-by-grade: routines, BFF Lesson Strings, models, manipulatives, MLRs, standards alignment); manipulative inventory and gap report; weekly routine observation snapshots (3-column tool); BFF Lesson String pacing tracker by teacher; biweekly collaborative planning agendas with number sense data component; instructional rounds debrief notes; student perception check responses; mid-year and end-of-year Beacon Numerical Reasoning sub-domain comparison data. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly (routine observation snapshots); monthly (collaborative planning)		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Polya's 4-step problem-solving framework is an existing school-wide structure. However, Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (55–69% Below Target, grades 4–5) and Measurement & Data (51–54% Below Target) — the domains most dependent on multi-step application — are among the weakest on both Beacon and Milestones. Only 7% of fifth graders met Stretch Growth on iReady, and 69% of fifth graders are in Support Needed for Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning on Beacon. The current implementation is inconsistent: some classrooms use Polya as a genuine cognitive scaffold while others treat it as a labeling exercise. Compounding this, Step 1 (Understand the Problem) is fundamentally a language task, and there is no school-wide structure for mathematical vocabulary instruction. EL students and economically disadvantaged students disproportionately lack the academic mathematical vocabulary required to decode multi-step word problems — terms like 'difference,' 'product,' 'elapsed time,' 'perimeter,' and 'interpret the data' are not conversational English, and students cannot execute a plan they cannot first understand linguistically. There is no grade-level mathematical vocabulary scope and sequence, no shared routine for introducing and reinforcing math vocabulary, and no systematic approach to vocabulary in problem-solving 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	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, Green Acres will have (1) a written, grade-differentiated Polya Implementation Look-For document with vocabulary instruction embedded in Step 1, and (2) a K–5 Mathematical Vocabulary Scope and Sequence identifying the priority Tier 2 and Tier 3 math terms at each grade level aligned to the CCSD unit sequence. By May 2027, 80% of observed math problem-solving lessons will demonstrate all four Polya steps as genuine cognitive work and include explicit vocabulary instruction or reinforcement at Step 1.		Polya Implementation Look-For document (updated with vocabulary component) K–5 Mathematical Vocabulary Scope and Sequence Frayer Model templates Word Wall frameworks by grade Problem-solving task bank with vocabulary audits Polya scoring rubric ESOL co-planning time (quarterly) GSE Math standards K–5	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: August–September: Full staff professional learning session with two anchors: (1) Polya recalibration — side-by-side student work showing surface vs. deep implementation; teachers identify the difference and discuss what instruction produced each. (2) Mathematical vocabulary as an equity issue — coach presents data showing that Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning and Measurement & Data are the weakest domains, and that the language demands of those domains are disproportionately high for EL students. Teachers complete a vocabulary audit of two upcoming word problems at their grade level: they circle every term a student would need to know to successfully complete Step 1. The audit almost always reveals 6–10 terms per problem that have never been explicitly taught. Each grade level leaves with their first unit's vocabulary list, their Frayer Model template, and their Word Wall framework. Daily vocabulary routine begins week one.			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			Evaluation Performance Target: 60% of students will score proficient across all domains on the Polya scoring rubric by May 2027. Evaluation Tool(s): Polya problem solving rubric Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ 2 times per year	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			Need more information for the evaluation plan Data Analysis Plan: Students will be assessed in January and May. Teachers will participate in collaborative scoring. Student scores will be entered in CTLs.	
Teachers will implement Polya's 4-Step Problem-Solving framework as a genuine cognitive tool, with mathematical vocabulary instruction embedded as a non-negotiable component of Step 1 and as a daily classroom routine across all grade levels K–5 daily.	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads			

