

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Fair Oaks Elementary
Principal Name:	Cathie Seibert
Date Submitted:	6/1/2026
Revision Date(s):	

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Fair Oaks ES
<i>Team Lead</i>	Rebecca Plummer
<i>Position</i>	1 st Grade EIP
<i>Email</i>	rebecca.plummer@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	(678) 594
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: In developing this plan, the school actively engaged a diverse range of stakeholders to ensure a comprehensive and effective approach to meeting the needs of students and the broader school community. This collaborative process involved multiple strategies to gather input and incorporate valuable insights: School Input meetings were held in person and virtually to support multiple opportunities for caregivers to provide feedback. The instructional support specialist team meets weekly to discuss school improvement and acts as the core group representing each grade level. Administration and Instructional Support team met with grade-level CCC teams to get feedback on key items related to educational outcomes, such as the professional learning process.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

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

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature

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	1st grade: The percentage of 1st grade students scoring near target and prepared will increase by a minimum of 30% from Fall 2025 baseline to Spring 2026, as measured by the 2025-2026 Beacon Assessment. 2nd grade: The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring near target and prepared will increase from 44% in Spring 2025 (1st grade) to 55% in Spring 2026 as measured by the 2025-2026 Beacon Assessment. The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students scoring level 3 or 4 will increase from 27.26% in Spring 2025 to 32.26% in Spring 2026 as measured by the 2025-2026 Georgia ELA Milestones Assessment. 3rd grade: 25% of third-grade students will score level 3 or 4 on the Spring 2026 ELA Milestones Assessment. 4th grade: The percentage of 4th grade students scoring level 3 or 4 will increase from 24.5% in Spring 2025 (3rd grade) to 30% in Spring 2026 as measured by the 2025-2026 Georgia ELA Milestones Assessment. 5th grade: The percentage of 4th grade students scoring level 3 or 4 will increase from 26.5% in Spring 2025 (4th grade) to 31 % in Spring 2026 as measured by the 2025-2026 Georgia ELA Milestones Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	1st-yes (50 and 10 -- 64%) 2nd -yes (40 and 32—72%)
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	

If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	Action Step Glows • Collaborative teaching is embedded within the 120-minute literacy block, with six Title tutors effectively supporting phonics instruction and early learning pathways. • Wonders assessments add instructional rigor, as they are more cognitively demanding than CFAs and require students to demonstrate application through reading, writing, and vocabulary tasks. • Students are consistently engaging across all literacy domains (reading, writing, phonics, vocabulary) throughout the 120-minute block using the new curriculum. • Structured quarterly, grade-level professional learning supports fidelity of implementation of the 120-minute literacy block and the Wonders curriculum through the district transformational model. Action Step Glows • Implement and monitor a UFLI phonics timeline checklist to ensure consistent alignment of whole-group phonics instruction and small-group instructional time across grade levels. Use the checklist to: • Ensure pacing matches grade-level expectations • Align small-group instruction with whole-group phonics skills • Support instructional consistency among classroom teachers and Title tutors
---	---

Previous Year's Goal #2	Kindergarten– 25% of kindergarten students will score near target or prepared on the Math Beacon Assessment in Spring 2026. 1st Grade – The percentage of 1st grade students scoring near target or prepared on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 22% in Winter 2025 (Kindergarten) to 25% in Spring 2026. 2nd Grade – The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring near target or prepared on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 68% in Spring 2025 (1st Grade) to 70% in Spring 2026. 3-5 EOG – The percentage of 3-5 students scoring proficient and distinguished on the Math Milestones Assessment will increase from 44% in May 2025 to 50% in May 2026.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	• Kinder – yes 81% are Near Target or Prepared • 1st – yes 89% are Near Target or Prepared • 2nd -yes 83% are Near Target or Prepared • 3rd yes 46.6% of students are Proficient or Distinguished • 4th yes 52.8% of students are Proficient or Distinguished • 5th no 38% of students Proficient or Distinguished • 3rd – 5th results 45% proficient or distinguished

