

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2025 - 2026
School Name: Smitha Middle School	Smitha Middle School
Principal Name:	Chris Salter
Date Submitted:	06/04/25
Revision Date(s):	06/12/25; 8/13/25

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>Location</i>	Smitha Middle School
<i>Team Lead:</i>	William Grant
<i>Position:</i>	Assistant Principal
<i>Email:</i>	william.grant@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone:</i>	
Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)	
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems ONLY
	“Fund 400” - Consolidation of Federal funds only
Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)	
X	Free/Reduced meal applications
	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification ONLY
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

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

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

School Response: In Spring 2025, Smitha Middle School conducted a comprehensive needs assessment process to inform the development of the FY26 School Improvement Plan. This process began with academic departments reviewing current data sets, including Georgia Milestones results, BEACON screeners, RI/MI scores, ACCESS data, and internal common assessments. Each Cardinal Collaborative Community (CCC) analyzed trends, identified instructional challenges, and proposed solutions grounded in classroom experience. Feedback was then solicited from specialized instructional support personnel, including ESOL, SPED, and gifted teachers, as well as counselors and academic coaches, to ensure representation of all student subgroups. The school's leadership team compiled and analyzed this data during a series of design team meetings, where root causes and barriers to success were refined.

Input from parents was gathered through surveys, a Spring input meeting, and targeted feedback sessions, ensuring that family perspectives and concerns were integrated into the plan. Additionally, community partners, including local business leaders and family engagement specialists, were consulted to align support services and resources with identified student needs. This collaborative, data-driven approach ensured that the SIP reflects the voices and expertise of a broad range of stakeholders committed to improving outcomes for all students.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

Required Stakeholders	Suggested Stakeholders
Administrative Team	Parent Facilitators
Content or Grade Level Teachers	Media Specialists
Local School Academic Coaches	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)	Social Workers
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders

Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists
MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)	Community Health Care Providers
	Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	Position:	Printed Name:	Signature:
5/21/25	Parent	SHANTELLA BANNERMAN	[Signature]
5/21/25	ELA teacher	Bina Patel	[Signature]
05/21/25	Reading Teacher	Lindsey Thurman	[Signature]
5/21/25	S.S. GA Studies	Aisha McCowan	[Signature]
5/21/2025	SS GA Studies	Tabitha Stroud	[Signature]
5/21/2025	SCI TEACHER	JAMES [unclear]	[Signature]
5/21/25	Library Media	[Signature]	Sandra Davis
5/21/25	ESOL Lead	Terence Buger	[Signature]
5/21/25	Band Teacher	Morgan Fargo	[Signature]
5/21/25	AVID Teacher	Rasheda Byner	[Signature]
5/21/25	Counselor	Michael Stokes	[Signature]
5/21/25	Asst. Principal	William Grant	[Signature]
5/21/25	Coach	Dean Speer	[Signature]

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 33% to 43% as measured by the 2024–2025 ELA Georgia Milestones Assessment
Was the goal met? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Spring 2025 ELA EOG Scores: 6 th Grade = 35.2% 7 th Grade = 35.5% 8 th Grade = 23.4% School Average = 31.4%
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	<p>The SY25 ELA goal was not met, with a schoolwide average of 31.4% scoring Level 3 or higher—falling short of the 43% target. While 6th and 7th grade showed modest gains (35.2% and 35.5%, respectively), 8th grade declined to 23.4%, pulling down the overall average.</p> <p>Actionable Strategies to Address the Area of Need (SY26 SIP-Aligned): To close this gap in SY26, the following targeted strategies from our updated School Improvement Plan will be implemented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured Writing Connected to Text: All 6–8 ELA teachers will embed frequent, standards-aligned writing assessments into daily instruction, using Milestones-based rubrics and exemplars. Instruction will focus on text-based responses, aligned to GaDOE writing expectations, to strengthen coherence and rigor. 2. Professional Learning on Rigor & Relevance: Teachers will participate in a three-part Rigor & Relevance training series (Aug–Dec) focused on student engagement, effective feedback cycles, and mastery-based instruction. This will help raise the quality of both instruction and assessments. 3. Collaborative Data Review: Monthly CCC meetings will be used to analyze writing samples, calibrate scoring, and adjust instruction in real time. Data-driven planning will ensure that gaps in comprehension and writing structure are addressed early and often.

	<p>4. SPED & ELA Co-Planning: SPED and ELA teachers will engage in structured collaborative planning time to collaborate on modifying writing assessments and integrating accommodations for SWDs. This ensures access without reducing rigor and addresses gaps in writing performance noted among students with disabilities.</p> <p>5. Targeted Walkthroughs & Feedback: School leaders and coaches will conduct regular walkthroughs focused on writing instruction and use of feedback, providing just-in-time coaching support where needed.</p>
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

Previous Year's Goal #2	The percentage of students scoring Level 3 or higher will increase from 22% to 32% as measured by the 2024–2025 Math Georgia Milestones Assessment.
Was the goal met? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<p>The SY25 math goal was to increase the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 or higher (Proficient and Distinguished Learners) from 22% to 32%.</p> <p>Current combined percentages based on the merged file:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proficient Learner: 21.61% • Distinguished Learner: 5.49% • Total Level 3 or Higher: 27.10% <p>Conclusion: We fell short of the SY25 math goal, achieving 27.10% instead of the 32% target. This reflects a 5% gap between the current performance and the intended goal.</p>

Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	To address the area of need identified, the following actionable strategies will be implemented: Increase the frequency of structured peer review sessions in 360-math classrooms. Provide targeted interventions using specialized instruction in math intervention sessions. Implement Tier 2 ELLevation strategies daily/weekly to support EL students. Embed WICOR strategies in daily instruction to promote critical thinking and problem-solving. Use BEACON assessments for real-time progress monitoring and data-driven instruction. Provide ongoing professional learning focused on rigorous, standards-aligned assessment development .
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

Previous Year's Goal #3	From the start of the 2023 school year to the end of the 2024 school year, increase the percentage of students with zero referrals all year from 69% (615 of 891 students) by at least 10% as measured by the Comprehensive Discipline Summary Report.
Was the goal met? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	SY25 Comprehensive Discipline Summary Report data shows 76% of all students had zero referrals all year.
Reflecting on Outcomes	