	● October–December: Daily math vocabulary routine running in every classroom. Every grade level implements at least two Polya four-step problems per week with vocabulary instruction embedded at Step 1, documented in lesson plans. Coach conducts monthly walkthroughs using the Polya look-for tool, with a specific vocabulary look-for added: Is there a Word Wall present and current? Is Step 1 including explicit vocabulary work before students attempt to solve? Biweekly collaborative planning includes the problem analysis protocol: grade levels select a problem from the upcoming week, conduct the vocabulary audit together (circling every term students must know), plan how each term will be introduced or reinforced, and then plan the questions they will ask at each of the four steps. Coach attends one collaborative planning session per grade per month. ESOL teacher attends quarterly — once per semester — to review the vocabulary list for EL-specific prioritization and to suggest visual supports for the highest-density Tier 2 terms. ● January–February: Collect a common problem-solving sample from every student K–5 on a multi-step problem aligned to the grade-level standard. Before scoring, teachers identify the three to four vocabulary terms in the problem that are most likely to have been barriers. Score using the Polya rubric (one point per step for quality of reasoning) and add a vocabulary observation note: did vocabulary appear to be a barrier at Step 1? Share results with grade-level teams. Full staff session: share patterns — which steps are strongest, which are weakest, and whether vocabulary barriers are concentrated at particular grade levels or with particular subgroups (ELs, SWDs). Adjust second-semester focus accordingly. ● March–April: Grade levels focus on the weakest Polya step from mid-year data. Coach co-teaches at least one Polya lesson per grade level with explicit vocabulary instruction modeled at Step 1 — this is the most important coaching move of the year because it demonstrates what the integration of vocabulary and problem-solving looks like in real time. Teachers collect a second problem-solving sample in April and compare to January. ESOL teacher reviews April samples for EL students and provides feedback on whether the vocabulary scaffolds used in Step 1 are sufficient or need adjustment for the final push to May.		
--	--	--	--

	● May: Final problem-solving sample collection. Score and compare to January baseline. Document what Polya fidelity with vocabulary instruction looks like at each grade level, which Tier 2 and Tier 3 terms proved most challenging, and what the K–5 Vocabulary Scope and Sequence needs to address in FY28. Share end-of-year walkthrough data and vocabulary wall documentation with staff. Artifacts to be Collected: Polya Implementation Look-For document (grade-differentiated, with vocabulary component at Step 1); K–5 Mathematical Vocabulary Scope and Sequence (by unit, Tier 2 and Tier 3); Word Wall documentation by classroom (photo or checklist, updated monthly); daily vocabulary routine logs; lesson plans documenting frequency of four-step problems with vocabulary audit notes; walkthrough observation records; collaborative planning agendas with problem analysis and vocabulary audit protocol; common problem-solving task samples (January and May) with Polya rubric scores and vocabulary barrier notes; coach co-teaching logs. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly walkthroughs (Polya + vocabulary look-fors)		
--	---	--	--