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	- Beginning in the 2026–2027 school year, the Title I Coach will provide an integrated model mathematics lesson at the start of each quarter to support instructional consistency, effective use of manipulatives, and high-yield strategies. - Increase intentional use of individual math tasks aligned to student-directed learning, ensuring tasks promote problem-solving, ownership, and application of mathematical thinking across grade levels.
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	<u>Action Step Glows</u> - Targeted training and instructional support for math manipulatives has strengthened instructional practices across grade levels. - Title I coaching and modeling provide ongoing, job-embedded professional learning to support effective mathematics instruction. - Metro RESA professional learning deepens teacher content knowledge and instructional understanding in mathematics. - District expectations for mathematics professional development are consistently implemented in alignment with the Transformational Schools model. - Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) and clearly defined success criteria are implemented consistently in mathematics, K–5. - Students in grades 3–5 engage in error analysis, demonstrating reflection and conceptual understanding to support mathematical growth. <u>Action Step Grows</u> - Beginning in the 2026–2027 school year, the Title I Coach will provide an integrated model mathematics lesson at the start of each quarter to strengthen instructional coherence and best practices. - Increase the use of individualized tasks aligned to student-directed learning, ensuring tasks promote ownership, engagement, and application of mathematical understanding.

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

ELA DATA

ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	11.6%	20.8%	24.5%
4 th Grade	17%	15%	26.5%
5 th Grade	21.9%	32%	30.8%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Foundations			Language			Texts			Interpreting Texts			Constructing Texts		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	36	39	25	44	42	15	30	54	16	35	49	16	51	27	22
2 nd Grade	26	43	30	28	39	32	30	42	27	28	37	34	31	50	19

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade	33	64	2	21	70	8	31	65	4	46	50	3	35	63	2	26	71	2	42	56	2
4 th Grade	23	62	15	15	67	18	22	70	8	29	61	10	15	59	26	14	71	15	26	67	6
5 th Grade	28	46	26	26	51	23	32	50	18	33	53	14	29	58	13	26	52	21	38	43	19

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups) Data not available for 2026	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): K-2 (all students) Based on the 1 st grade Spring Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA), our students demonstrated strengths in Texts with an average of 70% students scoring Near Target or Prepared. Based on the 2 nd grade Spring Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA), our students demonstrated strengths in Foundations with an average of 73% students scoring Near Target or Prepared. 3rd – 5th (all students) Based on the 3 rd grade Spring Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in Techniques (Interpreting Texts) with an	Based on the 1 st grade Spring Beacon results in ELA our students demonstrated weaknesses in Constructing Texts with an average of 51% in Support Needed. Based on the 2 nd grade Spring Beacon results in ELA our students demonstrated weaknesses in Constructing Texts with an average of 31% in Support Needed. Based on the 3 rd – 5 th grade Spring ELA Beacon results, our students demonstrated weaknesses in the Listening domain: • 3rd grade - 46% in Support Needed • 4th grade - 29% in Support Needed • 5th grade - 33% in Support Needed CNABeacon.xlsx EL: Based on the Spring Beacon report 31.6% of the students are still striving at needs to develop stage for 1 st – 5 th grade. SWD: 38.4% of students need development 1 st – 5 th grade.

	average of 78% scoring Near Target and Prepared. Based on the 4th grade Spring Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in Research and Analysis (Constructing Texts) with an average of 86% scoring Near Target and Prepared. Based on the 5th grade Spring Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in Techniques (Interpreting Texts) with an average of 74% scoring Near Target and Prepared. EL: Based on the Beacon Spring results, the % of students scoring near target or prepared indicates an increase to 62.8 1st – 5th grade SWD: 59.4% of 1st – 5th grade students scored near target or prepared.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: ELA independent tasks are not consistently aligned to Tier 1 instruction, limiting student-directed practice and skill application.	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: Based on the 2026 Access Reading scores students scored: <u>Entering</u> K 13.1% 1st 4.9 %	Grade Levels (all students): EL: Based on the 2026 Access writing scores students scored: <u>Entering</u> K 13.0% 1st 8.8% 2nd 1.5%