<p>If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?</p>	
<p>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?</p>	<p>The increase from 69% to 76% of students with zero referrals was driven by several intentional, schoolwide efforts that will continue moving forward. Consistent PBIS implementation allowed teachers to reinforce expectations using common language across classrooms, with frequent reteaching during REACH days and advisory. Tier 1 behavior supports, including clear routines, posted norms, and predictable classroom structures, reduced opportunities for misbehavior. Positive reinforcement systems such as weekly and monthly recognition, shout-outs, raffles, and incentives motivated students to stay on track. Grade-level teams monitored behavior trends and collaborated to respond early to patterns of concern. Increased staff presence during transitions provided both accountability and relational support. Additionally, admin and coaches regularly reviewed behavior data during CCCs, allowing for timely adjustments and staff support. These structures will remain in place and be refined annually to ensure ongoing behavior success and a positive learning environment for all students.</p>

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

ELA DATA									
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24		SY25		
	% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		
	6 th Grade	40 Out of 192 20.8%	51 out of 207 24.6%	92 out of 232 39.7%	96 out of 273 35.2%				
	7 th Grade	63 Out of 226 27.9%	71 out of 239 29.7%	85 out of 255 33.3%	103 out of 290 35.5%				
	8 th Grade	65 Out of 222 29.3%	79 out of 246 32.1%	70 out of 262 26.7%	69 out of 295 23.4%				

Beacon ELA Data – Winter 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
6 th Grade	60	120	55	66	119	50	70	111	54	61	123	51	67	119	49	55	129	51	91	113	31	70	117	48
7 th Grade	66	122	75	74	117	72	67	140	56	71	120	72	66	134	63	73	107	83	132	101	30	67	131	65
8 th Grade	102	102	70	100	105	69	97	116	61	102	108	64	97	111	66	87	111	76	134	94	46	87	121	66

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups) Achievement Level 2-4 6 th Grade = 60.8% 7 th Grade = 66.6% 8 th Grade = 65.8% ELs (Active & IEL) = 24.5% SWD = 38.2%	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:

	SWD:	
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	<p>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD</p> <p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p>6th Strengths:</p> <p>Text Types and Purposes had the highest number of Proficient scores, indicating students can express ideas effectively through writing.</p> <p>Research also showed strong performance with a relatively high number of Proficient students, suggesting students are improving in locating and using evidence.</p> <p>7th Grade ELA</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Craft and Structure and Key Ideas and Details had higher Proficient counts, showing growth in reading comprehension and text analysis.</p> <p>Informational Text performed well with fewer in Support Needed, a positive trend for non-fiction understanding.</p>	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p>6th Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary had a high number of students in Support Needed, suggesting limited word knowledge or context usage. Informational Text revealed more students needing support than proficient, indicating struggles with non-fiction comprehension. <p>7th Weaknesses:</p> <p>Research was a weak area with low proficiency, indicating difficulty synthesizing sources or citing evidence.</p> <p>Vocabulary Acquisition and Use had a significant portion in Support Needed, reflecting challenges with academic language.</p> <p>8th Weaknesses:</p> <p>Vocabulary had one of the lowest Proficient rates, pointing to word acquisition gaps.</p> <p>Informational Text had more Support Needed than Proficient, revealing difficulty unpacking factual or technical content.</p>

	<p>8th Grade ELA</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Key Ideas and Details and Craft & Structure both had solid Proficient numbers, indicating critical reading skills are maturing.</p> <p>Literary Text showed improved comprehension, suggesting engagement and interpretation are areas of confidence.</p> <p>EL: EL students showed relative strength in identifying key ideas in literary texts but needed continued support with vocabulary acquisition in informational passages.</p> <p>Many EL students performed near target in writing conventions, indicating partial mastery of grammar and sentence structure.</p> <p>SWD:</p> <p>SWD students demonstrated improvement in reading comprehension tasks when texts were supported with graphic organizers or teacher modeling.</p>	<p>EL:</p> <p>Els show ongoing challenges with academic language in extended responses.</p> <p>SWD:</p>
--	---	---

SY25 Milestones ELA EOG	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>6th Grade</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writing Domain: 32.2% of students met target—highest among all domains. 2. Reading & Vocabulary: 27.1% Met Target, showing stronger comprehension vocabulary performance than other reading areas. 3. Writing & Language Combined: Second-highest domain performance (28.2% Met Target). <p>7th Grade</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writing Domain: 36.8% Met Target—strongest of all areas, showing students can express ideas effectively in writing. 2. Reading Literary Text: 32.3% Met Target—above average comprehension and engagement with literary passages. 3. Writing and Language Combined: 30.8% Met Target—shows consistent performance in grammar and expression. <p>8th Grade</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writing Domain: 26.2% Met Target—the highest performing area, indicating relative strength in extended written expression. 2. Reading Literary Text: 25.2% Met Target—stronger engagement and comprehension with narrative text. 	<p>6th Grade</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: Nearly half (49.5%) Below Target. 2. Language Domain: Over half (51.6%) Below Target. 3. Reading Informational Text: 52.4% Below Target—major need area given its Milestones importance. <p>7th Grade</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 45.9% Below Target—vocabulary development remains a concern. 2. Language Domain: 43.6% Below Target—grammar and usage skills need targeted support. 3. Reading Informational Text: 42.1% Below Target—nonfiction comprehension is still underdeveloped. <p>8th Grade</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vocabulary Acquisition and Use: 55.1% Below Target—largest gap, severely impacting comprehension across subjects. 2. Language Domain: 54.2% Below Target—grammar and conventions remain a significant area of need. 3. Reading Informational Text: 52.3% Below Target—indicates difficulty extracting meaning from nonfiction texts.

