Final

Approved Copy

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A

School Year:	**2025 - 2026**
School Name:	**Belmont Hills Elementary**
Principal Name:	**Dr. Ashley Campoli**
Date Submitted:	**June 2, 2025**
Revision Date(s):	**8/7/25, 11/13/25**

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	Belmont Hills Elementary
Team Lead	Patrice Hill and Ashley Owenby
Position	EIP Support
Email	Patrice.hill@cobbk12.org Ashley.owenby@cobbk12.org
Phone	678.842.6810

Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems **ONLY**
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only

Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification **ONLY**
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). *References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]*
School Response: Our leadership team first met and reviewed the GaDOE, Beacon, and Amira data and reviewed the results from the district School Instructional Walks for ELA and Mathematics Forms data. Each grade level met to review Beacon data and group students for instruction and for the development of the SIP. Later, the Administration team met with each grade level to review the 2024 student achievement data, and reflected on strengths, weaknesses, and root causes and completed the reflections document. After careful reflection, we used the conversation to create our SSP goals aligned to each team's identified needs. Parents had the opportunity to participate in developing the SIP through the spring input meeting. After the plan was completed, all stakeholders had a chance to provide feedback on the finished plan. Additionally, our BLT discussed our goals for the upcoming school year.

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: Dinna Ortiz De Gracia
Dr Ashley Campoli and Haroldeen Swearingen	
Content or Grade Level Teachers:	Media Specialists: Melissa Weatherford
Local School Academic Coaches	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches: Dr. Angela Mack	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: Natarsha Miller
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.

3/28/25	4/1/25	4/15/25	5/9/25
Leadership Meeting	Grade Level Meeting	Grade Level/Admin Team Meeting	Building Leadership Team Meeting

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
ISS	Patrice Hill	
Teacher	Amy Hall	Amy Hall
Teacher	Samantha Phillips	Samantha Phillips
Counselor	Hollie Ollivierre	
Gifted	Jennifer Darnell	
Teacher	Jessica Smith	Jessica Smith
Teacher	Kristen Thalacker	
Media	Natasha Miller	
Teacher	Jordan Hirst	
Teacher	Ashley Bollinger	A. Bollinger
ISS	Ashley Owenby	Ashley Owenby
Teacher	Melissa Weatherford	M. Weatherford
Teacher	Kimberly Test	Kimberly Test
Principal	Ashley Campoli	AJ Campoli
Asst. Principal	Haroldeen Swearinge	

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
Title I Supervisor	Cheryl C Johnson	Cheryl C. Johnson
Title I District Coach	Angela Mack	Angela Mack
Parent	Lisa Hawk	Lisa Hawk

FY26 Title I School Improvement Plan 4

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	• The percentage of kindergarten students demonstrating at/near or above grade level proficiency will increase from Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 by at least 10% as measured by the Amira in Spring 2025. • The percentage of 1st – 2nd grade students scoring proficient and above in reading will increase from Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 by at least 10% as measured by the Beacon assessment. • The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in ELA will increase from 26% (31 students) to at least 35% (42 students) as measured by the 2024 –2025 Milestone EOG ELA Assessment.
	Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Amira – 97% of kindergarten students scored at/near or above grade level proficiency. Fall 2024 was 59% and in the Spring 97%. The goal was met. Beacon - The students in first and second grades met the goal by increasing their Overall Scale Beacon scores by at least 10%. There were 3 first-grade students in the fall who scored 'prepared', and there were 10 out of 34 students in the Spring. In second grade, 3 students scored 'prepared' in the fall, and 14 out of 34 students scored 'prepared' in the Spring. The percentage of students scoring prepared increased from 9% in the fall to 35% in the spring. On the Milestones ELA Assessment, the average percentage of students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels in grades 3–5 was 17%