2 nd 1.5 %	3 rd 1%
3 rd 2.2%	4 th none
4 th 0.7 %	5 th 1.2%
5 th 1.7%	<u>Emerging</u>
<u>Emerging</u>	K 0.2%
K none	1 st 4.7%
1 st 5.3%	2 nd 5.7%
2 nd 5.8%	3 rd 1.2%
3 rd 5.8 %	4 th 0.7%
4 th 1.7%	5 th 0.7%
5 th 2.2%	<u>Developing</u>
<u>Developing</u>	K 0.5%
K none	1 st 2.2%
1 st 2.2%	2 nd 11.8%
2 nd 3.4%	3 rd 14%
3 rd 3.2%	4 th 4.2%
4 th 3.2%	5 th 5.4%
5 th 3.9%	<u>Expanding</u>
<u>Expanding</u>	K none
K 0.2	1 st none
1 st 1.5%	2 nd 0.7%
2 nd 2.9%	3 rd 2.5%
3 rd 2.4%	4 th 14.3%
4 th 4.4%	5 th 4.9%
5 th 1.7%	<u>Bridging</u>
<u>Bridging</u>	K- 3 rd none
K 0.2 %	4 th 0.5%
1 st 1.2%	5 th 0.2%
2 nd 3.2%	<u>Reaching: None</u>

	3rd 3.4% 4th 7.5% 5th 2.2% <u>Reaching</u> K none 1st 1% 2nd 2.7% 3rd 1.9% 4th 2.2% 5th 0.7% SWD: Out of 57 students tested in grades 1-5 the reading scores reflect: 25% are entering 28% are emerging 26% are developing ,05% are expanding 12% are bridging .03% are reaching SWD: Out of 57 students tested in grades 1-5 the composite scores reflect: 19.3% are entering 29.8% are emerging 29.8 % are developing 19.3% are expanding 1.8% are reaching	SWD: Out of the 57 students tested in grades 1-5 the writing scores reflect: 26.3% are entering 23% are emerging 39% are developing 12% are expanding Reaching: None
--	---	---

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Student goal setting is not consistently implemented in grades 2–5.	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): - Kindergarten increased by 11.91% on Wonders reading common assessments from first to second semester. 1st grade increased by 9.45% on Wonders reading common assessments from first to second semester. 2nd grade increased by 17.52% on Wonders reading common assessments from first to second semester. 3rd grade increased by 9.5% on Wonders reading common assessments from first to second semester. 4th grade showed a 14.5% increase from U1W 3&4 to U2 W1 &2.	Grade Levels (all students): - Kindergarten- 1st grade students have not collectively scored above 83% on any Wonders reading common assessment this school year. 2nd-5th grade students have not collectively scored above 62% on any Wonders reading common assessment this school year.

	5th grade increased by 6% on Wonders reading common assessments from first to second semester.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Students need consistent success criteria and individual work activities aligned to student-directed learning. Self-direction in collaborative learning (visible reminders of what success looks like in the ELA block). Teachers need to maintain a focus on learning – What are students learning and can they transfer the skill to authentic situations.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	- Speaking and listening skills are consistently implemented in K–5 settings, with speaking rubrics embedded in grade-level plans and used during instruction. - Hands-on ELA tasks are consistently observed in 1st, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades. - Use of Wonders and Tier I curriculum is evident in 97% of instructional walks (113 out of 116), indicating strong curriculum fidelity. - GUMS instructional practices are consistently implemented, as evidenced in 19 instructional walks across K–5.	- Student success criteria are not consistently implemented across all settings. Training began in October 2025 after walkthrough data indicated ELA success criteria were not systematically embedded in instruction. - Students need more opportunities to independently apply GUMS activities to reinforce skill mastery. - Collaborative learning requires increased student self-direction, supported by visible reminders and clear expectations for what academic skills look like in instructional settings.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Teachers need additional training to consistently implement success criteria and support student-directed learning.	

Other Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Title I teacher survey results indicate strong understanding and support: • 91% of teachers report understanding their Title I grade-level goals. • 96% of teachers indicate appreciation for the collaborative instructional model.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Inconsistent implementation of success criteria and student-directed learning is due to limited teacher training and support, resulting in uneven instructional practices across classrooms.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA

Kindergarten: 80% of Kindergarten students will be **developing**, **on track**, or **above** grade level as measured by Amira by Spring 2027.