	<p>3. Writing and Language Combined: 23.4% Met Target—suggests some consistency in grammar and communication.</p>	
SY25 ACCESS Scores	<p>Based on 2025 ACCESS data, <u>6th Grade</u> <u>7th Grade</u> <u>8th Grade</u> the distribution of English Learners by composite performance level is as follows:</p> <p>6th Grade (N = 226): Entering: 16 students (7.1%) Emerging: 72 students (31.9%) Developing: 91 students (40.3%) Expanding: 43 students (19.0%) Bridging: 4 students (1.8%)</p> <p>7th Grade (N = 213): Entering: 10 students (4.7%) Emerging: 55 students (25.8%) Developing: 86 students (40.4%) Expanding: 54 students (25.4%) Bridging: 8 students (3.8%)</p> <p>8th Grade (N = 178): Entering: 10 students (5.6%) Emerging: 30 students (16.9%) Developing: 59 students (33.1%) Expanding: 63 students (35.4%) Bridging: 16 students (9.0%)</p> <p>Overall Trends: Across all grade levels, the majority of students fall within the <i>Developing</i> and</p>	

	<p><i>Expanding</i> ranges, showing growth toward language proficiency. Notably, 8th grade has the highest percentage of students in the <i>Expanding</i> and <i>Bridging</i> levels, suggesting language acquisition gains over time.</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>6th</p> <p>19.0% of students scored at the <i>Expanding</i> level, indicating increasing proficiency. Presence of students at the <i>Bridging</i> level (0.9%), showing readiness for language exit. A relatively balanced distribution across mid-level bands, with over 40% in <i>Developing</i> (not shown above but confirmed in prior data).</p> <p>7th</p> <p>12.9% of students reached the <i>Expanding</i> level, showing growth from prior years. Mid-level (<i>Developing</i>) not shown above but constitutes the largest group (~40%). Moderate presence of <i>Bridging</i> students (3.8%, from earlier data), indicating upward mobility.</p> <p>8th</p> <p>Highest percentage at <i>Expanding</i>: 29.7%, a sign of readiness for advanced content. Significant number of students in the <i>Bridging</i> level (9.0%), nearing reclassification. Only ~33% at <i>Developing</i>, suggesting many have moved beyond intermediate proficiency.</p>	<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>6th</p> <p>22.1% of students are still at the <i>Emerging</i> level, needing foundational language support. 17.7% remain at the <i>Entering</i> level, requiring significant language scaffolding. Low presence in upper proficiency tiers beyond <i>Expanding</i>.</p> <p>7th</p> <p>25.8% at the <i>Emerging</i> level, highest among the three grades. 9.7% still at <i>Entering</i>, suggesting ongoing need for intensive supports. Lower proportion at <i>Expanding</i> compared to 8th grade, indicating slower progression.</p> <p>8th</p> <p>17.8% at <i>Entering</i> and another 17.8% at <i>Emerging</i>, indicating a split population with both high and low performers. Persistent language gaps for students entering from lower bands late. Despite gains, a small cohort remains far from exit thresholds.</p> <p>EL</p>
--	--	---

	EL SWD	SWD
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The issue is about <i>how</i> writing is (or is not) being embedded into daily instruction and aligned to standards, which falls under Coherent Instruction — ensuring curriculum, instruction, and assessments are all aligned, consistent, and effectively implemented. Our focus must be academic rigor and instructional design, not environment.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction	Root Cause Explanation:	

<input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment		
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
Other Summary Data <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Parent Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Learning Survey <input type="checkbox"/> _____		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	The percentage of students scoring Prepared will increase from 20% (154 out of 823) to 30% as measured by the 2025–2026 ELA BEACON Assessment.			
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Writing Connected to Text is inconsistently planned, and writing assessments are not consistently aligned to GaDOE Milestones outcomes or designed to provide rigorous, actionable feedback.			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____			
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources	
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Target: 100% of 6–8th grade ELA teachers will implement quarterly common writing assessments aligned to the rigor of the K-12 Georgia ELA Standards. Implementation Plan: August 18, 2025 – Digital Learning Day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALP department will provide professional development (PD) for all teachers to establish expectations for writing assessments aligned with the Georgia Department of Education (GaDOE) Milestones. Emphasize the integration of Rigor and Relevance strategies to deepen student engagement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce teachers to GaDOE Milestones writing rubrics and grade-level exemplars. Use GaDOE “Writing Connected to Text” assessment templates, exemplars, rubrics, and accompanying checklists aligned to Milestones domains to guide 	Evaluation Performance Targets: _50_ % of 6 th Grade students will perform proficient (GaDOE/CTLS 3-point rubric) on common writing assessments _50_ % of 7 th Grade students will perform proficient (3-point on rubric) on common writing assessments. _50_ % of 8 th Grade students will perform proficient (3-point rubric) on common writing assessments.	CCSD Advanced Learning Department CCSD Assessment Department CCSD Title I Academic Coaches CCSD ELA Department	
Target Student Group				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Students <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input type="checkbox"/> SWD				
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i> 6-8 th grade ELA teachers will align common writing assessments to the rigor of the K-12 Georgia ELA standards			Evaluation Tool(s): Monthly Common Writing Assessments Evaluation Plan: Student progress in writing will be measured through schoolwide common writing assessments scored with Milestones-aligned,	

	<p>student writing, feedback, and revision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Train teachers to embed frequent, standards-aligned writing assessments with built-in feedback opportunities into daily instruction, ensuring Rigor and Relevance strategies are applied. ○ Set CCC expectations around assessment quality and rigor, including how writing data will be brought to monthly CCCs to calibrate scoring and inform instructional adjustments. ○ Teachers will embed Rigor and Relevance strategies, particularly those focused on student engagement, feedback cycles, and mastery, to ensure alignment with student needs and promote deeper learning. <p>September 2025 – April 2026:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA teachers will administer quarterly school-developed common writing assessments scored with Milestones-aligned rubrics. • Teachers will bring student work samples to CCC meetings for collaborative scoring, calibration, and planning instructional responses to trends in writing performance. • Academic Coach and CCC leads will monitor implementation and provide ongoing support. • CCC documentation will reflect calibration activities, student 	<p>standards-based rubrics that integrate Rigor and Relevance principles. These assessments will occur monthly and be analyzed during CCC meetings to adjust instruction and calibrate scoring practices. Evaluation artifacts will include common assessment data and BEACON writing domain data as a secondary measure to track longitudinal growth trends.</p> <p>The evaluation of this action step will focus on three interconnected areas: student performance on common writing assessments, the quality and frequency of written feedback provided to students, and instructional adjustments based on student work analysis. CCC documentation, walkthroughs, and rubric-aligned assessment data will be triangulated to ensure that writing instruction is responsive, rigorous, and aligned to Milestones expectations.</p> <p>Students will be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly • <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <p>Data Analysis Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student writing assessments will be scored quarterly using standards-based rubrics aligned to Milestones expectations, with an emphasis on Rigor and Relevance strategies to deepen student mastery and engagement. 	
--	---	--	--