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA/OTHER DATA

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
ACCESS (Data by grade & subgroup)	School-wide: 47 students exited or were reclassified after the FY26 ACCESS administration, the highest reclassification number in recent years. This is the strongest indicator that overall English language development is progressing across the building. More students are in the Developing, Expanding, and Bridging levels than in Entering and Emerging school-wide, indicating that the majority of Green Acres EL students have moved past the earliest acquisition stages. Listening is the overall strongest domain with 34% of students reaching the Bridging or Reaching level — reflecting the positive impact of structured listening experiences in core instruction. Grade 2 shows the strongest academic language growth trajectory in the building: reading jumped from an average of 2.46 in Grade 1 to 3.88 in Grade 2 — the largest single-grade gain in any domain — and Grade 2 has the highest iReady growth rate (79% meeting Typical Growth). Grade 2 EL instruction is a documented building strength. Previous year's goal was met: the percentage of students in Entering and Emerging for speaking decreased from 65% to below 56%, demonstrating that speaking frequency as a focus produced measurable movement at the lower proficiency levels. Speaking Domain Specifically: Speaking has been a named school-wide focus for two consecutive years. Teachers are using turn-and-talk with greater frequency and fidelity than in prior years, and walkthrough data confirms that speaking structures are present in most classrooms. Grades 3 and 4 show the most students at the Developing level in speaking (42% and 33% respectively), indicating a large body of students who are close to the Expanding threshold and positioned for meaningful growth with targeted, quality discourse instruction.	School-wide Speaking: Despite two consecutive years of speaking as a named school-wide focus, speaking scores are flat or declining across most grades. The percentage of students at or below Emerging in speaking has not improved meaningfully in Grades 4 and 5. Two years of turn-and-talk implementation has not moved the ACCESS speaking needle, indicating the strategy is insufficient rather than absent. The listening-speaking gap is the most alarming finding in the data. In Grades 4 and 5, students comprehend academic English at an average of 5.38 (Bridging) but speak at an average of only 3.03 (Developing) — a gap of more than two full proficiency levels. Students in upper grades are hearing and understanding grade-level academic language but cannot yet produce it. This gap does not close without explicit, structured academic oral language production practice. Grades K and 1 have the highest concentrations of Entering-level students: 88% of kindergarteners and 60% of first graders are at Level 1 in speaking. These students need structured speaking scaffolds from day one of school — not as an ESOL add-on, but as a core classroom routine. Without it, the pipeline of students arriving at Grade 3 behind in speaking will continue. Grade 3 is a plateau grade: the overall ACCESS average in Grade 3 (3.22) is nearly identical to Grade 2 (3.22), despite a full year of additional schooling. Growth appears to stall at Grade 3, likely reflecting a shift to content-heavy instruction in upper elementary without continued explicit academic language scaffolding for ELs. Speaking Quality vs. Frequency: Turn and talk produces social and conversational language participation. ACCESS speaking measures academic oral language — the structured, content-specific, linguistically complex speech students use to demonstrate knowledge in academic settings. Frequency of talking is not the same as quality of academic language production. The current implementation conflates the two. There is no school-wide definition of what academic speaking looks like at each WIDA proficiency level. The district rubric addresses sentence complexity only and is student-facing. There is no teacher-facing, multi-dimensional rubric that defines vocabulary use, discourse structure, and sentence complexity simultaneously — the three dimensions that together predict ACCESS speaking performance. Walkthroughs and coaching have been calibrated to the presence of speaking (is talking happening?) rather than the quality of speaking (is academic language being produced at the student's level?). This means instructional feedback has reinforced frequency without driving linguistic rigor.
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	• The speaking strategies being implemented — primarily turn and talk — produce conversational language participation but not the academic oral language production that ACCESS measures. Students are talking more, but they are not producing more linguistically complex, content-specific speech. • Teachers have not been equipped to distinguish between social speaking structures and structured academic discourse, and implementation has not been differentiated by WIDA proficiency level. A Level 1 student and a Level 4 student receive the same turn-and-talk prompt with no language scaffolding differentiated to their level. • Professional learning on speaking has focused on frequency and participation — getting students talking — rather than on the linguistic complexity, vocabulary demand, and discourse structures that characterize academic oral language at each proficiency level. This is what ACCESS measures and what current PL has not addressed. • There is no school-wide definition of what academically rigorous speaking looks like for ELs at each WIDA level, no multi-dimensional teacher-facing rubric to score it, and no walkthrough look-for calibrated to evaluate the quality — not just the presence — of academic oral language production. • The root cause is a professional capacity and leadership gap: the school has implemented speaking as an activity without building teacher understanding of what academic oral language development requires at each proficiency level. Without a shared, observable, leveled standard for academic speaking — embedded in a rubric, a walkthrough tool, and professional learning — frequency of talk will continue to produce social conversation rather than academic language growth.
--	---

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA / OTHER DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3: SPEAKING	By May 2027, Green Acres Elementary will decrease the percentage of EL students scoring at the Entering or Emerging level in speaking on the ACCESS from the current school-wide rate of approximately 50% to 38%, and will increase the percentage of students scoring at the Expanding or Bridging level from 20% to 28%. Additionally, the school-wide listening-speaking gap will decrease by at least 0.5 levels in Grades 1, 2, and 3, as measured by the FY27 ACCESS for ELLs administration.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Despite two consecutive years of speaking as a named school-wide focus, ACCESS speaking scores are flat because current strategies (primarily turn and talk) produce conversational language, not the academic oral language ACCESS measures. There is no school-wide multi-dimensional definition of what academic speaking looks like at each WIDA level, no teacher-facing rubric to score it, and no walkthrough calibrated to evaluate quality of oral language production. Grade 4–5 students comprehend at Bridging level but speak at Developing — a 2+ level gap that requires structured, leveled academic discourse production, not more frequency of talking.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2026, the Green Acres Academic Speaking Rubric will be adopted school-wide and posted in every classroom. By January 2027, 80% of walkthrough observations will show at least one structured academic discourse routine beyond turn-and-talk, and the routine will include observable differentiation by WIDA level.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2027: The percentage of EL students at Entering or Emerging in speaking on ACCESS decreases from ~50% to 38% school-wide. Evaluation Tool(s): ACCESS for ELLs — Speaking domain (FY27 vs. FY26) Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly	Green Acres Academic Speaking Rubric K–5 WIDA Sentence Frame Bank Speaking Walkthrough Look-For Tool WIDA ACCESS Descriptors Structured discourse routine bank (Inside-Outside Circle, Structured Academic Controversy, Collaborative Discussion)
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>	Implementation Plan: August–September: Full staff professional learning session (half day): The Core Distinction — Academic vs. Conversational Language. Every teacher participates in a calibration exercise: they listen to or read three student speaking samples and score them using both the old district rubric (sentence complexity only) and the new three-dimension rubric. The difference in the		

