Final

Approved Copy

July 10, 2025

School Improvement Plan Title I, Part A





School Year:	2025 - 2026	
School Name:	Milford Elementary School	
Principal Name:	Dr. Tiffany Jones	
Date Submitted:	May 23, 2025	
Revision Date(s):	June 2, 2025; June 12, 2025, June 16, 2025	

Distric	istrict Cobb County School District						
Name							
Schoo		Milford Elementary School					
Name							
Team	Lead	Dr. Tiffany Jones					
Posi	tion	Principal					
Ema	nil	Tiffany.Jones2@cobbk12.org					
Phone 678-842-6966							
		Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)					
Х	Traditi	onal 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.)					
Х	Free/R	educed meal applications					
	Comm	unity Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY					
	Other	(if selected, please describe below)					
	-						

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders).

References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]

To ensure the development of a comprehensive and collaborative school improvement plan, three planning meetings were held (April 16, 2025, May 14, 2025, and May 19, 2025). During these meetings, the team reviewed the 2024–2025 school goals, analyzed current academic, evaluated the extent to which the 2024–2025 goals were met, identified root causes of performance gaps, and developed updated goals and action steps for the upcoming year.

The planning team included a diverse group of stakeholders: the principal, assistant principal, grade-level teachers from kindergarten through fifth grade, special education teachers, an EIP teacher, the gifted teacher, the school counselor, and two parent representatives. Input from all participants was gathered through discussion, data review, and collaborative decision-making to ensure that the plan reflects the needs and priorities of the entire school community.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders are those 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 of participating federal programs. Documentation of stakeholder involvement must be maintained by the school. Suggested stakeholder participation includes the following roles. **A parent is required**.

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

-

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	April 16, 2025	May 14, 2025	May 19, 2025

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Dr. Tiffany Jones	Jeffang Jones
Assistant Principal	Chris Moll	Chris mal
EIP Teacher	Dr. Tykier Brown	Like Bro
Kindergarten Teacher	Courtney Roberson	Courney Roberson
1 st Grade Teacher	Marsi Arcaro	Jul
2 nd Grade Teacher	Denotra Hill	Omate Mill
3 rd Grade Teacher	Dr. Tiffany Paige	Opplaige
4 th Grade Teacher	Tiara Vancant	
5 th Grade Teacher	Tijuana Mitchell	Jona Debell
Special Education Teacher	Heather Cenis	Part an
Counselor	Kelly Jenkins	Lely Derland
Gifted Teacher	Courtney Weldon	Can Weld
Parent	Sydney Mogotsi	800
Parent	Autumn Williams	Late
Social Worker	Joanna Jasso	Jaanne Josof
Parent Facilitator	Elsa Constantino	1 Files Our

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	The percentage of students in K-2 nd grade performing proficient or higher on the Amira assessment will increase by 15% from August 2024 to May 2025.										
Goal #1	The percentage of 3 rd -5 th grade students performing at proficient or higher on the Georgia Milestones assessment will increase by 15% from May 2024 to May 2025.										
	Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially										
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	When evaluating progress toward our 2024–2025 goals, we reviewed student performance data from Amira for students in kindergarten through second grade. According to the data, the percentage of students scoring on grade level in Amira increased from 54% in August 2024 to 73% in May 2025, indicating overall growth in early literacy development. To determine whether we met our ELA goal for the 2024–2025 school year, we reviewed Georgia Milestones assessment data for students in grades 3 through 5. In the 2023–2024 school year, 29% of students (47 out of 161) scored at the Proficient or Distinguished levels. According to the 2024–2025 ELA Milestones data, 29% of students (46 out of 159) also achieved Proficient or Distinguished. These results indicate no change in the percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished in ELA when comparing School Year 2024 to School Year 2025.										
	Reflecting on Outcomes										
If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	 To strengthen ELA instruction and address identified areas of need, the following actionable strategies can be implemented: Ensure consistent use of ELA curriculum, such as Wonders, across all grade levels. Provide professional development focused on assessment literacy in ELA, including how to interpret and use formative and summative assessment data to guide instructional planning and differentiate support. Facilitate training on unpacking ELA standards, with an emphasis on ensuring instruction targets the appropriate depth of knowledge and supports students in analyzing complex texts, citing textual evidence, and writing for a variety of purposes. Promote authentic literacy experiences that connect reading and writing to real-world contexts. 										
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be											

implemented to										
sustain progress?										
Previous Year's	By May 2025, students in K-2 nd grades will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced by 15% from August 2025 to May 2025 on the Beacon Assessment									
Goal #2	By May 2025, students in 3 rd -5 th grades will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 34% (58 students) to 49% (83 students) on the Math Milestones assessment.									
	Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially									
	3 rd - 5 th Grade Milestones									
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	To determine whether we met our ELA goal for the 2024–2025 school year, we reviewed Georgia Milestones assessment data for students in grades 3 through 5. In the 2023–2024 school year, 38.51% of students (62 out of 161) scored proficient or distinguished. In the 2024–2025 school year, 32.51% of students (52 out of 160) scored proficient or distinguished, reflecting a decrease of 6.01%									
	Reflecting on Outcomes									
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	 To address the identified areas of need, the following actionable strategies can be implemented: Review and refine the instructional schedule to ensure that math instruction occurs consistently and without interruption. Protecting this time is essential to support student mastery of mathematical concepts. Provide targeted professional development focused on assessment practices, including how to use formative assessments to guide instruction and respond to student learning needs in real time. Offer professional development to unpack the math standards, ensuring that all instructional staff clearly understand the depth of knowledge required by each standard. This will help align instruction with the complexity and intent of the Georgia Standards. Emphasize math instruction that incorporates real-world applications to help students make meaningful connections, rather than focusing solely on computational procedures. Applying math concepts in authentic contexts can enhance engagement and deepen understanding. 									
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be										

implemented to sustain progress?		
sustain progress?		