	<p>strengths/needs, and specific instructional adjustments made based on assessment data.</p> <p>October – December 2025:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admin, Academic Coach, and CCC leads will conduct walkthroughs every six weeks targeting writing assessment implementation, feedback practices, and application of Rigor and Relevance strategies. • Academic Coach, CCC leads, and Administrators will provide follow-up coaching based on observed needs. <p>October 13, 2025 – Digital Learning Day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALP department will provide additional PL to deepen teacher understanding of Rigor and Relevance principles, focusing specifically on method strategies and feedback practices aligned to student writing development. <p>December 2, 2025 – Rigor & Relevance PL Session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final semester session emphasizing the role of meaningful student feedback in improving writing. Teachers will analyze anonymized student samples and revise lesson plans to strengthen instructional alignment with rubric expectations. <p>January 5, 2026 – Teacher Workday:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data will be reviewed during CCCs to guide instruction, make timely adjustments, and improve feedback practices. <p>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/Instructional Support Specialists • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads 	
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Midyear writing data review: Teachers and instructional leaders will review student performance trends using common writing data, BEACON domain data, and CCC notes. • Use data to adjust writing instruction pacing, feedback strategies, and target areas for reteaching or intervention. <p>May 18–20, 2026 – Teacher Workdays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-of-Year Review: Reflect on writing assessment practices and student writing growth. Teachers will analyze student portfolios and common summative data to identify trends. • Use Rigor and Relevance strategies to set individual and team writing goals for SY27. • The final three CCC meetings of the year will focus on “tiering out” next steps based on Common Summative Assessments and BEACON writing domain data to group students by writing proficiency and plan summer/fall supports. <p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student writing samples scored with Milestones-aligned rubrics • CCC Minutes/Discussion • Lesson Plans <p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/Instructional Support Specialists • CCC Leads <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkthroughs every 6 weeks, bi-weekly CCC reviews, and quarterly leadership team data reviews • Midyear reflection and end-of-year evaluation to assess the effectiveness of Rigor and Relevance strategies in writing assessments 		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BEACON data shows that SWD students consistently scored lowest in Text Types and Purposes and Conventions, indicating challenges with organizing ideas, expressing complete thoughts, and applying grade-level writing conventions. These patterns suggest that writing instruction and assessment accommodations for SWD students are not consistently differentiated or scaffolded in alignment with their IEP goals. Additionally, SPED and ELA teams lack regular, structured collaboration time to co-develop modified writing tasks that maintain rigor while ensuring accessibility. 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of SPED teachers will collaborate with ELA teams during structured collaborative planning time to plan IEP-driven scaffolds for daily instruction. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Coach & Administrators will review expectations of providing accommodations for SWD students during assessment development. Collaborative Planning Time schedule will be developed to ensure SPED teachers have allocated time to collaborate with ELA teachers. August-May: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPED teachers will collaborate with ELA teams during assessment development and administration to ensure accommodations 	Evaluation Performance Target: _50_ % of 6 th Grade SWD students will perform proficient or higher on common writing assessments. _50_ % of 7 th Grade SWD students will perform proficient or higher on common writing assessments. _50_ % of 8 th Grade SWD students will perform proficient or higher on common writing assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BEACON writing domain reports Common assessment constructed response data, incorporating feedback cycles tied to Rigor and Relevance Milestones Constructed Response results, analyzed with focus on Rigor and Relevance engagement Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed:	CCSD Advanced Learning Department
Target Student Group			CCSD Assessment Department
<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD			CCSD Title I Academic Coaches
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			CCSD ELA Department CCSD SPED Department
2. SPED and ELA teachers will collaborate (biweekly or monthly) to plan IEP-driven scaffolds for daily instruction.			

	<p>are made for students with disabilities (SWDs).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These accommodations will be reviewed and refined based on Rigor and Relevance principles to enhance accessibility, engagement, and learning for SWDs. • Collaborative Planning: SPED teachers will be allocated collaborative planning time to participate in the development and review of writing assessments, design accommodations for writing assessment • Review lessons and assessments and ensure accessibility for SWD assessment tasks. <p>October-December:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct monthly walkthroughs targeting writing assessments, feedback practices aligned to Rigor and Relevance strategies. • Ensure assessments are aligned with Rigor and Relevance strategies. SPED Action: SPED teachers engage in walkthroughs to ensure accommodations are being implemented correctly for SWDs. • Collaborative Planning: Provide collaborative planning time for SPED teams to calibrate scoring using GaDOE rubrics, while ensuring Rigor and Relevance strategies are applied in the feedback process. <p>January 5, 2026 - Teacher Workday:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPED Action: SPED teachers will collaborate with ELA teams to adjust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly • <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EOY Milestones _____ <p>Data Analysis Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student writing assessments will be scored monthly using standards-based rubrics aligned to Milestones expectations, with an emphasis on Rigor and Relevance strategies to deepen student mastery and engagement. • Data will be reviewed during CCCs to guide instruction, make timely adjustments, and improve feedback practices. • BEACON writing results will inform adjustments to intervention and enrichment efforts. • Final Milestones writing performance will validate progress in Rigor and Relevance application. <p>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/Instructional Support Specialists • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPED Coordinators to monitor accommodations and their impact on SWD performance 	
--	--	--	--

	<p>instruction based on data for SWDs, ensuring that Rigor and Relevance strategies are integrated into modifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocate collaborative planning time for SPED teams to analyze student writing data and adjust accommodations based on Rigor and Relevance principles. <p>May 18-20, 2026 - Teacher Workdays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPED Action: SPED teams reflect on the effectiveness of writing assessments for SWDs and adjust instructional practices using Rigor and Relevance strategies to enhance engagement and mastery for SWDs. <p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of scaffolds in SPED lesson plans <p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPED Coordinators for SWD accommodations and progress tracking</p> <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly walkthroughs, bi-weekly CCC reviews, and quarterly leadership team data reviews • Midyear reflection and end-of-year evaluation to assess the effectiveness of 		
--	--	--	--

	Rigor and Relevance strategies in writing assessments		
--	---	--	--

MATH DATA									
MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22		SY23		SY24		SY25		
	% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		% of students scoring proficient & distinguished		
	6 th Grade	58 Out of 192 30.2%	60 out of 207 29.0%	62 out of 232 26.75	70 out of 273 25.64%				
	7 th Grade	63 Out of 226 27.9%	55 out of 239 23.0%	61 out of 255 23.9%	70 out of 288 24.3%				
	8 th Grade	61 Out of 222 27.5%	35 out of 246 14.2%	56 out of 262 21.4%	92 out of 295 31.18%				