Teachers and students will utilize the Green Acres Academic Speaking Rubric daily to assess a variety of structured academic discourse routines as measured by walkthrough observations.	two scores shows exactly what was being missed. This session establishes why the new rubric exists — not as a compliance tool, but as a diagnostic one. ESOL teacher presents the WIDA level composition of every classroom to every grade-level team — this is often the first time general education teachers have seen a visual of their students' specific WIDA levels. Teams use this to post the right sentence frame tiers in their rooms. Each grade level selects two academic discourse routines beyond turn-and-talk to implement consistently. Research-supported options differentiated by grade band: Philosophical Chairs (3–5), Structured Academic Controversy (4–5), Inside-Outside Circle (2–5), Think-Pair-Share with leveled frame (K–5), Numbered Heads Together (1–5), and Collaborative Discussions using WIDA frames (K–5). Each routine requires students to produce language at a more complex level than turn-and-talk. • October–December: Two academic discourse routines running in every classroom, documented in lesson plans. ESOL teacher co-teaches at least one academic language lesson per grade level per month — not pull-out, but co-instruction inside the general education block, modeling how to use the sentence frames, ask linguistically demanding questions, and differentiate response expectations by WIDA level. Student Support Leads conduct monthly walkthroughs using the speaking look-for tool. Specific look-fors added: Are sentence frames posted and current? Is the teacher asking questions that require students to produce Dimension 1 (vocabulary) and Dimension 2 (discourse) responses — not just yes/no or one-word answers? Is differentiation visible by WIDA level? Monthly collaborative planning includes a 15-minute academic language protocol: grade-level teams bring one student speaking sample (recorded or transcribed) from the prior week's discourse routine, score it on the three-dimension rubric together, and plan one instructional move to advance that student to the next level on the weakest dimension. • January–February: Mid-year speaking data collected: Student Support Leads and ESOL teachers use the three-dimension rubric to score a brief speaking task (2–3 minutes per student, conducted during a structured academic discussion in the classroom) for every EL student in a sampled grade level (one grade per week across the building). Results shared with grade-level teams: What is the school-wide pattern?	☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Annually Data Analysis Plan: ACCESS scores reviewed upon return and compared to prior year by grade, by domain, and by proficiency level distribution. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	ACCESS preparation materials
---	--	---	-------------------------------------

	Which dimension is the weakest — vocabulary, discourse structure, or sentence complexity? Adjust second-semester instructional focus accordingly. Full staff mid-year session: ESOL teacher presents grade-level rubric score patterns alongside prior-year ACCESS data. This is the moment that connects classroom practice to the ACCESS assessment — teachers see the rubric is not a new tool, it is a translation of what ACCESS has always measured. • March–April: Grade levels focus on the weakest rubric dimension from January data. Student support leads and ESOL teachers co-plan and co-teach at least one academic language lesson per grade level per month targeting that dimension specifically — for example, if Dimension 1 (vocabulary) is weakest in Grade 3, the co-taught lesson focuses on how to use Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic vocabulary in spoken response, not just in writing. • May: Debrief once scores return with ESOL team: Did the listening-speaking gap narrow? Did the percentage at Entering/Emerging decrease? Which grades moved most? Document what worked and what professional learning is needed in FY28. Full-year walkthrough data summary shared with staff. Percentage of observations with quality academic discourse routines compared to baseline. Grade levels update their sentence frame banks and discourse routine choices for FY28 based on what produced the most growth. Artifacts to be Collected: Rubrics CCC minutes Walkthrough data PL sign in sheets Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	---	--	--

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.	August 20, 2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026) Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	October 13-17, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	March 4, 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	August 20, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	January 21, 2027		
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: • •	April 15, 2027		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide translated information related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	List documents translated for parents: All school documents and announcements are translated.		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