1st -2nd grade: The percentage of 1st grade and 2nd grade students scoring near target and prepared will increase by a minimum of 30% from Fall 2026 baseline to Spring 2027, as measured by the 2026-2027 Beacon Assessment.

3rd-5th grade: The percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from ____ to ____ (a 3% increase) as measured by the 2026-2027 Georgia ELA Milestones Assessment.

- 3rd grade: 25% of third-grade students will score proficient or distinguished on the Spring 2027 ELA Milestones Assessment.
- 4th grade: The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from ____% Spring 2026 (3rd grade) to ____% (5% increase) in Spring 2027 as measured by the 2026-2027 Georgia ELA Milestones Assessment.
- 5th grade: The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from ____ % in Spring 2026 (4th grade) to __% (5% increase) in Spring 2027 as measured by the 2026-2027 Georgia ELA Milestones Assessment.

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:

- Teacher capacity to leverage student agency needs strengthening, particularly in the consistent use of success criteria and student success notebooks.
- Students with disabilities require explicit instruction in language processing skills, including strategies to move information from short-term to long-term memory.
- Student-directed learning tasks need to be more intentionally designed, allowing students to independently apply GUMS skills during instruction.
- Application of the Standards of English across content areas is inconsistent, as identified through ACCESS, BEACON, and Milestones data.
- Integration of English Language standards needs to occur systematically across all classrooms to ensure coherence and support literacy development schoolwide.

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: K-5 teachers will use strategies from <i>Teaching Students to Drive Their Learning</i> to lead student-directed learning daily as evidenced by classroom observations.	Evaluation Performance Target:	
Target Student Group	<u>Subgroup student goals</u>	Evaluation Tool(s):	
☐ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD	100% of students with disabilities (SWD) will produce and submit artifacts monthly, demonstrating implementation of student-directed learning in their Success Playbook.	- Walkthrough form with focused student-directed learning questions: - I know where I am. - I know where I am going. - I monitor my progress. - I recognize when I'm ready what's next and I'm ready for what's next.	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	100% of EL students will implement WIDA ACCESS criteria (speaking, listening, reading, writing) in their Success Playbook.	Student survey including the student-directed learning questions differentiated for primary and intermediate students.	
Action Step 1: K-5 Teachers will implement daily student-directed learning using the engagement continuum and/or the characteristics of students who drive their learning as evidenced by classroom observations.	Implementation Plan: - May 11, 2026: teachers trained on student success criteria with a focus on student ownership. - Preplanning – Teachers attend a workshop on student-directed learning facilitated bHy Doug Fisher. - August: Teachers train students on student-directed learning tasks using ESOL district goal-setting worksheet (if applicable) and grade-level goal sheets. - September-December: - Teachers will complete the Modules 1, 2, 3, 5 in <i>Teaching Students to Drive Their Learning</i> during CCCs. During designated CCCs, teachers will discuss each assigned module and their reflections related to their implementation of the "Teacher Action" sections. - January-February: Teachers will complete Modules 4 and 6 during CCCs. During designated CCCs, teachers will discuss each assigned module and their reflections related to their implementation of the "Teacher Action" sections. - March-April: Teachers will complete Modules 7-8 during CCCs. During designated CCCs, teachers will discuss each assigned module and their reflections related to their implementation of the "Teacher Action" sections.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ By unit Data Analysis Plan: - Unit Common Assessment Data - Student Survey 3x/year Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	

	May: Post Survey Artifacts to be Collected: CCC Minutes from each team (monthly) and Success Playbook Goal Sheets from classrooms (3x per year) Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly and 3x per year		
--	---	--	--

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	36%	27%	38.5%	46.6%
4 th Grade	24%	35%	50%	52.8%
5 th Grade	34%	26%	37%	38%

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kinder (Spring) Administration	18	43	39	50	32	18	41	24	34	40	31	29
1st Grade	22	57	20	20	61	19	4	53	43	26	53	21
2nd Grade	27	48	25	20	53	27	34	44	22	13	37	50
3rd Grade	7	90	3	8	90	2	14	82	3	30	69	2
4th Grade	22	65	13	30	60	10	39	58	2	42	54	4