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	ELA Milestones Assessment - In our plans for the 25-26 school year, we have appointments with the district assessment department, METRORESA (new ELA standards), and district Wonders writing connected to text. They will be providing support to teachers with developing understanding of new standards, instructional planning and developing common assessments that include a variety of questions that meet the ELA standards.
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions	Amira successes were attributed to our Shine Time intervention block for the ELA foundational skills, and the intervention will be implemented again in the 25-26 school year. Shine Time is our school-wide 20-minute intervention block. We used the University of Florida's Literacy (UFLI) instructional resources to provide instruction.

contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	Beacon successes were attributed to our Shine Time intervention block for the ELA foundational skills, and the intervention will be implemented again in the 25-26 school year. Shine Time is our school-wide 20-minute intervention block. We used the University of Florida's Literacy (UFLI) instructional resources to provide instruction.

Previous Year's Goal #2	• At least 80% of kindergarten students will demonstrate proficiency by scoring 75% or higher in mathematics as measured by the CCSD Evidence of Student Learning assessment by the end of each unit. • The percentage of 1st – 2nd grade students scoring proficient and above in mathematics will increase from Fall 2024 to Spring 2025 by at least 10% as measured by the Beacon assessment. • The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in mathematics will increase from 39% (46 students) to at least 48% (57 students) as measured by the 2024-2025 Milestone EOG Math Assessment.
	Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☒ **Partially**
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Evidence of Student Learning (EOSL) District unit assessments – 79% (27/34) of students scored 75% or higher. The goal was missed by 1%. Beacon - The students in first and second grades met the goal by increasing their Overall Scale Beacon scores by at least 10%. There was 1 first-grade student in the fall who scored 'prepared', and there were 11 out 34 students in the Spring. In second grade, 1 student scored 'prepared' in the fall, and 9 out of 34 students scored 'prepared' in the Spring. The percentage of students scoring Prepared increased from 3% in the fall to 29% in the spring. The goal was met. Milestones EOG Math Assessment – 31% (36/117) of students scored proficient or distinguished levels. The goal was unmet.

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	EOSL - In our plans for the 25-26 school year, we have appointments with the district assessment department. They will be providing support to teachers with instructional planning and developing common assessments that include a variety of questions that meet the math standards. Math Milestones Assessment - In our plans for the 25-26 school year, we have appointments with the district assessment department and METROESA math unit planning. They will be providing support to teachers with instructional planning and developing common assessments that include a variety of questions that meet the math standards.

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?	Beacon successes were attributed to our Shine Time intervention block for the mathematics fact fluency skills using Origo resources. Even though the intervention will not be included in our Shine Time during our school-wide 20-minute intervention block, the intervention will be restructured and included during our Discovery Saturday program.

Previous Year's Goal #3	The percentage of 5th-grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in science will increase from 32% (15 students out of 47) to at least 40% (18 students out of 47) as measured by the 2024-2025 Milestone EOG Science Assessment
	Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	20% (9/45) of students scored in the proficient and/or distinguished levels in Science.

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Our STEM Lab teacher will be providing EIP support in grades 3rd – 5th during the integrated ELA block.
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?	

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

ELA DATA

ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3rd Grade	34%	22%	20.9%	17.9%
4th Grade	17.9%	17%	16%	17.6%
5th Grade	21.4%	27%	34%	15.6%

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
1st Grade	16	11	13	16	15	9	16	14	10	17	13	10	14	17	9
2nd Grade	13	9	18	17	11	12	13	18	9	12	15	13	16	14	10

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Reading									Reading Text Types						Writing								
	Key Ideas & Details			Craft & Structure/ Integration of Knowledge & Skills			Vocabulary Acquisition & Use			Literary			Informational			Text Types and Purposes			Conventions			Research		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3rd Grade	5	30	3	11	24	3	4	32	2	8	27	3	8	27	3	11	25	2	18	19	1	13	24	1
4th Grade	10	19	4	10	17	6	4	20	4	8	27	3	8	27	3	6	24	3	14	15	4	4	25	4
5th Grade	12	27	5	13	26	5	16	25	3	15	25	4	14	24	6	9	28	7	20	23	1	17	21	6