	ELA DATA											
ELA Milestones	SY22	SY23	SY24	SY25								
Longitudinal Data	% of students scoring											
	proficient & distinguished	proficient & distinguished	proficient & distinguished	proficient & distinguished								
3 rd Grade	32.7%	22%	21.8%	33%								
4 th Grade	36.2%	36.2%	22%	31%								
5 th Grade	35.6%	42.2%	44.2%	23%								

Beacon ELA Data –	Foundations				Language	2		Texts		Inte	rpreting	Texts	Constructing Texts		
Spring	Support Near		Prepared	Support	Near	Prepared	Support	Near	Prepared	Support	Near	Prepared	Support	Near	Prepared
Administration	Needed	Target		Needed	Target		Needed	Target		Needed	Target		Needed	Target	
1st Grade	48%	33%	19%	41%	38%	21%	26%	52%	22%	50%	31%	19%	41%	33%	26%
	(28/58)	(19/58)	(11/58)	(24/58)	(22/58)	(12/58)	(15/58)	(30/58)	(13/58)	(29/58)	(31/58)	(11/58)	(24/58)	(19/58)	(15/58)
2 nd Grade	35%	28%	37%	35%	28%	37%	38%	31%	31%	34%	29%	37%	38%	32%	29%
	(25/71)	(20/71)	(26/71)	(25/71)	(20/71)	(26/71)	(27/71)	(22/71)	(22/71)	(24/71)	(21/71)	(26/71)	(27/71)	(23/71)	(21/71)

	Reading								Reading Text Types							Writing									
Beacon	n Key Ideas &		Key Ideas & Craft &			Vocabulary			Literary			Informational			Text Types and			Conventions			Research		า		
ELA Data -	- Details			Structure/			Acquisition &									Р	urpose	S							
Spring				Integration of			Use																		
Administr			Knowledge & Skills			e &																			
ation																									
	SN	NT	Р	SN	NT	Р	SN	NT	Р	SN	NT	Р	SN	NT	Р	SN	NT	Р	SN	NT	Р	SN	NT	P	
3 rd Grade	24%	63%	13%	24%	63%	13%	17%	70%	13%	20%	63%	17%	20%	72%	8%	13%	76%	11%	41%	50%	9%	6%	85%	9%	
	(13/	(34/	(7/5	(13/	(34/	(7/5	(9/54	(38/5	(7/5	(11/5	(34/5	(9/58	11/5	(39/5	(4/5	(7/54	(41/5	(6/5	(22/5	(27/5	(5/5	(3/54	(46/5	(5/5	
	54)	54)	4)	54)	54)	4))	4)	4)	4)	4))	4)	4)	4))	4)	4)	4)	4)	4))	4)	4)	
4 th Grade	27%	58%	15%	34%	52%	14%	22%	64%	14%	29%	51%	20%	20%	68%	12%	29%	59%	12%	54%	37%	9%	34%	54%	12%	
	(16/	(34/	(9/5	(20/	(31/	(8/5	(13/5	(38/5	(8/5	(17/5	(30/5	(12/5	(12/5	(40/5	(7/5	17/5	(35/5	(7/5	(32/5	(22/5	(5/5	(20/5	(32/5	(7/5	
	59)	59)	9)	59)	59)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	9)	
5 th Grade	31%	51%	18%	36%	53%	11%	38%	49%	13%	27%	60%	13%	40%	44%	16%	35%	47%	18%	38%	47%	15%	22%	60%	18%	
	(14/	(23/	(8/4	(16/	(24/	(5/4	(17/4	(22/4	(6/4	(12/4	(27/4	(6/45	(18/4	(20/4	(7/4	(16/4	(24/4	(8/4	(17/4	(21/4	(7/4	(10/4	(27/4	(8/4	
	45)	45)	5)	45)	45)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5))	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	5)	

Source Strengths Weakness	es
---------------------------	----

SY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)

Grade Levels (all students):

From SY 24 to SY25, the 3rd grade proficient and distinguished percentage has increased from 21.8% to 36% on the ELA Milestones.

EL:

- Based on the 2025 3rd grade ELA Milestones score 50% (14 of the 28) of the 3rd grade that who scores indicate they are reading on or above grade level are ELL students.
- Based on the 2025 5th grade ELA Milestones score 55% (15 of the 27) of the 5th grade that who scores indicate they are reading on or above grade level are ELL students.

SWD:

 Based on the 2025 5th grade ELA Milestones 40% (4 out of 10) of the students in special education are reading on grade level or above

Grade Levels (all students):

From SY 24 to SY25, the 5th grade proficient and distinguished percentage has decreased from 32.7% to 25% on the ELA Milestones.

EL:

 Based on the 2025 3rd grade and 5th grade ELA Milestone results less than 8 ELL students met target on any of the 9 domains assessed.

SWD:

- Based on the 2025 3rd grade ELA Milestones results of the 9 domains assessed, only 1 student in special education met the target in the domain of vocabulary acquisition and use domain, with zero students meeting the target on the other 8 domains.
- Based on the 2025 5th grade ELA Milestones results of the reading domains assessed only one student met the standard on 8 of the 9 domains with no student meeting the target in the domain of reading information text.

Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)

Grade Levels (all students):

1st and 2nd grade (all students)

 Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in Texts with 67% (87 out of 129 students) scoring Near Target or Prepared.

3-5 (all students)

 Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our student demonstrated strengths in **Research** with 79% (125 out of 158 students) scoring Near Target and Prepared.