5 th Grade	36	56	8	59	37	4	37	51	12	46	53	1
-----------------------	----	----	---	----	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	---

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	1. Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (Grades 1–4) - Grades 1st–4th show strong performance, with a large percentage of students in the Near Target range (60%+ in grades 1, 3, and 4). 3rd grade is a notable strength, with 90% Near Target in both Numerical Reasoning and Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning. - This suggests instructional coherence and effective teaching strategies in algebraic thinking across multiple grade levels.	. Low “Prepared” Percentages Across Most Domains - Across nearly all grades and domains, the Prepared category is consistently low—often under 15%. - This indicates that while many students are approaching proficiency, fewer are demonstrating strong mastery or extended reasoning. - This is most evident in: - Numerical Reasoning (grades 3–5) - Geometric & Spatial Reasoning (grades K-5)
	2. Measurement & Data Reasoning (Grades 1 and 3) 1st grade shows strong readiness, with 43% Prepared in Measurement & Data (highest prepared rate in that domain). 3rd grade again stands out, with 82% Near Target, indicating solid conceptual understanding.	Numerical Reasoning (Kindergarten and Upper Grades) - Kindergarten shows a high percentage of students needing support (18%) and a relatively small Prepared group (39%). 5th grade also shows concern, with 36% Support Needed and only 8% Prepared.

	These strengths point to effective use of real-world contexts and representations in these grades.	This suggests a need for stronger emphasis on number sense, reasoning, and explanation of thinking, especially during lesson launches and Engage components.
	3. Curriculum Implementation Fidelity - Performance trends suggest Tier I instruction is effectively supporting most students to the Near Target level, particularly in grades 1–4. - Consistency in Near Target percentages across domains indicates that the core math curriculum is generally addressing grade-level standards.	Geometric & Spatial Reasoning (Schoolwide Concern) - This is the weakest domain overall: - Prepared percentages are low across all grades (often single digits). - Upper grades (3–5) show particularly high percentages in Support Needed or Near Target without progression to Prepared. - Indicates limited opportunities for deep spatial reasoning, visualization, and application tasks.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Students are not consistently provided with intentional numerical-reasoning opportunities during core instruction, limiting mastery and progression beyond the Near Target level. We will focus on looking at the K-5 math learning progressions for numerical reasoning to pinpoint focus of instruction. We are working on building professional capacity and a clear understanding of math content and student expectations for each standard, especially for teachers who are new to the grade level or math instruction. Next year, we will continue to explore ways to deepen student engagement and understanding using math manipulatives.	
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels K-5 , ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten students performed at an average of 82% on the Unit 5 Post Assessment covering standards MA.K.NR.1, MA.K.NR.2, MA.K.NR.4 1st grade students performed at an average of 80% on the Unit 3 Post Assessment covering standards MA.1.GSR.4, MA.1.PAR.3, and MA.1.MDR.6.	For Grade Levels K-5, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten students performed at an average of 55% on the Unit 1 post assessment covering standards MA.K.NR.2, MA.K.NR.3, MA.K.NR.5 1st grade students performed at an average of 59% on the Unit 2 post assessment covering standard MA.1.NR.2. 2nd grade students performed at an average of 58% on the Unit 1 post assessment covering standards MA.2.GSR.7 and MA.2.PAR.4.