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 ELA Milestones **(Grade Levels & Subgroups)**	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** **3rd grade** • 47% (18/38) of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in the Key Ideas and Details domain. **4th grade** • 8.25%(4/33) of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in the Key Ideas and Details domain **5th grade** • 40% (18/45) of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in the Reading Informational Text domain.	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** **3rd grade** • 76% (29/38) of students scored Below performance level in the Reading Literary Text domain. **4th grade** • 88% (29/33) of students scored Below performance level in the Reading Literary Text domain. **5th grade** • 76% (34/45) of students scored Below performance level in the Reading Literary Text domain.
Beacon Assessment – ELA **(Grade Levels & Subgroups)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** **Grades 1-2:** • Students demonstrated strengths in Foundation, with 64% (51 students out of 80 students) scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories. **Grades 3-5** • Students demonstrated strengths in vocabulary acquisition and use, with 75%	**Grade Levels (all students):** Constructing text is a weak area across all grade levels **Grades 1-2:** • Students demonstrated an area of weakness in Constructing Texts, with 38 % (30 students out of 80 students) scoring in the Support Needed category. • **Grades 3-5**

	(86 students out of 115 students) scoring in the Near Target and Prepared categories. **EL:** • ESOL students in grades 1-2 demonstrated strengths in the Foundations domain. • ESOL students in grade 3, students demonstrated strengths in the areas of Vocabulary Acquisition and Use and Key Ideas and Details. • ESOL students in grade 5, students demonstrated strengths in the areas of Text Types and Purposes (writing). **SWD:** • The second-grade students have learned letters and sounds.	• Students demonstrated an area of weakness in conventions of standard English, with 45% (52 out of 115 students) scoring in the Support Needed category. • Students demonstrated an area of weakness in Craft and Structure, with 30% (34 out of 115 students) scoring in the Support Needed category. **EL:** • ESOL students in grades 1-2 demonstrated weakness in the Language domain. All students whose overall ELA Scale Score was Support Needed are Second Language Learners who are Newcomers this school year. • ESOL students in grades 3 -5 demonstrated weakness in the Conventions domain. **SWD:** • Students' lowest domain in grades 1-2 is in the Foundations domain.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** There is a need for explicit instruction in writing. There is a need for Professional Development in writing, especially in writing connected to text. There are limited opportunities for students to engage in a spiral review of grammar and the use of conventions during writing.	
ACCESS Scores **(Grade Level Reading, Writing, Listening, and Speaking)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** The composite score for first grade increased in the intermediate domain from 27.3 to 38.9 from 2023 to 2024. This was an increase of 11.6.	**Grade Levels (all students):** 2023 Reading Average- 3.11/128 2024 Reading Average- 2.89/149 Average ACCESS reading scores decreased by .22 from 2023 to 2024 2023 Writing Average- 2.90/128 2024 Writing Average- 2.6 /149

	The composite score for 3rd grade decreased in the beginner domain from 13.0 to 4.2 from 2023 to 2024. This was a decrease of 8.8. The composite score in 5th grade increased in the 4.0-4.9 range from 31.2 to 40.7 from 2023 to 2024. This was an increase of 9.5	Average ACCESS writing scores decreased by .3 from 2023 to 2024 2023 Speaking Average- 3.01/128 2024 Speaking Average- 2.78/149 Average ACCESS speaking scores decreased by .23 from 2023 to 2024 2023 Listening Average- 4.24/128 2024 Listening Average- 3.70/149 Average ACCESS reading scores decreased by .54 from 2023 to 2024
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Limited use of district instructional resources designed to support students in developing listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. • Limited opportunities for all teachers to engage in professional learning of ELLevation about best practices for teaching ESOL students to scaffold support based on individual students' needs.	
ELA Common Assessments **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	**Based on the grade level discussion, each team highlighted strengths from common assessments:** K: printing upper/lower case letters 1: decoding two-syllable words 2: strong ability to ask and answer questions and analyze characters 3: answering right-there types of questions, literal questions (Fiction and Non-Fiction) 4: answering literal questions 5: success with DOK 1 questions. Vocabulary has improved as well as phonics and decoding.	**Based on the grade level discussion, each team highlighted areas of weakness from common assessments:** K: isolating phonemes in one-syllable words 1: writing complete sentences using capital letters and correct punctuation 2: comparing and contrasting text in stories, identifying point of view 3: writing skills- Conventions of standard English 4: writing skills- Conventions of standard English 5: answering questions with inferential thinking and logical reasoning
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction	**Root Cause Explanation:** There is a need to increase students' reading stamina by aligning tasks and assessments to the ELA standards.	

☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	There is a need for explicit instruction for grammar and conventions. There are limited opportunities for students to engage in a spiral review of grammar and the use of conventions during writing.	
School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	**K-5** • Data revealed that 88% of teachers were using the instructional materials for UFLI instruction. • Percentage of student engagement was 98%	**K-5** • In some observations, teachers were mispronouncing phonemes during instruction • In some observations, teachers were uncertain about the lesson components and how to implement them with fidelity.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** There is a need for continuous professional development in pronouncing phonemes in grade level cccs meetings.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	N/A	N/A
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	• The percentage of kindergarten students demonstrating at/near or above grade level proficiency will increase from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 by at least 80% as measured by the Amira in Spring 2026. • Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 50 points from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 as measured by the Beacon assessment. • The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in ELA will increase from 17% to at least 20% as measured by the 2025-2026 Milestone EOG ELA Assessment.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• There is a need to develop teachers' knowledge of providing quality instruction for writing connected to text.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☒ Other: district

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** **Target Student Group** ☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** 1. K-5 teachers will implement reading comprehension instruction aligned with the rigor of the standards using grade-level text for all students.	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of teachers will implement a writing connected to text tasks as aligned to the Wonders curriculum daily. **Implementation Plan:** ○ Preplanning: ○ District LEI -ELA New Standards & Wonders (New curriculum) Training ○ August-September: ○ MRESA - New Standards Training (Texts & Practices) ○ Weekly collaborative planning and data analysis focused on reading comprehension skills and explicit writing instruction will begin ○ October-December: ○ K-5 teachers will analyze Wonders Progress Monitoring Assessment data to identify student needs and adjust instructional practices. ○ Vertical Alignment PL- Using ELA standards and Wonders Curriculum/Assessments, the teachers	**Evaluation Performance Target:** At least 50% of students in each grade level will score 70% or higher on the end-of-unit progress monitoring assessments (Wonders assessments). **Evaluation Tool(s):** Wonders Progress Monitoring Assessment **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ end of each unit **Data Analysis Plan:** Grade level teams will meet at least monthly at the end of each unit to analyze student writing using Wonders or district provided rubric/checklist **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:**	District Consultants MRESA consultants

	will explore instructional rigor and expectations and identify opportunities for growth ○ Establish a Literacy Task Force to include at least one representative from each grade level to lead school-wide literacy initiatives ○ Podcast PL – Leveling Reading, Leveled Lives with Dr. Tim Shanahan ○ Implement homework policy/contracts to include more opportunities for students to engage with grade-level text and apply reading comprehension skills. ○ March-April: ○ Continue weekly collaborative planning and data analysis focused on reading comprehension skills and explicit writing instruction will begin **Artifacts to be Collected:** Collaboration agenda CCCs Data Reflection sheets **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ EIP support **Frequency of Monitoring:** Quarterly	☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Limited opportunities for all teachers to engage in professional learning of ELLevation about best practices for teaching ESOL students to scaffold support based on individual students' needs.		
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District		
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** **Target Student Group**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of teachers will implement at least one ELLevation strategy during daily ELA instruction as measured by lesson plans or instructional walks. **Implementation Plan:**	**Evaluation Performance Target:** At least 50% of ELL students in each grade level will score 70% or higher on the end-of-unit progress monitoring assessments (Wonders assessments). **Evaluation Tool(s):**	ESOL Consultants

☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 2. Teachers will become acquainted with the ELLevation platform resource and implement at least one strategy during ELA instruction.	○ **October**: ○ PL from the ESOL Dept. ○ Teachers will begin referencing at least one ELLevation strategy within lesson plans ○ **November:** ○ School Visit to observe language development strategies in action (i.e., speaking and listening protocols) ○ Teachers will continue to reference at least one ELLevation strategy within lesson plans ○ **December - April**: ○ December 2, 2025: Digital Learning Day –ELLevation Strategies Training ○ Teachers will continue to reference at least one ELLevation strategy within lesson plans **Artifacts to be Collected:** PPT or Agenda Sign in sheet Teacher reflection **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ EIP support **Frequency of Monitoring:** weekly	○ Wonders Progress Monitoring Assessment **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ end of unit (Wonders), Winter Administration of ACCESS **Data Analysis Plan:** Grade level collaboration days, teachers will review students' writing **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads ☒ ESOL Leads	

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3rd Grade	46.8%	44%	44.2%	25.6%
4th Grade	28.2%	33%	29.5%	44.1%
5th Grade	9%	27%	38.3%	24.4%

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 (Winter Administration)	16	10	11	20	9	8	13	13	11	19	12	7
1st Grade	12	18	10	13	9	18	10	10	20	11	20	9
2nd Grade	14	18	8	11	20	9	15	11	14	10	15	15
3rd Grade	2	36	0	2	35	1	9	29	0	17	20	1
4th Grade	8	24	1	14	19	0	14	19	0	17	16	0
5th Grade	27	15	2	26	18	0	25	28	1	28	14	2

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 MATH Milestones **(Data by grade & subgroup)**	**3rd grade** • (76% (29/38) students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning: Attributes of Polygons. **4th grade** • 88% (30/34) of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning: Angle and Measurement domain.	**3rd grade** • 61% (23/38) of students scored Below performance level in the domain Measurement and Data Reasoning. **4th grade** • 53% (18/34) of students scored Below performance level in the Numerical Reasoning: Compare and Round Numbers domain. **5th grade**

	5th grade • 53% (24/45) of students scored Proficient or Distinguished performance levels in the Measurement and Data domain.	• 71% (32/45) of students scored Below performance level in the Numerical Reasoning: Place Value and Decimals domain.
Beacon Assessment – Math **(Grade Level & Subgroups)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** **Grades 1-2:** • Students demonstrated strengths in Measurement and Data Reasoning with 68% (54 students out of 80 students) scoring Near Target and Prepared. **Grades 3-5** • Students demonstrated strengths in numerical reasoning, with 68% (78 students out of 115 students) scoring Near Target and Prepared. **EL:** • ESOL students in grades 1-5 demonstrated strengths in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning.	**Grades 1-2:** • Students demonstrated an area of weakness in Numerical Reasoning, with 33 % (26 students out of 80 students) scoring Support Needed. **Grades 3-5** • Students demonstrated an area of weakness in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning, with 54% (62 out of 115 students) scoring Support Needed. **EL:** • ESOL students in grades 1-2 demonstrated weakness in the Numerical Reasoning domains. • ESOL students in 3rd grade demonstrated weakness in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning domain. • ESOL students in 4th grade demonstrated weakness in the Measuring and Data Reasoning domain. • ESOL students in 5th grade demonstrated weakness in the Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning and Numerical Reasoning domain. **SWD:** Students' lowest domain in grades 3-4 is in Measurement and Data Reasoning domain. Students' lowest domain in grade 5 is in the Numeric Reasoning.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** There is a need for Professional Development focused on aligning instruction to the full scope of the standards. There are limited opportunities for students to engage in a spiral review of previously taught content standards. There is a need for developing quality assessments that fully align with the math standards.	
MATH Common Assessments **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	K: identifying 3D shapes and their attributes 1: identifying time (analog & digital) 2: addition fact fluency 3: addition strategies (algorithm, place value) 4: reasoning with shapes 5: numbers and operations	K: distinguishing the difference between addition and subtraction situations 1: counting on, decomposing to make a ten, place value, elapsed time 2: Patterning and number sense 3: multistep problem solving, mental reasoning 4: fractions 5: understanding and using visual representations to model mathematics.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** There is a need for Professional Development focused on aligning instruction to the full scope of the standards. There are limited opportunities for students to engage in a spiral review of previously taught content standards. There is a need for developing quality assessments that fully aligns with the math standards.	
School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	**K-5** • Data revealed that 59% of teachers were using the instructional materials for Origo instruction. • Percentage of student engagement was 65%	**K-5** • In some observations, teachers were uncertain about the Origo lesson components and how to implement with fidelity. • 44% of the classes observed were not using manipulatives
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** There was a need for professional development in explaining the components of the program which was addressed through Instructional Support staff modeling to teachers that had confusion. There is a need for professional learning focused on the use of manipulatives and connecting concrete, representational, and abstract models in mathematics. There are limited opportunities to engage in exploration and application tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard.	

Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	N/A	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** N/A	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	• At least 80% of kindergarten students will demonstrate proficiency by scoring 75% or higher in mathematics as measured by the CCSD Common Formative (Post) assessments at the end of each unit. • Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 80 points from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 as measured by the Beacon assessment. • The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in Math will increase from 31% to at least 34% as measured by the 2025-2026 Milestone EOG Math Assessment.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	There is a need for Professional Development focused on aligning instruction to the full scope of the standards. There are limited opportunities for students to engage in a spiral review of previously taught content standards.
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
 	
Target Student Group
☒ 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.K–5 teachers will collaboratively use the District's Math Core Package, which includes the GADOE learning plans, to design and deliver daily rigorous instruction aligned to grade-level standards, with an emphasis on
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of teachers will implement daily math instruction aligned to the rigor of the grade-level standards as measured by lesson plans or instructional walks.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	○ September - October
	  ○ MetroRESA consultant will engage K-5 teachers in quarterly collaborative planning and professional learning focused on effectively merging the CCSD Coursework Lesson with the GaDOE Instructional Learning Plans.
	  ○ Teachers will examine strategies to align and adapt these resources to plan and deliver high quality, standards-based instruction.
	  ○ Teacher will create unit plans and review assessments
	○ November – December
	  ○ Teachers will apply skills from MetroRESA training to plan units and
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		At least 65% of students in each grade level will score 75% or higher on common formative math unit assessments.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		○ Common Summative Assessments (adapted from the Evidence of Student Learning Assessments)
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☐ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☒ end of unit
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
			MRESA Consultant

increasing Depth of Knowledge (DOK) to enhance student achievement.	create assessments aligned to the rigor of the standards ○ March – April ○ March 2, 2025 Digital Learning Day – MetroRESA consultant will engage K-5 teachers in quarterly collaborative planning and professional learning focused on effectively merging the CCSD Coursework Lesson with the GaDOE Instructional Learning Plans. ○ Teachers will examine strategies to align and adapt these resources to plan and deliver high quality, standards-based instruction. ○ Teachers will create unit plans and assessments **Artifacts to be Collected:** Sign in sheets Planning agenda Unit plans **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** quarterly	Teachers will analyze formative and EOSL assessments to determine student needs for small group instruction and spiral review. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ **CCC** Leads	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	There is a need for developing quality assessments that fully align with the math standards.		
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** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 2. K–5 grade level teachers will administer common formative assessments to inform reteaching and enrichment strategies.	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of teachers will administer common formative assessments throughout each unit as evidenced by grade-level reflection sheets. **Implementation Plan:** August 26th: Assessment Department (Standards) – ○ Teachers will examine standards to determine if the rigor of instruction matches the standards' expectations. September 9th: Assessment Department (Learning Targets) ○ Teachers will post learning targets and success criteria for students to use as checklist/self-assessment tools. September 30th: Assessments ○ Teachers will analyze common formative assessments using CTLS reports and use data to guide small group instruction October 13th: CTLS (Rhonda Dye) ○ Teachers will continue to explore CTLS assess reports and use data to guide small group instruction October 28th: Assessment Audit PL ○ Teachers will evaluate the rigor of common assessments using the GADOE Evidence of Student learning and/or Achievement Level Descriptors (3-5) and plan instruction that aligns	**Evaluation Performance Target:** At least 65% of students in each grade level will score 75% or higher on the end-of-unit common formative assessment. **Evaluation Tool(s):** ○ Common Formative Assessments developed by the district **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ at least once per week **Data Analysis Plan:** Assessment data will be analyzed during grade-level meetings to inform reteaching and enrichment strategies. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	**CCSD Assessment Consultants**