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
6 th Grade	162	79	4	138	89	18	116	105	24	143	99	3
7 th Grade	150	101	16	131	93	43	149	94	24	129	103	35
8 th Grade	195	47	14	179	56	21	158	72	26	171	67	18

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p>EL: EL students performed best on computation and one-step problem solving, especially in familiar formats.</p> <p>SWD: SWD students showed proficiency in isolated skills (e.g., basic operations</p>	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p>EL: Tasks with embedded academic language, such as multi-step word problems, proved more difficult, limiting progress in reasoning and application domains.</p> <p>SWD: Assessment stamina and decoding complex question formats impacted overall performance in constructed response items.), Performance is behind</p>

	<p>6th Grade Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Numerical Reasoning Domain – 54 students met target, only 2 below target. 2. Numerical & Algebraic Expressions – Strong performance with 52 meeting target. 3. Overall Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning – High achievement in this broader domain. <p>7th Grade Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (Overall Domain) – 59 met target, only 2 below. 2. Operations with Rational Numbers – 54 met target, 0 below. 3. Expressions, Equations & Inequalities – 54 met target, 0 below. <p>8th Grade Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (Overall Domain) – 63 met target. 2. Linear Problem Solving – 58 met target. 3. Functional & Graphical Reasoning (Overall Domain) – 56 met target. 	<p>grade level in multi-step reasoning tasks and abstract content areas like geometry and algebra.</p> <p>6th Grade Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinate Plane & Polygons – 25 approaching, 10 below target. 2. One-Step Equations & Inequalities – 12 approaching, 11 below target. 3. Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Coordinate Plane – notable concentration of students not yet at target. <p>7th Grade Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Angle Measurement, Area, Surface Area & Volume – 28 approaching, 12 below. 2. Proportional Relationships – 18 approaching, 6 below. 3. (Same Angle Measurement domain reappears due to high below-target count.) <p>8th Grade Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Properties and Uses of Functions – 45 approaching, 22 below. 2. Pythagorean Theorem and Volume – 27 approaching, 21 below. 3. (Both of the above stand out significantly from all other domains.)
--	---	---

Beacon Assessment – MATH (Grade Level & Subgroups)	<p>6th Grade Math Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerical Reasoning had the highest number of Proficient scores, showing strong foundational number skills. • Measurement and Data Reasoning showed a balanced spread, suggesting gradual mastery in interpreting and applying quantitative data. <p>7th Grade Math Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerical Reasoning stood out with strong Proficient counts, suggesting solid number sense and operations. • Geometric Reasoning was comparatively stronger than in other grades, indicating improved spatial reasoning. <p>8th Grade Math Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerical Reasoning had the highest number of students reaching Proficiency, affirming strong number skills heading into Algebra I. • Algebraic Reasoning showed improved scores, a good sign of secondary readiness. 	<p>6th Grade Math Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning had one of the lowest Proficient counts, showing students are struggling with algebra readiness. • Geometric and Spatial Reasoning had many students in Support Needed, signaling difficulty visualizing shapes and applying geometry. <p>7th Grade Math Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algebraic Reasoning showed lower proficiency and high support needs, marking it as an area for targeted intervention. • Measurement and Data Reasoning had a dip in proficiency, signaling a need to revisit data interpretation and units. <p>8th Grade Math Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurement and Data Reasoning was one of the weakest, suggesting students are struggling to apply formulas or interpret data. • Geometric and Spatial Reasoning again stood out as a challenge across all grades, with many needing additional support.
<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause::</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p>Root Cause Explanation:</p> <p>Coherent Instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The variation in performance across domains (e.g., consistently low Vocabulary and Algebraic Reasoning scores) points to gaps in aligned curriculum, instructional strategies, or scaffolding. • Students needing support in foundational skills like Vocabulary, Measurement, and Algebra suggests instruction may not be consistently targeted or vertically aligned. <p>Professional Capacity</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeted weaknesses—like Research in ELA or Data Reasoning in Math—imply that educators may need more support or training on instructional strategies and interventions for these specific domains. Developing teacher expertise in areas like academic language, non-fiction reading strategies, and Algebra readiness could significantly improve these outcomes. 	
MATH Common Assessments	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p>EL: EL students showed stronger performance in basic numerical reasoning.</p> <p>SWD: SWD students were more successful in computation-based tasks but struggled with abstract reasoning and applying concepts across unfamiliar contexts.</p>	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p>EL: EL students required additional scaffolds for word problems involving multi-step operations. Language-heavy domains like Data and Measurement presented challenges, particularly when interpreting graphs or decoding multi-step tasks.</p> <p>SWD: Geometry and Algebraic Reasoning emerged as key growth areas, especially when multi-part questions required sustained attention or multi-step planning.</p>
<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause::</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)		

<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause::</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p>Root Cause Explanation:</p>	
<p>Other Summary Data</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Survey</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Parent Survey</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Professional Learning Survey</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p>		
<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause::</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p>Root Cause Explanation:</p>	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	The percentage of students scoring Prepared will increase from 6% (46 out of 823) to 16% as measured by the 2025–2026 Math BEACON Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Structured problem-solving tasks and assessments are inconsistently aligned to GaDOE Milestones standards and do not consistently provide rigorous feedback opportunities to students.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 6–8 grade math teachers will align common assessments to the rigor of the K-12 Georgia Math standards. Implementation Plan: August 18, 2025 – Digital Learning Day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will receive training on designing structured, multi-step problem-solving assessments aligned to GSE standards and Georgia Milestones. Academic Coaches will model exemplar problem-solving tasks and rubric-scored feedback cycles. Teachers will revise existing assessments or create new unit-aligned tasks that mirror Milestones rigor. 	Evaluation Targets: __70__% of 6 th Grade students will perform proficient (75%+) on common summative assessment. __70__% of 7 th Grade students will perform proficient (75%+) on common summative assessment. __70__% of 8 th Grade students will perform proficient (75%+) on common summative assessment. Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards-based math rubrics aligned to achievement level descriptors for Milestones expectations, with a focus on Rigor and Relevance strategies to promote deeper student understanding 	
Target Student Group			
<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input type="checkbox"/> SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
1. 6-8th grade Math teachers will align common assessments to the rigor of the K-12 Georgia Math standards.			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCC leads will help establish a timeline for administering assessments and analyzing results after each unit. <p>August 21, 2025 – Assessment PL Session 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will collaborate to finalize common unit assessments and identify success criteria. • Teams will review rubric language and scoring protocols, ensuring alignment with Milestones performance levels. • Teachers will plan how to collect student work samples and provide feedback that informs next instructional steps. <p>August 28, 2025 – Assessment PL Session 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams will calibrate sample student work and norm rubric scoring across grade levels. • Teachers will establish systems for recording, tracking, and sharing data from assessments and feedback. • CCC expectations will be set for how assessment results will be used to adjust instruction through reteaching, enrichment, or small-group intervention. <p>October 2, 2025 – Assessment PL Session 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCCs will receive support from the CCSD Assessment Department and Title I Academic Coaches on refining structured assessments, designing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common assessment performance on problem-solving items, analyzed with a focus on Rigor and Relevance strategies <p>Smitha Middle School will evaluate three interconnected components to determine the effectiveness of structured problem-solving implementation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Common Assessments: Teachers will administer standards-aligned common assessments to measure student mastery of multi-step problem-solving tasks. These assessments will serve as a consistent measure across classrooms and ensure alignment to Georgia Milestones expectations. 2. Feedback Practices: Teachers will use rubric-based feedback to guide student revisions and strengthen mathematical reasoning. The quality and frequency of feedback will be monitored through student work samples, CCC documentation, and walkthrough observations. 3. Instructional Adjustments: Teachers will use common assessment data and student responses to adjust instruction in real time. Lesson plans, CCC discussions, and observational data will document how teachers modify strategies to address misconceptions and extend learning. 	
--	---	---	--