	2nd grade students performed at an average of 77% on the Unit 6 Post Assessment covering standards MA.2.MDR.5 and MA.2.NR.2. 3rd grade students performed at 82% on standard 3.GSR.7.2. (Determine the area of rectangles presented in relevant problems by tiling and counting.). 4th grade students performed at 90% on standard 4.NR.5.2. (Represent, read, and write fractions with denominators of 10 or 100 using decimal notation, and decimal numbers to the hundredths place as fractions, using concrete materials and drawings.). 5th grade students performed at 88% on standard 5.NR.2.1. (Fluently multiply multi-digit whole numbers to solve authentic word problems.	3rd grade students performed at 34% on standard 4.NR.1.3. (Use place value understanding to round whole numbers up to 1000 to the nearest 10 or 100.) 4th grade students performed at 45% on standard 4.NR.2.5. (Demonstrate and explain the concept of equivalent fractions with denominators of 10 and 100, using concrete materials and visual models. Add two fractions with denominators of 10 and 100.) 5th grade students performed at 53% on standard 5.MDR.7.2. (Ask questions and answer them based on gathered information, observations, and appropriate graphical displays to solve problems relevant to everyday life.)
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	K–2 Glows - Frequent use of manipulatives and pictorial models to build number sense and place value. - High student engagement through hands-on tasks, math talk, and partner activities. - Teachers consistently modeled vocabulary and supported oral language development with sentence stems. - Small groups and stations effectively used to support foundational skills. K–2 Grows - Make success criteria explicit and revisit what “meeting the goal” looks like during the lesson.	Grades 3–5 Glows - Strong alignment to standards with tasks that promote reasoning and problem solving. - Effective use of small group instruction and station rotation for differentiation. - Regular opportunities for students to justify thinking using precise mathematical language. - Teachers frequently used error analysis and feedback to advance understanding. Grades 3–5 Grows - Clearly align and reference learning targets and success criteria throughout the lesson. - Increase purposeful use of manipulatives and visual models, especially in small groups.

	• Increase open-ended questioning (How do you know? Why does that work?) to deepen reasoning. • Ensure math tools remain available during independent and workbook practice. • Use anchor charts more consistently to support student self-assessment.	• Strengthen student ownership by embedding self-checks and reflection tied to success criteria. • Continue shifting questioning to prioritize explanation and critique of reasoning.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
	K–2 • Teachers prioritize engagement and exploration, which is a strength, but success criteria is often implied rather than stated in student-friendly language. • Younger students rely heavily on visuals and routines; when anchor charts or sentence frames are missing, students are less able to self-assess. • Teachers may assume students “get it” because they are participating, even when verbal reasoning is not consistently required. 3–5 • Instruction emphasizes productive struggle and problem solving, but success criteria is sometimes overshadowed by task completion. • Differentiation through stations and small groups can unintentionally lead to uneven expectations for how students demonstrate mastery. • Students explain thinking but are not always prompted to evaluate whether their explanation meets the learning goal.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	Kindergarten– 85% of kindergarten students will score near target or prepared on the Math Beacon Assessment in Spring 2027. 1st Grade – The percentage of 1st grade students scoring near target or prepared on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 81% in Spring 2026 to 84% in Spring 2027. 2nd Grade – The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring near target or prepared on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 89% in Spring 2026 to 92% in Spring 2027. 3-5 EOG – The percentage of 3-5 students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 45.6% in May 2026 to 50% in May 2027 as measured by the 2026-2027 Georgia Math Milestones Assessment. 3rd Grade: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 46.2% in May 2026 to 50% in May 2027 as measured by the 2026-2027 Georgia Math Milestones Assessment. 4th Grade: The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 52% in May 2026 to 56% in May 2027 as measured by the 2026-2027 Georgia Math Milestones Assessment. 5th Grade: The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase from 38.9% in May 2026 to 50% in May 2027 as measured by the 2026-2027 Georgia Math Milestones Assessment.				
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Teachers need professional capacity in conceptual numerical reasoning instruction. - Teachers need to prioritize exploration to build students’ numerical reasoning capacity. - Teacher capacity to leverage student agency needs strengthening, particularly in the consistent use of success criteria and student success notebooks. - Students with disabilities require explicit instruction in language processing skills, including strategies to move information from short-term to long-term memory. - Student-directed learning tasks need to be more intentionally designed, allowing students to independently apply skills during instruction.				
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____				
Components	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"> Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i> </td><td style="width: 50%; padding: 5px;"> Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i> </td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="padding: 5px; text-align: right;">Resources</td></tr> </table>	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources	
Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>				
Resources					

Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of K-5 teachers will implement weekly numerical reasoning activities using manipulatives where needed.	Evaluation Performance Target: 15% of students will score above 80% or higher on unit common summative assessments.	GaDOE Mathematical Learning Progressions
Target Student Group	Timeframe for this target will need to reflect small group focus.	Evaluation Tool(s): - Beacon assessment (numerical reasoning) - Unit Common Summative Assessments that contain numerical reason standards - Kinder – Unit 1, 3, 4A, 4B, 5, 7 - First – Unit 1, 2, 4, 5 - Second – Unit 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 - Third – 1, 3, 6, 8 (Include units 2, 3, and 8 due to application of skills in other domains) - Fourth – Unit 1, 3, 4A, 4B - Fifth – Unit 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)</i>	Implementation Plan: Full Year Actions: - Teachers will use manipulatives to develop conceptual understanding - Teachers will align small group lessons to the rigor of the numerical reasoning standards, moving beyond rote memorization to flexible mathematical thinking. August-September: - District Math coach will provide grade level PL on numerical reasoning strategies to connect content with instructional practices during grade level planning to align with expectations. - August 24 - October 5 - January 11 - March 8 October-December: - Quarterly Collaboration Days - Monitoring classroom walks January-February: - Quarterly Collaboration Days - Monitoring classroom walks	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☒ Every unit (common assessments) Data Analysis Plan: Beacon data analysis led by EIP lead teachers after each Beacon administration. Beacon reports will be pulled and housed in Fair Oaks Title I Team. Common Assessment data analysis plan. Teams will meet within 10 days of the assessment to analyze the data. Data review will be captured in the CCC minutes for each team. Notes must include feedback regarding the standards rather than % of students passing item number. Person(s) Collecting Evidence:	

	March-April: • Quarterly Collaboration Days • Monitoring classroom walks Artifacts to be Collected: Classroom observation data Lesson plans CCC detailed agenda Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ EIP Lead Teachers Frequency of Monitoring: Quarterly classroom walks Weekly lesson plan checks	☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Teacher capacity to leverage student agency needs strengthening, particularly in the consistent use of success criteria and student success notebooks. • Students with disabilities require explicit instruction in language processing skills, including strategies to move information from short-term to long-term memory. • Student-directed learning tasks need to be more intentionally designed, allowing students to independently apply skills during instruction.		
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	<u>Subgroup student goals</u> 100% of students with disabilities (SWD) will produce and submit artifacts monthly, demonstrating implementation of student-directed learning in their success playbook. 100% of EL students will implement WIDA ACCESS criteria (speaking, listening, reading, writing) in their success playbook. Implementation Plan: • Post planning May 2026: teachers trained on student success criteria with a focus on student ownership. Preplanning – Teachers attend a workshop on student-directed learning facilitated by Doug Fisher. • August-September: Teachers train students on student-directed learning tasks using district goal-setting worksheet and WIDI framework • October-December: - Teachers will complete the modules 1-4 in Teaching Students to drive their learning. • January-February: Teacher will complete modules 5-6 • March-April: Teachers will complete modules 7-8 • May: Post Survey	• Walkthrough form with focused student-directed learning questions: 1. I know where I am going. 2. I have the tools for my journey. 3. I monitor my progress. 4. I recognize when I'm ready what's next and I'm ready for what's next. • Student survey including the student-directed learning questions differentiated for primary and intermediate students.	Teaching Students to Drive Their Learning
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)			
K-5 Teachers will implement daily student-directed learning using the engagement continuum and/or the characteristics of students who drive their learning as evidenced by classroom observations.		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☒ By unit Data Analysis Plan: • Unit Common Assessment Data • Student Survey 3x/year Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches	

	Artifacts to be Collected: Student-directed learning artifacts Specify what these will be Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	☒ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

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

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

Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
Title 1 New Parent Orientation- new families to the school will have an orientation as to expectations and polices for attending.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			TBD	Parents will sign up as they attend. Pictures will be taken. Parents will receive packets for their families to help their child.	Academic Coach Parent Facilitator Lead Teacher
Title 1 ESOL Night – parents of multilingual learners will attend a meeting to learn about ESOL services, ACCESS, and to receive materials to assist their child in reading, writing, listening, and speaking.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			TBD	Parents will sign up as they attend. Pictures will be taken. Parents will receive packets for their families to help their child. Parents will receive previous year’s ACCESS scores.	Parent Facilitator ESOL Teachers Admin
Title 1 Literacy Nights – parents will attend literacy nights to learn more about their child’s progress and how to help at home.	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			TBD	Parents will sign up as they attend. Pictures will be taken. Parents will receive packets for their families to help their child. Parents will receive their child’s scores and create ELA and Math goals with their child.	Teachers Admin