	January - April: Weekly/Quarterly Collaboration ○ Teachers will continue to explore CTLS assess reports and use data to guide small group instruction **Artifacts to be Collected:** Common assessments audit Sign in sheets Differentiated lesson plans **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Quarterly collaboration		

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	There are limited opportunities to engage in exploration and application tasks aligned to the rigor of the standard.
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**
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)* There are currently few opportunities for K-5 students to engage in the exploration and application of math tasks. Students will be provided opportunities for enrichment through Saturday tutoring by integrating DOE Math lesson components and emphasizing interdisciplinary connections.	**Implementation Performance Target:** **Implementation Plan:** **August 12th : Registration letters sent out.** **September 27th:** How can we use nature to help us understand shapes and patterns (Data) October 25th : Planning a Winter Garden using a Grid. November 15th: Calculating area December 13th : Vegetables Take over the World- Estimation, Probability, Data Collection January 17th: Best Use of Space: Geometry and Measuring in the Garden February 28th: Thin it Out: Area and Density March 28th: Can We Harvest Yet? Data, Measurement (All activities will come from the DOE capstone lessons) **Artifacts to be Collected:** **Sign in Sheets** **Lesson plans** **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly	**Evaluation Performance Target:** **Evaluation Tool(s):** **Beacon Math** **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ at least once per week **Data Analysis Plan:** **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement *(Required Components)*			
Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	**Date(s) Scheduled**	**Date Completed**	**"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed**
1. Required Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline **– September 30, 2025** Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement, including use of the family resource center.	9/12/25		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline – **November 3, 2025** 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 2-31, 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – **Deadline April 30, 2025** 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.	March 10 – April 30, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required TWO Building Staff Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) – Deadlines: **September 26, 2025 and February 16, 2026** Teacher 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	9/16/25 1/20/26		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 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 by attending Kinder Orientation. Parents will learn about the academic schedule and communication platforms for gleaning school information, such as teacher/class announcements, field trips, grades, dismissal, etc. Fifth grade students engage in a structured transition activity in which they spend a day at the middle school. This experience includes a school tour, an opportunity to meet the administrative team, and a question-and-answer session designed to support a smooth transition	5/7/26		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

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:*** Policy, compact, teacher newsletters, principal's newsletter, surveys, Family engagement materials	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 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**
Character Parade Literacy Day	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Copy supplies	Title I	10/31/25	Parent Survey Collected for feedback from families, agendas, sign in sheets, CTLS invitation	Team Leaders
STEM Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Copy supplies	Title I	3/5/26	Parent Survey Collected for feedback from families, agendas, sign in sheets, CTLS invitation	Melissa Weatherford
Kindergarten Orientation	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Copy supplies	Title I	5/7/26	Parent Survey Collected for feedback from families, agendas, sign in sheets, CTLS invitation	Learning Support Specialists

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:
Belmont Hills provides iReady for all students who are at risk in reading in grades K-5. The web-based software and materials are funded through the district.

Belmont Hills implements LETRS Training. District funds provide many of the materials while Title I provides subs to cover classrooms during debriefing and assessment discussions.

Title III offers EL students access to Imagine Learning, and Title I supplements those licenses where needed.