EL:

1st and 2nd grade students

 Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in Texts with 53% (39 out of 74 students) scoring Near Target or Prepared.

3-5 grade students

Grade Levels (all students):

1st and 2nd grade (all students)

 Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA out students demonstrated weaknesses in Interpreting Texts and Foundations with 41% (53 out of 129 students) scoring support needed.

3-5 (all students)

 Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Conventions with 45% (71 out of 158 students) scoring support needed.

EL:

1st and 2nd grade students

 Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA out students demonstrated weaknesses in Constructing Text with 53% (39 out of 74 students) scoring support needed.

3-5 students

 Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our student demonstrated strengths in Research with 71% (55 out of 77 students) scoring Near Target and Prepared.

SWD:

1st and 2nd grade students

 Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in Foundations with 30% (3 out of 10 students) scoring Near Target or Prepared.

3-5 students

 Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students demonstrated strengths in Craft and Structure/Integration of Knowledge and Skills and Literacy with 65% (13 out of 20 students) scoring Near Target and Prepared. Conventions with 52% (40 out of 77 students) scoring support needed.

SWD:

1st and 2nd grade students

 Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA out students demonstrated weaknesses in Text and Constructing **Texts** with 90% (9 out of 10 students) scoring support needed.

3-5 grade students

 Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Conventions with 45% (9 out of 20 students) scoring support needed.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

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

Root Cause Explanation:

- Interpreting Texts
 - Students are struggling with decoding, which directly impacts their ability to interpret texts.
 - o Foundational gaps in phonics and phonemic awareness are also contributing to students' inability to interpret text.
- Foundations
 - o Students' limited language skills impact their ability to perform sound substitutions and understand written text.
 - Inconsistent or ineffective implementation of the UFLI (University of Florida Literacy Institute) program by K-2 teachers.
 - o Teachers not implementing UFLI with fidelity in all K-2 classrooms
 - o Teachers are not adequately trained or confident in using the various UFLI resources effectively
- Conventions
 - o Students not receiving explicit, focused instruction on grammar and conventions
 - o Teachers are teaching standards from the previous grade level, not the current grade level expectations
 - o Lack of a common grammar curriculum
 - o Daily schedule does not allocate enough dedicated time for explicit grammar and conventions instruction
- Assessment Alignment:
 - Assessments not aligned with the DOK of the standard
 - Assessment data is not consistently used to identify specific skill gaps and inform targeted interventions.
 - o Teachers need support in developing and selecting high-quality assessment items aligned with ELA standards
- Planning
 - Lack of consistent collaboration between general education teachers, ESOL teachers, and SPED teachers
 - Collaborative planning between general education teachers, ESOL teachers, and SPED teachers are limited to a fragment of the quarterly planning days

	Data-driven intervention groups	riven instruction groups to address students who have not mastered
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: 2024 Listening Average- 3.51 2025 Listening scores increased by 0.26 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 2024 Reading Average- 2.78 2025 Reading Average-2.92 Average ACCESS reading scores increased by 0.14 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 2024 Speaking Average- 2.43 2025 Speaking Average- 2.75 Average ACCESS speaking scores increased by 0.32 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 2024 Writing Average- 2.46 2025 Writing Average- 2.75 Average ACCESS writing scores increased by 0.29 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 SWD: 2024 Reading Average- 2.25 2025 Reading Average- 2.64 Average ACCESS reading scores increased by 0.39 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 2024 Listening Average- 3.22 2025 Listening Average- 3.39 Average ACCESS listening scores increased by 0.17 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025	Grade Levels (all students): EL: The average ACCESS scores of all domains increase for EL from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 SWD: 2024 Speaking Average- 2.25 2025 Speaking Average- 2.13 Average ACCESS reading scores decreased by 0.12 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025 2024 Writing Average- 2.63 2025 Writing Average- 2.54 Average ACCESS writing scores decreased by 0.09 from ACCESS 2023-2024 to 2024-2025
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☑ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity	Lack of ongoing collaboration between general education ESOL and general education teachers do not have a constrategies to address the students' language needs	ion teachers and ESOL teachers mmon planning time to discuss student needs and instructional

☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
a supportive rearring rivironment		
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): Grade levels are creating common assessments for ELA standards EL: Grade levels are creating common assessments for ELA standards SWD: Grade levels are creating common assessments for ELA standards	Grade Levels (all students): Common Assessments are not aligned to the rigor of the Beacon or Milestones Assessment. EL: Common Assessments are not aligned to the rigor of the Beacon or Milestones Assessment. SWD: Common Assessments are not aligned to the rigor of the Beacon or Milestones Assessment.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Student performance on the common assessments creand Milestones. Teachers are creating CFA but using the information ga	rated by teachers do not match the students' performance on Beacon sined from the assessment as a CSA.
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	 K-2 Teachers are using UFLI with fidelity 4-5 Teachers are using morphology with fidelity Teachers are using 120 minutes ELA block with fidelity 	Lack of a common writing curriculum
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Limited opportunities for students to practice writing of the Limited instruction that includes modeling writing constant.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey		

Check the system that contributes to	Root Cause Explanation:	
the root cause:		
☐ Coherent Instruction		
☐ Professional Capacity		
☐ Effective Leadership		
☐ Supportive Learning		
Environment		

	ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN					
GOAL #1: ELA	 By May 2026, students in 1st-2nd grades will increase their level of achievement to on track or higher, by 15% from August 2025 to May 2026 on the Beacon Assessment. The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students performing at proficient or higher on the Georgia ELA Milestones assessment will increase by 10 % from May 2025 to May 2026. 					
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	 Common formative and summative assessments at Assessment data is not consistently used to identification. 	re not aligned to the rigor or DOK of the standard y specific skill gaps and inform targeted interventions.				
Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	☑ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other:					
Components	Implementation Plan SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26	Evaluation Plan SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26	Resources			
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will use ELA common assessment data to form targeted intervention groups every 2 weeks as evidenced by lesson plans and observations.	Evaluation Performance Target: When administering Common Summative Assessments 75% of students will score 80% or higher. Evaluation Tool(s):	PLC Books (Instructional Agility, Teacher as the Assessment			
Target Student Group ☑ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: Outline assessment expectations for staff Outline expectations for assessment professional development (book study and district assessment training) August-December: Book Study presentation during staff meetings	Grade Level Common Formative and Common Summative Assessment results Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: □ Every 2 weeks ☑ Monthly □ Every other month □ 3 times per year	Leader, and Coaching your classroom) Chart paper Markers			
Teachers will use ELA common assessment data to form targeted intervention groups month.	 Staff Book Study- Instructional Agility District Professional Learning presented to teachers during grade level planning teachers during grade level planning 	Data Analysis Plan: Student CSA and CFA assessment data • Intervention Group Rosters Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☑ Principal ☑ Assistant Principals				

Date	Topic
9/3	Standards and Learning
	Targets
9/17	Match DOK to
	Standards
10/1	Item Analysis
10/29	Assessment Audit

 Grade-level teams review class data and identify trends and develop intervention groups develop actionable plan to address student that have not demonstrated proficiency for the learning target and for students that have demonstrated proficiency during CCC meetings and grade level planning.

January-May:

• Continued fidelity checks and targeted support provided as needed.

Artifacts to be Collected:

Teacher-Level Artifacts

- Lesson Plans & Intervention Schedules:
 - Reviewed monthly to ensure alignment with assessment data and targeted groupings.
- Collaborative Team Meeting Notes (CCC Documentation):
- Evidence of data analysis, group formation, and instructional adjustments.
- CCC Meeting Agendas & Notes with evidence of data discussions, grouping decisions, and instructional planning
- Intervention Group Rosters aligned with current student performance data

Student-Level Artifacts:

- Assessment data
- Student data tracking documents

Пп	Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists	
	CCC Leads	
	CCC Leaus	
:		

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☑ Principal ☑ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring:	ucation teachers and ESOL teachers a common planning time to discuss student needs and instru	ctional strategies
Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other:		
Components	Implementation Plan SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26	Evaluation Plan SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2025, 75% of SPED and ELL teachers will implement differentiated small group instruction aligned to the standards as evidenced by instructional walks	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of SWD and ELL students will score 75% or higher on summative ELA assessments.	Notebook Substitute teachers
Target Student Group	and/or lesson plans.	Evaluation Tool(s): Summative Assessments	Chart paper
☑ Gen Ed ☑ EL ☑ SWD	By December 2025, 100% of SPED and ELL teachers will implement differentiated small group instruction aligned to the standards as evidenced by instructional walks and/or lesson plans.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: □ Every 2 weeks □ Monthly	Markers Paper
Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v) 2. SPED and ELL teachers will implement differentiated instructional strategies, including targeted small group instruction, aligned to the rigor of the grade level standards daily.	Implementation Plan: Facilitate quarterly grade-level planning days for general education, SPED, and ELL teachers to:	□ Every other month □ 3 times per year ☑ at the end of each unit Data Analysis Plan: During grade level CCC, teacher teams will analyze student data and develop a plan for students that did not show proficiency and for students that have demonstrated proficiency on the learning target. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☑ Principal ☑ Assistant Principals	

 Unpack grade-level standards for clarity and instructional alignment Develop common formative assessments (CFAs) and common summative assessments (CSAs) Align instructional strategies and supports to meet the needs of all learners 	☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☑ CCC Leads	
Participation will be measured through attendance records, submitted planning artifacts (e.g., unpacked		
standards documents and CFAs/CSAs). This initiative is		
designed to increase instructional coherence, improve		
assessment quality, and strengthen collaboration between		
general education teachers, ESOL teachers, and SPED		
teachers		
 August-May Weekly Morning Planning Quarterly Planning Artifacts to be Collected: Quarterly planning agenda 		
Quarterly planning agentua Quarterly planning notes		
Lesson Plans		
 Instructional walk look-fors/data 		
Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:		
☑ Principal		
☑ Assistant Principals		
☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists		
Frequency of Monitoring:		
• Quarterly		

MATH DATA						
MATH Milestones	SY22	SY23	SY24	SY25		
Longitudinal Data	% of students scoring					
	proficient & distinguished	proficient & distinguished	proficient & distinguished	proficient & distinguished		
3 rd Grade	42.9%	31.0%	43.6%	37%		
4 th Grade	36.2%	51.1%	38.9%	34%		
5 th Grade	32%	31.1%	32.7%	25%		