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

1. Assist parents in understanding state academic standards, state and local assessments, and how to monitor their child’s academic progress.
2. Provide materials and training to help parents work with their child to improve academic achievement. (Ex. Literacy training, technology training)
3. Educate school staff in the value and utility of the contributions of parents, and how to reach, communicate with, and partner with parents to implement parent programs to build ties between parents and the school.
4. Coordinate and integrate parent programs and activities with other Federal, State, and local programs (Preschool to Kindergarten, transitions, parent resource centers, etc.) to support parents in more fully participating in their child’s education.

5. Ensure information related to school and parent programs/meetings are sent in a format and language parents can understand.
6. Provide other reasonable support for parental involvement activities as parents may request. These are school-developed activities based upon parent's input. (#14 in list of “shalls” and “mays”)

School Improvement Plan Required Questions	
Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)	
1. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)	
2. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)	
3. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school’s participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)	
4. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school’s website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)	
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. SWP Checklist 5(e) <u>Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)</u> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Fair Oaks Elementary will integrate state and local funds and community support in several ways. Title 1 will support district initiatives such as Early Literacy Framework (ELF), LETRS professional development for K-2 leads and Administration. Title II will provide professional development support for all staff. Title III will provide language proficiency support and monthly professional development for ESOL and classroom teachers. Fair Oaks will utilize Title I and Twenty-day funds for tutoring support of our students struggling to meet state standards. The Student Assistance Programs department will provide support for the school’s implementation of the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support program (PBIS). Community Partners (Smyrna Business Network International, Square Church, Mosaic Church, and Gracepoint Church) will provide volunteers and support for our academic nights and our parent	

university. These programs will work together to meet the needs of the students and families identified in the CNA and through our parent and family surveys.

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: Fair Oaks Elementary will regularly monitor implementation of schoolwide programs through walkthroughs, observations, attendance data, Beacon and EOG GA Milestones data, photos, and sign in sheets.

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: Fair Oaks Elementary will determine the effectiveness of programs through the quarterly review of interims, Imagine Learning, i-Ready, Beacon, AMIRA, and EOG GA Milestones. We will discuss and adjust programs during CCC meetings and quarterly grade team data digs.

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: Fair Oaks Elementary will determine the effectiveness of programs through the quarterly review of interims, Imagine Learning, i-Ready, Beacon, AMIRA, and EOG GA Milestones. We will discuss and adjust programs during CCC meetings and quarterly grade team data digs.

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

10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State's challenging academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State's challenging academic standards, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(a)*

11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(b)*

12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include - counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable. SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)
13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Fair Oaks Elementary will continue the implementation of PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) this school year. PBIS is an evidence based three-tiered framework to improve and integrate all the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. School counselors will be on the PBIS team and will help create the PBIS school plan. Counselors will also instruct students in class and small group sessions on behavior strategies and be a good citizen.
14. <u>Describe professional development</u> and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, <u>and to recruit and retain effective teachers</u>, particularly in high need subjects. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: K-2 teacher representatives will be trained in LETRS by CCSD; instructional paraprofessional monthly meetings with professional learning; During pre-planning, teachers will set specific targeted professional goals for teachers to create goals based on students they are serving.
15. ONLY MIDDLE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED Describe the transition activities provided for preschool children to kindergarten, 5th grade students to 6th grade and 8th grade students to 9th grade. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(v)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE:
16. ONLY HIGH SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED Describe how the school prepares and makes aware of opportunities for postsecondary education and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school (such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, dual or concurrent enrollment, or early college high schools. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE:
Comprehensive Needs Assessment – Section 1114(b)(1)(A)
17. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school, that considers information on the academic achievement of children in relation to the challenging State academic standards, particularly the needs of those children who are failing, or are at-risk of failing, to meet the State academic standards and any other factors as determined by the local educational agency. Evidence to support this statement includes: The comprehensive needs assessment section of the schoolwide plan. SWP Checklist 1

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

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

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

School Improvement Goals <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy</i>	
Goal #1	
Goal #2	
Goal #3	
Goal #4	