	<p>rigorous success criteria, and improving feedback practices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will revisit student work samples from early units and assess the effectiveness of feedback and instructional adjustments. <p>October 13, 2025 – Digital Learning Day:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will deepen their understanding of Rigor and Relevance strategies that support problem-solving and conceptual understanding. CCC teams will prepare for upcoming walkthrough cycles focused on evaluating the implementation of structured assessments and instructional responsiveness to data. <p>December 2, 2025 – Final Rigor & Relevance PL Session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will reflect on mid-semester data from structured problem-solving tasks. Teachers will share samples of feedback, rubrics, and instructional adjustments that followed from assessment results. Teams will refine assessment practices for upcoming units to improve alignment and clarity. <p>January 5, 2026 – Teacher Workday:</p>	<p>Justification: Evaluating common assessments, feedback, and instructional adjustment ensures fidelity to the full assessment cycle promoted by the SIP. Each element contributes to student growth: common assessments measure learning, feedback drives reflection, and instructional adjustment ensures targeted support. This comprehensive approach aligns with the SIP’s Rigor and Relevance framework and supports continuous improvement in math instruction.</p> <p>Evaluation Plan:</p> <p>Students will be assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <p>Data Analysis Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student math assessment data will be collected and reviewed monthly using standards-based rubrics, ensuring Rigor and Relevance strategies are integrated into assessments. BEACON math domain scores will be used for interim checks, guiding instructional adjustments. Walkthroughs and lesson plan data will validate Rigor and Relevance implementation. Milestones results will serve as final validation of assessment effectiveness 	
--	--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 6–8 math teachers will participate in a midyear data review focused on assessment trends across units. • Teams will evaluate how assessment feedback led to instructional changes and identify any gaps in implementation. • Coaches and CCC leads will provide guidance on modifying tasks and supports for SWDs and ELs based on trends in performance. <p>May 18–20, 2026 – Teacher Workdays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers will reflect on student performance across all structured problem-solving assessments administered throughout the year. • Teams will analyze rubric-aligned growth and identify patterns of success or continued need. • CCCs will revise unit assessments and feedback strategies for SY27 to better support mastery, based on Milestones-style results. • Instructional teams will create an SY27 action plan for improving structured assessment cycles and building student problem-solving stamina. <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p>	<p>and the integration of Rigor and Relevance strategies for engagement and mastery.</p> <p>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/Instructional Support Specialists • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPED Coordinators for tracking accommodations and progress for SWDs 	
--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly walkthroughs, bi-weekly CCC reviews, and quarterly leadership team data reviews • Midyear reflection and end-of-year evaluation to assess the effectiveness of Rigor and Relevance strategies in problem-solving assessments <p>Artifacts to be collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artifact: Student work samples scored with Milestones-aligned math rubrics • CCC Minutes • Lesson Plans 		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BEACON math data for SWD students shows persistent gaps in Algebraic Reasoning and Geometric & Spatial Reasoning, with a high percentage performing in the “Support Needed” range. These domains require multi-step problem solving, abstract reasoning, and language-rich tasks—areas where SWD students often struggle without explicit strategy instruction and scaffolded supports. The data suggests that accommodations are not consistently embedded during assessment development, and SPED teams need more structured collaboration time with general education math teachers to design accessible, rigorous tasks aligned to Milestones expectations. 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of SPED and Math teachers will collaborate (biweekly or monthly) to plan IEP-driven scaffolds for daily instruction. Implementation Plan: Preplanning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Coach & Administrators will review expectations of providing accommodations for SWD students during assessment development. Collaborative Planning schedule will be developed to ensure SPED teachers have allocated time to collaborate with math teachers. August-May: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPED teachers will collaborate with MATH teams during assessment development and administration to ensure accommodations are made for students with disabilities (SWDs). 	Evaluation Performance Target: 50% of 6 th Grade SWD students will perform proficient (75%+) on common summative assessment. 50% of 7 th Grade SWD students will perform proficient (75%+) on common summative assessment. 50% of 8 th Grade SWD students will perform proficient (75%+) on common summative assessment. Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CTLS Common Assessment reports Quarterly Math Beacon Data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year 	
Target Student Group			
<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. SPED and Math teachers will collaborate (biweekly or monthly) to plan IEP-driven scaffolds for daily instruction.			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These accommodations will be reviewed and refined based on Rigor and Relevance principles to enhance accessibility, engagement, and learning for SWDs. • Collaborative Planning: SPED teachers will be allocated collaborative planning time to participate in the development and review of writing assessments, design accommodations for writing assessment • Review lessons and assessments and ensure accessibility for SWD assessment tasks. <p>October-December:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct monthly walkthroughs targeting math assessments and feedback practices. • Ensure assessments are aligned with Rigor and Relevance strategies. • SPED Action: SPED teachers will engage in walkthroughs to ensure accommodations are being implemented correctly for SWDs. • Walkthroughs will focus on the integration of Rigor and Relevance principles for deeper student engagement. • Collaborative Planning: Provide collaborative planning time for SPED teams to calibrate scoring using GaDOE rubrics, while ensuring Rigor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> _____ <p>Data Analysis Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student math assessment data will be collected and reviewed monthly using standards-based rubrics, ensuring Rigor and Relevance strategies are integrated into assessments. • BEACON math domain scores will be used for interim checks, guiding instructional adjustments. • Walkthroughs and lesson plan data will validate Rigor and Relevance implementation. Milestones results will serve as final validation of assessment effectiveness and the integration of Rigor and Relevance strategies for engagement and mastery. <p>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/Instructional Support Specialists • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads • <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPED Coordinators for tracking accommodations and progress for SWDs 	
--	--	---	--