<u>Academic-Related</u> School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)							
Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
Back to School Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☒ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4			August 20	Grade level syllabus	Admin Teachers Parent Faciliator
Literacy Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☒ Goal 4		Title I	January 14	Family data reflection	Admin Teachers Parent Faciliator

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: Green Acres Elementary's schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination with Cobb County School District initiatives and aligned with federal, state, and local programs that directly support student achievement. The following programs and resources are integrated into the schoolwide plan and supported through Title I funds: Cobb County District Literacy Initiatives: The schoolwide plan is built around the district's structured literacy framework, including the implementation of UFLI (University of Florida Literacy Institute) for foundational phonics instruction in grades K–2 and Wonders as the core ELA curriculum in grades K–5. Professional learning tied to both programs is embedded in the ELA action steps and funded in part through Title I. Georgia ELA Standards Implementation: The plan is aligned to the 2023 Georgia K–12 ELA Standards, which reorganize literacy instruction around the domains of Foundations, Language, Texts, and Practices. Action steps specifically address the transition to these new standards as a root cause of current performance gaps. WIDA/ACCESS Framework for English Learners: The ELA action steps incorporate the WIDA English Language Development framework to support the school's English Learner population. Professional learning, structured academic discourse protocols, and oral language scaffolds are aligned to WIDA proficiency levels and monitored through the ACCESS assessment. Family Engagement: The plan coordinates with the school's Title I Family Engagement requirements, including the Annual Title I Meeting, fall and spring input sessions, and translated communications for families, to ensure parents are informed partners in supporting student achievement.
ESSA Requirements to Include in the Schoolwide Plan – Section 1116(B)(1)

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

SWP Checklist 4

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - 34 CFR § 200.26

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: We conduct a data dig of the Milestones locally and with our district team to ensure we understand the data and what it tells us about our instructional program.

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: We review the data regularly and pivot if the data indicates the need.

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: As implementation begins, we will make revisions if necessary based on the needs of the staff and students.

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

10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State's challenging academic standards. **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.). <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Green Acres follows the Response to Intervention process (RTI). Our RTI coordinator meets with teachers continually to discuss concerns and determine intervention needed to support students.
14. <u>Describe professional development</u> and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, <u>and to recruit and retain effective teachers</u>, particularly in high need subjects. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Professional development that connects to our goals and action steps is provided for all teachers and paraprofessionals on an ongoing basis. New teachers are assigned a mentor and attend monthly meetings to guide them in improved instruction and use of data to make instructional decisions.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(v)</i> 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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)</i> 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?
1.5 Classroom Teachers	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Classroom teachers will implement grade-level, standards-aligned instruction as assigned.
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.

School Improvement Goals
Include goals on the parent compacts and policy

Goal #1	By May 2027, Green Acres Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the ELA Georgia Milestones from 11.8% (3rd grade), 22.8% (4th grade), and 20.8% (5th grade) to 20% (3rd grade), 30% (4th grade), and 28% (5th grade), as measured by the Georgia Milestones Assessment. In grades 1–2, Green Acres Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring Prepared on Beacon ELA across all domains from a current average of 13% (1st grade) and 13% (2nd grade) to 20% in both grades, as measured by the Spring Beacon ELA administration.
Goal #2	By May 2027, Green Acres Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the Math Georgia Milestones from 36.7% (3rd), 30.3% (4th), and 28.2% (5th) to 44% (3rd), 37% (4th), and 35% (5th). The school will also decrease the percentage of K–2 students in Support Needed for Numerical Reasoning on Beacon Math from 38% (K), 38% (Grade 1), and 40% (Grade 2) to 28% (K), 28% (Grade 1), and 30% (Grade 2), as measured by the Georgia Milestones Assessment and the Beacon Math Spring Administration.
Goal #3	By May 2027, Green Acres Elementary will decrease the percentage of EL students scoring at the Entering or Emerging level in speaking on the ACCESS from the current school-wide rate of approximately 50% to 38%, and will increase the percentage of students scoring at the Expanding or Bridging level from 20% to 28%. Additionally, the school-wide listening-speaking gap will decrease by at least 0.5 levels in Grades 1, 2, and 3, as measured by the FY27 ACCESS for ELLs administration.
Goal #4	