	Num	erical Reas	oning	Patte	rning & Alg	gebraic	Measuren	nent & Data	Reasoning	Geometri	c & Spatial	Reasoning
Beacon Math Data -					Reasoning	3						
Spring Administration	Support	Near	Prepared	Support	Near	Prepared	Support	Near	Prepared	Support	Near	Prepared
	Needed	Target		Needed	Target		Needed	Target		Needed	Target	
Kinder	54%	31%	15%	67%	21%	12%	61%	32%	7%	54%	27 %	19%
(Winter Administration)	(39/72)	(22/72)	(11/72)	(48/72)	(15/72)	(9/72)	(44/72)	(23/72)	(5/72)	(39/72)	(19/72)	(14/72)
1 st Grade	27%	57%	16%	25%	34%	41%	14%	45%	41%	38%	46%	16%
	(15/56)	(32/56)	(9/56)	(14/56)	(19/56)	(23/56)	(8/56)	(25/56)	(23/56)	(21/56)	(26/56)	(9/56)
2 nd Grade	28%	45%	27%	27%	41%	32%	40%	32%	28%	21%	35%	44%
	(20/71)	(32/71)	(19/71)	(19/71)	(29/71)	(23/71)	(28/71)	(23/71)	(20/71)	(15/71)	(25/71)	(31/71)
3 rd Grade	12%	82%	6%	11%	85%	4%	17%	79%	4%	38%	58%	4%
	(6/52)	(43/52)	(3/52)	(6/52)	(44/52)	(2/52)	(9/52)	(41/52)	(2/52)	(20/52)	(30/52)	(2/52)
4 th Grade	42%	53%	5%	47%	48%	5%	60%	37%	3%	55%	38%	7%
	(25/60)	(32/60)	(3/60)	(28/60)	(29/60)	(3/60)	(36/60)	(22/60)	(2/60)	(33/60)	(23/60)	(4/60)
5 th Grade	55%	43%	2%	53%	45%	2%	53%	47%	0%	70%	28%	2%
	(26/47)	(20/47)	(1/47)	(25/47)	(21/47)	(1/47)	(25/47)	(22/47)	0/47)	(33/47)	(13/47)	(1/47)

Source	Strengths	
		Weaknesses
SY25 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	 All Students: Based on the 2025 Milestones scores, 3rd grade students showed a 9% increase in students performing at the Proficient level and a 3% increase of student performing at the Distinguished level compared to the 3rd grade 2024 Milestones Math results. ELL: 10 of the 14 students fifth grade students that met target for the domain Numerical Reasoning: Multiplication, Division, and Numerical Expressions Domain are ELL students. SPED: When comparing the 2024 to 2025 Milestones data of the 14 students in SPED that tested in both 2024 and 2025 at Milford 13 of students ELA Milestones results only one student performance level dropped from 2024 to 2025 with 1 student scoring distinguished in Math. 	 All students: Based on the 2025 Georgia Milestones data, 32.50% (52 out of 160) of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scored Proficient or Distinguished, reflecting a 6.01% decrease from the 2024 results, where 38.51% (62 out of 161) of students achieved those levels. ELL: Based on the 2025 Milestones data 17% (13 out of 78 students) of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students in ESOL scored proficient or distinguished SPED: Based on the 2025 Math Milestones 10% (2 out of 20 students) of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students in ESOL scored proficient or distinguished.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	 K-2 (all students) Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in Numerical Reasoning with 63% (57 out of 199 students) scoring near target or prepared. 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade (all students) Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in Numerical Reasoning with 66% (102 out of 159 students) scoring near target or prepared. ELL Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in Patterning and Algebra Reasoning with 59% (65 out of 110 students) scoring near target or prepared. Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in Numerical Reasoning with 62% (48 out of 110 students) scoring near target or prepared. 	 Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Patterning and Algebra Reasoning with 41% (81 out of 199 students) scoring support needed. 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade (all students) Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning with 54% (86 out of 159 students) scoring support needed. ELL Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Measurement & Data Reasoning with 50% (55 out of 110 students) scoring support needed. Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning with 38% (42 out of 110 students) scoring support needed.
		SPED

Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in Math our **SPED** Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in students have demonstrated weaknesses in Numerical Reasoning with 71% (15 out of 21 students) scoring support Math our students have demonstrated strengths in needed. Measurement & Data Reasoning with 67% (14 out of Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in Math 21 students) scoring near target or prepared. our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Patterning Based on the 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in and Algebra Reasoning with 81% (17 out of 21 students) Math our students have demonstrated strengths in scoring support needed. Numerical Reasoning with 43% (9 out of 21 students) scoring near target or prepared. Check the system that contributes to **Root Cause Explanation:** the root cause: Instruction/Standards Weak number sense and difficulty recognizing relationships between numbers hinder pattern recognition and algebraic ☑ Coherent Instruction thinking. ☑ Professional Capacity Students have limited exposure to foundational math concepts in early grades or prior years. ☐ Effective Leadership Geometry isn't taught until the end of the year which results in limiting instructional depth due to time constraints ☐ Supportive Learning Environment Students have limited exposure to real-world, standards-based word problems, which impacts their ability to apply mathematical concepts in meaningful and practical contexts. Instructional strategies lack targeted small-group scaffolding and do not consistently address the diverse learning profiles of the students. Assessment: Assessments not aligned with DOK of standard Assessment data is not consistently used to identify specific skill gaps and inform targeted interventions. o Teachers need support in developing and selecting high-quality assessment items aligned with math standards Planning Lack of consistent collaboration between general education teachers, ESOL teachers, and SPED teachers o Collaborative planning between general education teachers, ESOL teachers, and SPED teachers limited to a fragment of the quarterly planning days **MATH Common Assessments Grade Levels (all students):** Grade levels are creating Grade Levels (all students): Common Assessments are not aligned to (Grade Level Reading & Writing) common assessments for Math standards the rigor of the Beacon or Milestones Assessment. EL: Grade levels are creating common assessments for Math standards **EL:** Common Assessments are not aligned to the rigor of the Beacon or Milestones Assessment. SWD: Grade levels are creating common assessments for Math standards **SWD:** Common Assessments are not aligned to the rigor of the Beacon or Milestones Assessment.