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: Administrators frequently walk classrooms to ensure action steps are being implemented with fidelity. Teachers participate in grade-level CCCs and lead discussions regarding the action step implementation and effectiveness. These meetings occur weekly. The plan is also reviewed annually to ensure goals have been achieved. Reflection on goals occurs to assist with determining whether or not to keep, revise, or abandon the action steps or goals.

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: Belmont Hills reviews the score reports for both local and state assessments, looking for student growth from one level to the next. The goal is always to move students from support needed to proficient or higher. Students who need additional support are provided with action steps found within this School Improvement Plan. Each student is then evaluated using the achievement data used to assess whether or not that action step was effective. Revisions occur when needed to adjust the plan.

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: Revisions occur when needed to adjust the plan as determined by both formative and summative assessment data as well as CCC discussions with teachers and parent feedback when appropriate. The BLT also reviews this plan monthly to keep a pulse on what is working and what needs additional support. Areas that need additional support will be discussed in faculty meetings and additional PL can be provided to targeted teachers in CCCs.

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's 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**: Revisions occur when needed to adjust the plan as determined by both formative and summative assessment data as well as CCC discussions with teachers and parent feedback when appropriate. The BLT also reviews this plan monthly to keep a pulse on what is working and what needs additional support. Areas that need additional support will be discussed in faculty meetings and additional PL can be provided to targeted teachers in CCCs.
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. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)* **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: **<u>Cobb Collaborative Communities-</u>** Focused professional development based on high standards of teaching and learning is essential to improving teaching and increasing student achievement. It must be focused on what teachers district-wide and in the individual schools need to know and be able to do for their students. Ultimately, professional development should build "professional communities" committed to higher student learning. Continuous learning opportunities that are focused, reflective, and coherent are essential. The following are research-based practices in professional development that support career-long development of teaching and student learning: • Provide on-going learning opportunities for all • Improve teaching and learning • Target student outcomes and goals of schools and districts • Set time aside to allow teachers to implement new techniques learned and to plan collaboratively • Establish study groups (e.g., book studies, professional magazine articles, etc) Involve all teachers including, Special Education, ESOL, paraprofessionals and specialists (music, art, science, math and physical education) In addition:

- Quarterly professional learning led by MetroResa
- Professional learning led by CCSD/MetroRESA
- New Teacher Mentor/Mentee group
- New Teacher University
- Analyze data monthly with K-5 common formative assessments

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: Belmont Hills provides an orientation day with Kindergarten parents for all incoming students. Admin speaks with all parents to discuss incoming expectations and school procedures. Parents are added to CTLS to ensure communication can occur in a timely and seamless fashion. Incoming students receive a bookbag of materials to begin practicing skills over the summer as a preview of what will be taught in the classrooms during the first 9 weeks**.**
Fifth grade students engage in a structured transition activity in which they spend a day at the middle school. This experience includes a school tour, an opportunity to meet the administrative team, and a question-and-answer session designed to support a smooth transition

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: N/A

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

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

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)*			
Position	**Supports Goal(s)**	**Supports which system(s)**	**How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?**
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 communicate with families and serve as liaison between parents and school through translations of documents, weekly newsletters, parent compact, input meetings, language classes for parents, and parent resource room. The Parent Facilitator will assist parents with supporting students at home.
	☐ 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	
	☐ 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

Goal #1

- The percentage of kindergarten students demonstrating at/near or above grade level proficiency will increase from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 by at least 80% as measured by the Amira in Spring 2026.
- Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 50 points from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 as measured by the Beacon assessment.
- The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in ELA will increase from 17% to at least 20% as measured by the 2025-2026 Milestone EOG ELA Assessment.

Goal #2

- At least 80% of kindergarten students will demonstrate proficiency by scoring 75% or higher in mathematics as measured by the CCSD Evidence of Student Learning assessment by the end of each unit.
- Students in grades 1st – 2nd will increase their scale score by an average of 80 points from Fall 2025 to Spring 2026 as measured by the Beacon assessment.
- The percentage of 3rd – 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished in Math will increase from 31% to at least 34% as measured by the 2025-2026 Milestone EOG Math Assessment.