	<p>and Relevance strategies are applied in the feedback process.</p> <p>January 5, 2026 - Teacher Workday:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPED Action: SPED teachers will collaborate with math teams to adjust instruction based on data for SWDs, ensuring that Rigor and Relevance strategies are integrated into modifications. • Collaborative Planning Time: Allocate collaborative planning time for SPED teams to analyze student data and adjust accommodations based on Rigor and Relevance principles. <p>May 18-20, 2026 - Teacher Workdays:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPED Action: SPED teams will reflect on the effectiveness of problem-solving assessments for SWDs and adjust instructional practices using Rigor and Relevance strategies to enhance engagement and mastery for SWDs. <p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Artifact: Documentation of SPED accommodations for problem-solving assessments 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly walkthroughs, bi-weekly CCC reviews, and quarterly leadership team data reviews • Midyear reflection and end-of-year evaluation to assess the effectiveness of Rigor and Relevance strategies in problem-solving assessments 		
--	---	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	“Shall” Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required Annual Title I Meeting – September 9, 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.	09/09/2025		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Oct. 2 – Nov. 1, 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.	10/02/2025 – 11/01/2025		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – March 19, 2026 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.	03/19/2026		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6
4. Required TWO Building Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school			<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6
	09/18/2025		
	02/05/2026		
5. Required Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (<u>Multiple options, not just visit the school</u>) Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child’s education. <u>Briefly describe the transition activities here:</u> Transitions - Rising 6 th Grade Family Orientation	04/30/2026		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> Family-School Engagement Policy for Shared Student Success School-Parent Compact for Achievement		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)</i>							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities <u>(Must be listed in the school policy)</u>	“Shall” Addresse d	Goal(s) Addresse d	Resources	Funding Source(s)) <i>SWP Checklis t 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Team Lead: William Grant
Setting Up Students for Success! An introduction to Smitha’s educational resources and strategies that help your child thrive—and how parents can help along the way.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	Channing Bete Study Skill Workbooks		8/26/25	Post Activity Parent Survey	
Unlocking Learning Supports & Solutions Parents and their students take an in-depth look at student academic progress, goals & expectations; and explore academic resources and tools to improve home study.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	Channing Bete Study Skill Workbooks		1/29/26	Post Activity Parent Survey	
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	Collaboration with English Learner Program Channing Bete Periodicals				

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

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

School Improvement Plan Required Questions
Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)
1. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)
2. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)
3. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school’s participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)

4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)**

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

The FY26 Schoolwide Plan has been developed in alignment with and through integration of multiple Federal, State, and local programs and resources to ensure a coordinated approach to improving academic outcomes for all students, particularly those most at risk. The plan reflects input and coordination across initiatives that address academic intervention, student wellness, and readiness for future success.

Smitha Middle School integrates **Read180**, a research-based Tier 2 reading intervention program funded through Title I, to provide targeted support for students identified as below grade level in reading. Read180 implementation is supported by the Title I-funded academic coach and monitored through formative data reviews and collaborative planning.

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

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

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

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

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: Smitha Middle School regularly monitors both the implementation and results of its schoolwide program through a structured system of assessment, collaborative planning, and data-driven reflection. The school utilizes a combination of **Georgia Milestones**, **ACCESS for ELs**, **BEACON benchmark assessments**, and **school-developed common assessments** to measure academic progress and evaluate the impact of instructional strategies.

Monitoring of **implementation fidelity** includes:

- **Monthly CCC meetings** where teachers, coaches, and administrators review formative assessment results, instructional artifacts, and progress toward SIP goals.
- **Quarterly leadership team reviews** of walkthrough data, strategy implementation, and instructional trends aligned to SIP action steps.
- **Focused walkthroughs** targeting Rigor & Relevance strategies, writing connected to text, math problem-solving tasks, and ELLevation Tier 2 supports.
- Use of **common assessment calendars** to ensure timely administration of **common formative assessments (CFAs)** and **common summative assessments (CSAs)** across grade levels and content areas.
- Collection and review of implementation artifacts such as scored student work, teacher feedback rubrics, lesson plans, and meeting notes.

Monitoring of **student outcomes** includes:

- Disaggregation and analysis of **Georgia Milestones** and **BEACON** results to assess proficiency trends across grade levels and student subgroups.
- Ongoing review of **CFA and CSA data** to monitor progress on priority standards and adjust instruction in real time.
- Analysis of **progress report grades and grade profiles** by teacher, content area, and grade level to identify instructional gaps and equity concerns.
- Regular monitoring of **student performance trends across units**, with adjustments made through CCC collaboration and differentiated supports.

This ongoing cycle of data review, instructional reflection, and collaborative planning ensures that Smitha's schoolwide program remains aligned to student needs, SIP priorities, and academic outcomes. It allows school leaders to identify areas for celebration and areas needing additional support, while continuously refining strategies for school improvement.

8. Describe how the school determines whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the challenging State academic standards, particularly for those students who had been farther from achieving the standards. *SWP Checklist 3(b)*

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

Effectiveness is evaluated through multiple data sources:

- **Georgia Milestones scores** are disaggregated by subgroup to assess progress toward grade-level proficiency in ELA and Math.
- **BEACON benchmark assessments** are reviewed three times per year to track academic growth within key domains, particularly for students who enter below grade level.
- **Common formative and summative assessment data** are analyzed in CCC meetings to monitor mastery of priority standards over time and evaluate the impact of instructional strategies and interventions.
- **Progress reports and grade profile reviews** (by grade, subject, and teacher) are used to identify patterns of growth, gaps in performance, and instructional equity across classrooms.