	T	T
Check the system that contributes to	Root Cause Explanation:	
the root cause:		ated by teachers do not match the students' performance on Beacon
	and Milestones.	
☐ Coherent Instruction	Teachers are creating CFA but using the information ga	ined from the assessment as a CSA.
☐ Professional Capacity		
☐ Effective Leadership		
☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
School Instructional Walks	Teachers were using common teaching material	Word problems are not implemented with fidelity
(Grade Level)	Teachers used manipulatives with fidelity	Teachers are focusing on computation, and not enough
		time is spent on application
		5th-grade math instruction was interrupted
Check the system that contributes to	Root Cause Explanation:	
the root cause:	_	ne rigor did not match the level of the standards, Beacon assessments,
	and the Milestones	
☐ Coherent Instruction		
□ Professional Capacity		
☐ Effective Leadership		
☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
Other Summary Data		
☐ Teacher Survey		
☐ Parent Survey		
☐ Professional Learning Survey		
Check the system that contributes to	Root Cause Explanation:	
the root cause:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
☐ Coherent Instruction		
☐ Professional Capacity		
☐ Effective Leadership		
☐ Supportive Learning Environment		

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN						
GOAL #2: MATH	By May 2026, students in 1 st and 2 nd grade will increase their level of performance to prepared by 15% from August 2025 to May 2026 on the Beacon Assessment. By May 2026, students in 3 rd -5 th grades will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 32% (52 students) to 42% (67 students) on the Math Milestones assessment.					
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed: Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	Assessments not aligned with DOK of standard Lack of consistent collaboration between general education teachers, ESOL teachers, and SPED teachers □ Title I Funds □ Local School Funds □ Other:					
Components	Implementation Plan SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26 Evaluation Plan SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26					
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency Target Student Group	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2025, 75% of SPED and ELL teachers will implement differentiated small group instruction aligned to the standards daily, as evidenced by instructional walks and/or lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: At least 70% of SWD and ELL students will score 75% or higher on unit math assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): • Summative Assessments	Notebook Substitute teachers Chart paper			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v) 1. SPED and ELL teachers will implement differentiated instructional strategies, including targeted small group instruction, aligned to the rigor of the grade level standards daily.	By December 2025, 100% of SPED and ELL teachers will implement differentiated small group instruction aligned to the standards daily as evidenced by instructional walks and/or lesson plans. Implementation Plan: Facilitate quarterly grade-level planning days for general education, SPED, and ELL teachers to strengthen collaboration, unpack ELA standards, explore ELLevation and math strategies for ELs, and develop common formative and summative assessments (CFAs and CSAs). ESOL, and SPED teachers will participate in quarterly grade-level planning days. During these sessions, collaborative teams will work to:	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: □ Every 2 weeks □ Monthly □ Every other month □ 3 times per year ☑ at the end of each unit Data Analysis Plan: During grade level CCC, teacher teams will analyze SWD and ELL student data and develop a plan for students that did not show proficiency and for students that have demonstrated proficiency on the learning target.	Markers Paper			

 Unpack grade-level star instructional alignment Develop common forma and common summativ Align instructional strat meet the needs of all le 	
Participation will be measured the records, submitted planning articities standards documents and CFAs/designed to increase instructions assessment quality, and strength general education teachers, ESO teachers	acts (e.g., unpacked SAs). This initiative is I coherence, improve en collaboration between Satisfies will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month
August-May: • Weekly Morning Planni • Quarterly Planning	Data Analysis Plan:
Artifacts to be Collected:	S

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	 Instructional strategies lack targeted small-group scaffolding and do not consistently address the diverse learning profiles of the students. Students have limited exposure to real-world, standards-based word problems, which impacts their ability to apply mathematical concepts in meaningful and practical contexts. 					
Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Othe	r:				
Components	Implementation Plan SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26	Evaluation Plan SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26	Resources			
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By October 2025, 75% of teachers will provide daily targeted small group instruction focused on applying math concepts to real-world situations, as evidenced by lesson plans and instructional walks.	Evaluation Performance Target: When administering Common Summative Assessments 75% of students will score 80% or higher.	Notebooks Paper Target the Question			
Target Student Group	Tesson plans and instructional name.	Evaluation Tool(s): Student assessment data	ranger the Question			
☑ Gen Ed ☑ EL ☑ SWD	By December 2025, 100% of teachers will provide daily targeted small group instruction focused on applying math concepts to real-world situations, as evidenced by lesson plans and instructional walks.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: □ Every 2 weeks				
Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)	Implementation Plan: Preplanning:	 ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ at the end of each unit 				
2. All teachers will provide daily targeted small group instruction focused on applying math	August-May: Weekly small group instruction Teachers will receive training on the following areas	Data Analysis Plan:				
concepts to real-world situations (word problems) aligned to the rigor of the standards.	 Flexible grouping Using visual models and manipulatives Using literacy-based strategies to understand word problems 	During grade level CCC, teacher teams will analyze student data and develop a plan for students that did not show proficiency and for students that have demonstrated proficiency on the learning target.				
	 Embedding problem solving into daily spiral review 	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☑ Principal				
	 Artifacts to be Collected: Small Group Lesson Plans focused on real-world word problems Instructional Materials (e.g., problem sets, manipulatives, anchor charts) aligned to math standards 	 ✓ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads 				

Student Work Samples from small group sessions demonstrating application of problem- solving strategies	
Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☑ Principal ☑ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists	
Frequency of Monitoring: • Ongoing	

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (Required Components)						
Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	Date(s) Scheduled	S) Scheduled Date Completed				
1. Required Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline 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 28, 2025		□ 1 □ 4 □ 2 □ 5 □ 3 □ 6			
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) — Deadline Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	October 14-17, 2025		□ 1 □ 4 □ 2 □ 5 □ 3 図 6			
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	April 1, 2026		□ 1 □ 4 □ 2 □ 5 □ 3 ⋈ 6			
4. Required TWO Building Capacity Opportunities (Do 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	September 3, 2025 January 5, 2026		□1 □4 □2 □5			
the parents and school	January 3, 2020		⊠ 3 □ 6			
5. Required Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit 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: (Need at least 2) August 1- Parents will have the opportunity to meet their child's new teacher and gather essential	August 1, 2025 August 28, 2025					
information to ensure student success in the upcoming school grade-level. This event will focus on understanding classroom expectations, available resources, and strategies to support academic growth.						
August 28- During Open House parents will be informed about the academic expectations for the school year, including key learning standards, standardized testing, and other important events for the year. This event will provide insight into how parents can support their child's learning at home and stay informed about progress throughout the school year.						

6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. SWP Checklist 5.d	List documents translated for parents: Parent Newsletters Compact Policy	□ 1 □ 2 □ 3	□ 4 ⊠ 5 □ 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	"Shall" Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) SWP Checklist 5.e	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Team Lead
Family Game Night	□ 1 ⋈ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 ⋈ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal3 ☐ Goal 4	Instructional games Copy supplies	Title I	11/6/2025	Parent surveys Sign in sheet	Family Game Night Committe e
STEAM Night	□ 1 ⋈ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 ⋈ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Supplies for hands-on science, art, and math activities	Title I	3/5/2026	Parent surveys Sign in sheet	STEA M Com mitte e
Publix Math Night	□ 1 ⋈ 2 □ 3 ⋈ 4 □ 5 ⋈ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Copy supplies	Title I	April 2026	Parent surveys Sign in sheets	Publix Math Night Com mitte e

GaDOE required six "Shall's". Each shall must be addressed at least once during the school year:

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

School Improvement Plan Required Questions

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

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

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

The schoolwide plan at Milford Elementary has been developed in close coordination and integration with various federal, state, and local services and resources to ensure a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement, particularly in literacy and math. The plan aligns with Title I requirements and supports district-wide initiatives designed to meet the academic and social-emotional needs of all students.

Our Comprehensive Title I Schoolwide Plan is designed to enhance student performance through a focused objective to strengthen literacy and math outcomes. The plan includes a range of instructional strategies, targeted interventions, and ongoing professional development to build teacher capacity and directly address identified academic gaps. Professional learning is tailored to support teachers in implementing best practices in reading instruction, math application, and data-driven instruction.

The plan also supports students identified as at-risk through a structured Response to Intervention (RTI) process, which uses data to identify needs early and provide tiered levels of academic support. Teachers and staff participate in regular collaborative learning communities to analyze assessment data, monitor progress, and adjust instruction accordingly.

As part of the schoolwide strategy, teachers are supported in conducting data conferences with students, providing timely feedback, and setting personal academic goals with students. This approach fosters student ownership of learning and allows both students and teachers to track progress toward individual goals.

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:

Milford Elementary regularly monitors the implementation and effectiveness of the schoolwide program through a structured and ongoing process that utilizes multiple sources of academic data. Monitoring is conducted collaboratively by the principal and assistant principal to ensure instructional practices align with schoolwide goals and that all students are making meaningful progress.

Monitoring strategies include:

- Classroom Observations: The administrative team conducts regular walkthroughs and formal observations to monitor instructional delivery, student engagement, and alignment with curriculum standards.
- CCC Agendas & Meeting Minutes: Weekly CCC meetings provide structured time for teachers to review student data, collaborate on instructional strategies, and monitor progress toward grade-level and schoolwide goals. These sessions are documented and reviewed by school leadership.
- Data Monitoring Sheets: Student performance data is tracked consistently using monitoring tools that capture results from multiple assessments, including Beacon, Amira, common formative assessments (CFAs), and common summative assessments (CSAs). This data informs RTI decisions, instructional planning, and progress monitoring.
- 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:

Milford Elementary determines the effectiveness of its schoolwide program by analyzing multiple sources of student achievement data throughout the school year, with a particular focus on students who are performing below grade level or are historically underserved. The school uses a multi-tiered data review process to assess whether the program is increasing student achievement and helping all learners meet the challenging state academic standards.

To evaluate effectiveness, the school:

- Reviews Georgia Milestones Assessment results at the end of the year to measure overall student achievement and growth in relation to state standards. Particular attention is given to subgroup performance and students who have historically been farther from meeting grade-level expectations.
- Administers the Amira reading assessment three times per year, which provides diagnostic and progress monitoring data for foundational reading skills. This tool helps identify reading gaps early and assess growth over time for struggling readers.
- Uses Beacon benchmark assessments three times per year in both reading and math to track progress toward mastery of the Georgia Standards of Excellence. Beacon data is analyzed by standard and subgroup to guide schoolwide instructional planning and intervention.
- Implements common formative assessments (CFAs) and common summative assessments (CSAs) regularly across all grade levels to monitor ongoing progress and adjust instruction. These assessments are used in CCC meetings to identify trends, inform small group instruction, and provide targeted support for students not yet meeting expectations.
- 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:

Teachers will convene weekly for CCC, with a structured focus on content areas. On Wednesdays, teams will analyze math data and discuss instructional strategies, while Thursdays will be dedicated to reviewing ELA data and refining instructional practices as needed. During these meetings, teachers will also collaborate to develop aligned Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) and Common Summative Assessments (CSAs). The schoolwide plan will undergo ongoing revisions informed by student performance data and teacher input gathered during these sessions.

In addition, the administrative team will meet monthly with the district Title I supervisor and Title I instructional coach to review both the implementation of the plan and relevant student achievement data. This regular monitoring will be essential to ensuring that the schoolwide plan remains responsive to student needs and continues to support improved academic outcomes for all learners.

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

- 10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State's challenging academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State's challenging academic standards, where applicable. SWP Checklist 2(a)
- 11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.

 SWP Checklist 2(b)
- 12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. **Evidence to support** this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable. *SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)*
- 13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Milford Elementary will implement a schoolwide tiered model of support to prevent and address problem behaviors and provide early intervention services. This model will be coordinated with activities and services aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to ensure that all students, including those with disabilities, receive appropriate behavioral and emotional support.