To determine impact, Smitha monitors how previously underperforming students respond to tiered supports such as:

- Participation in **targeted interventions** (e.g., Read180, math lab, ELlevation strategies)
- Adjustments made through **SPED accommodations or co-teaching models**
- Embedded strategies like **Rigor & Relevance** and **AVID WICOR routines**

Data is reviewed quarterly by the school leadership team and monthly during CCC meetings to determine if students are showing academic growth, gaining access to grade-level standards, and closing achievement gaps. If progress is not evident, instructional approaches and intervention plans are revised to better meet student needs. This continuous reflection loop ensures that Smitha's schoolwide program remains responsive and impactful, particularly for students furthest from meeting standards.

9. Describe how the schoolwide plan will be revised, as necessary, based on regular monitoring to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program. *SWP Checklist 3(c)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Smitha Middle School revises its schoolwide plan as needed through an ongoing cycle of monitoring, reflection, and stakeholder collaboration. Regular review of implementation fidelity, student achievement data, and instructional impact ensures the plan remains responsive to evolving student needs.

Revisions are informed by:

- **Weekly CCC meetings**, where teachers, the academic coach, and administrators analyze common assessment data, student work samples, and walkthrough feedback to determine instructional effectiveness.
- **Monthly leadership team reviews** that evaluate trends in BEACON data, grade profiles, and subgroup performance.
- **Focused walkthroughs** that monitor alignment to SIP strategies—such as writing connected to text, structured problem-solving, and use of AVID/WICOR or ELlevation strategies.
- Review of **progress monitoring artifacts**, including formative and summative assessment results, progress reports, and student engagement indicators.

If the data indicates that certain strategies are not producing desired results—particularly for students performing below grade level or in key subgroups—the school modifies professional learning plans, adjusts coaching supports, and refines assessment or instructional expectations. These adjustments are documented through updated action steps, revised implementation timelines, and additional supports as needed.

Input from teachers, SPED and ESOL teams, and parents (via surveys and input sessions) is also incorporated into the plan’s revision to ensure shared ownership of school improvement efforts.

This reflective, data-informed approach allows Smitha to continuously improve its schoolwide program and maintain alignment between student needs, instructional practices, and improvement goals.

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

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

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

SWP Checklist 2(b)

12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include - counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students’ skills outside the academic subject areas. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable. SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)**

13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). *SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Smitha Middle School implements a comprehensive **schoolwide tiered model** to prevent and address problem behavior, aligned with Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) and coordinated with services outlined in the **Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)**.

At **Tier 1**, all students are taught common expectations through the school’s PBIS framework, which emphasizes consistent routines, posted norms, and reinforcement of positive behaviors. These expectations are explicitly taught during REACH periods and reviewed schoolwide after

breaks or spikes in behavior data. Recognition systems such as shout-outs, raffles, and grade-level incentives promote consistent engagement. Teachers use restorative practices, proximity strategies, and reteaching to support behavior before escalation.

At **Tier 2**, students who exhibit repeated low- to moderate-level behaviors are supported through targeted interventions, including **behavior monitoring plans, check-in/check-out systems, and social-emotional small groups** led by counselors or social workers. Behavior data is reviewed in **CCC team meetings**, and intervention plans are monitored using schoolwide data dashboards and discipline trackers.

At **Tier 3**, students with intensive behavior needs—many of whom are served under IDEA—receive **individualized behavior intervention plans (BIPs)** designed by IEP teams in coordination with school psychologists, behavior specialists, and SPED staff. Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs) are conducted as needed, and plans include specific goals, data collection protocols, and accommodations aligned to each student’s IEP. Collaboration between general education, SPED, and counseling staff ensures consistency and fidelity of implementation across settings.

Smitha’s behavior team regularly monitors fidelity of implementation across tiers and uses disaggregated behavior data to adjust supports. This tiered system allows the school to provide early intervening services while ensuring that students with disabilities receive individualized behavioral supports in compliance with IDEA.

14. Describe professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: A three-part professional learning series on rigor and relevance will be facilitated by the CCSD Advanced Learning Department. In coordination with this, the CCSD Assessment and Personalized Learning Department, alongside the Title I department, will lead a complementary three-part series focused on assessment development and usage. This series will cover key topics such as Success Criteria and Learning Targets, Target-Method-Match and DOK, as well as Item Analysis and Assessment Audits.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: Smitha Middle School provides multiple, structured transition activities to support students and families as they enter and exit the middle school setting. These activities are designed to ease academic and social-emotional transitions while building strong family-school partnerships.

For **incoming 6th grade students**, Smitha offers a “**Bridge to Middle School**” **summer program** designed to introduce rising 6th graders to the academic expectations, routines, and support structures of middle school. Students engage in sample lessons, team-building activities, and meet key staff members. In the spring, Smitha hosts **feeder school visits during the school day**, allowing 5th grade students to tour the building, attend a student Q&A panel, and observe classroom settings. Additionally, **Open House nights for rising 6th graders** provide families with an opportunity to meet teachers, explore course offerings, and receive guidance on scheduling and school logistics. To further support accessibility, the school maintains an **open-door policy** that allows parents to schedule **individual school tours** at any time throughout the year.

For **8th grade students transitioning to high school**, the school coordinates with receiving high schools to ensure a smooth handoff. Activities include academic planning meetings, counselor-led sessions about high school expectations, and elective preview opportunities. Parents are also invited to attend high school information nights hosted in collaboration with local high schools.

For **students with disabilities**, the IEP team coordinates with both feeder elementary schools and receiving high schools to ensure that transition plans and services are discussed and implemented early. These supports help students and families prepare for new settings with confidence and continuity.

These coordinated efforts ensure that students and families are supported throughout each critical transition point, helping to promote a positive start in each new academic environment.

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*

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement	The Parent Facilitator will support the overall instructional program at Smitha Middle School by creating community and family partnerships, conducting professional learning sessions to parents, teachers, and staff, and providing frequent communications to parents on the academic programs, events, and student information.
Teacher	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment <input type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement	Develop, implement, and facilitate standard-based instruction that supports students' understanding and mastering grade-level standards.
Academic Coach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment <input type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement	The academic coach will support the overall instructional program at Smitha Middle School by providing academic support and professional learning to teachers in all content areas.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment <input type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement	

School Improvement Goals <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy</i>	
Goal #1	The percentage of students scoring Prepared will increase from 20% (154 out of 823) to 30% as measured by the 2025–2026 ELA BEACON Assessment.
Goal #2	The percentage of students scoring Prepared will increase from 6% (46 out of 823) to 16% as measured by the 2025–2026 Math BEACON Assessment.
Goal #3	
Goal #4	