Milford will implement a Core team, which will consist of the assistant principal, principal, school counselor, social worker, parent facilitator, and school psychologist, will meet monthly to review behavior data and identify students with recurring infractions. This team will analyze patterns, determine appropriate interventions, and coordinate support services for students demonstrating behavioral concerns.

To proactively support positive behavior and reduce time out of class due to disciplinary issues, Milford will implement several schoolwide strategies, including:

- A "Student of the Day" program, recognizing students who consistently demonstrate positive behavior.
- Public praise on the school news and special incentives from educational partners for students who exhibit exceptional conduct.
- The implementation of "Brag Tags" to acknowledge and reinforce positive behavior throughout the school day.

The school counselor and social worker will lead small group interventions for students requiring additional behavioral support. These groups will focus on developing social-emotional learning, self-regulation, and conflict resolution skills.

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, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Milford Elementary will provide **ongoing professional development and collaborative learning opportunities** for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instructional practices and strengthen the use of academic assessment data to inform teaching and learning. These efforts will also support the recruitment and retention of effective educators, particularly in high-need subject areas.

Professional development and activities will include:

- Weekly CCC, where grade-level teams will meet to review student data, refine instructional strategies, and develop plan to provide intervention and enrichment.

 During these sessions, teachers will also create Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) aligned to the Georgia standards and monitor student progress through data discussions.
- Participation in **book studies** focused on evidence-based instructional strategies, student engagement, assessment literacy, and responsive teaching practices. These studies will foster reflective dialogue and support professional growth across content areas.
- Engagement in district-led professional learning centered on assessment design and data analysis. Teachers and instructional teams will participate in learning sessions focused on:
 - Designing assessments aligned to standards and learning targets
 - Ensuring assessments reflect the appropriate level of complexity and depth of knowledge
 - o Conducting assessment audits to evaluate the quality, alignment, and instructional usefulness of classroom assessments
- Training on how to use assessment data—including data from Beacon, Amira, CFAs, and CSAs—to differentiate instruction and provide timely, targeted feedback to students.

In addition to instructional development, Milford will support the recruitment and retention of effective teachers, particularly in high-need subjects, by:

- Creating a supportive and collaborative professional culture that emphasizes shared leadership and continuous improvement
- Providing meaningful coaching, mentoring, and induction supports for new teachers
- Offering structured opportunities for professional learning that are responsive to staff needs and aligned with schoolwide goals

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Milford Elementary is committed to supporting smooth and successful transitions for students at key educational milestones. A variety of transition activities will be provided to ensure students and families are well-prepared academically, socially, and emotionally as they move from one grade band to the next.

Preschool to Kindergarten Transition

- Local preschool students will be invited to visit Milford Elementary for a school tour to help familiarize them with the building, meet kindergarten teachers, and experience a welcoming classroom environment.
- A Kindergarten Parent Orientation will be held at the beginning of the school year to communicate important expectations, academic goals, and school procedures. This meeting will help parents understand how to support their child's transition and success in kindergarten.

5th Grade to 6th Grade Transition

- Milford will collaborate with Smitha Middle School's counselor and other representatives to visit each 5th grade classroom. During these visits, they will deliver a presentation highlighting the challenges, differences, and opportunities that await students in middle school. The presentation will offer a comprehensive overview of academic expectations, daily routines, extracurricular activities, and support services available.
- The second half of the session will include a Q&A segment, giving students the opportunity to ask questions and address any concerns they may have about the transition.

- Additionally, 5th grade students will visit Smitha Middle School during regular school hours, allowing them to spend a few hours experiencing life in a middle school classroom. This visit will help ease anxiety and builds excitement for the next phase of their academic journey
- 16. **ONLY HIGH SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED** Describe how the school prepares and makes aware of opportunities for postsecondary education and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual or concurrent enrollment, or early college high schools. *SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

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

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

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

3W1 Checkist 2.c(W) - 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?			
Class Size reduction teacher- 1 st Grade teacher	⊠ Goal 1 ⊠ Goal 2 □ Goal 3 □ Goal 4	 ☑ Coherent Instruction ☑ Professional Capacity □ Effective Leadership ☑ Supportive Learning Environment ☑ Family Engagement 	The Class Size Reduction teacher will be assigned to 1st grade to lower the teacher-to-student ratio, allowing for more targeted and differentiated instruction. This additional support will enable teachers to provide additional support for the diverse learning needs of students, particularly as they develop foundational math skills. First grade instruction often requires smaller group settings to effectively address multiple skill levels and ensure all students receive the individualized support necessary for academic growth.			
Parent Facilitator	⊠ Goal 1 ⊠ Goal 2 □ Goal 3 □ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☑ Family Engagement	The parent facilitator will serve as a vital link between home and school by offering quarterly literacy and math workshops for families. These workshops will equip parents with strategies and resources to support key literacy and math concepts at home, reinforcing the skills students are learning during the school day and strengthening the home-to-school connection.			
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement				
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement				

School Improvement Goals Include goals on the parent compacts and policy ■ By May 2026, students in 1st-2nd grades will increase their level of achievement to on track or higher, by 15% from August 2025 to May 2026 on the Beacon Assessment. Goal #1 ■ The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students performing at proficient or higher on the Georgia ELA Milestones assessment will increase by 10 % from May 2025 to May 2026. • By May 2026, students in 1st and 2nd grade will increase their level of performance to prepared by 15% from August 2025 to May 2026 on the Beacon Assessment. Goal #2 • By May 2026, students in 3rd-5th grades will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 32% (52 students) to 42% (67 students) on the Math Milestones assessment. Goal #3 Goal #4