School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A

School Year:	**2025 - 2026**
School Name:	**Betty Gray Middle School**
Principal Name:	**Vanessa Watkins, Ed.D.**
Date Submitted:	**June 2, 2025**
Revision Date(s):	**June 17, 2025; July 21, 2025**

APPROVED

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	Betty Gray Middle School
Team Lead	Vanessa Watkins, Ed.D
Position	Principal
Email	Vanessa.Watkins@cobbk12.org
Phone	770.819.2414

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: Betty Gray Middle School implemented a School Strategic Planning Team (SSPT) comprised of the building's administrative team, department chairs, and various teacher leaders. Each department was responsible for analyzing multiple points of data and presenting their strengths and concerns. A preliminary meeting was held in April to conduct a surface level data analysis, followed by two additional meetings in May with representatives from each content area providing input to establish goals and action steps based on the identified needs of the school. The plan is then shared with PTSA and the Principal Advisory Council for further review and input.

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:	4/15/25	5/12/25	5/23/25

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Title I Supervisor	Dr. Dennissa Brown	
Principal	Dr. Denise Magee/ Dr. Vanessa Watkins	
Assistant Principal	Dr. Joy Jones	
Assistant Principal	Tida Banfield	
Assistant Principal	James Strong	
Instructional Coach (Local School)	Dr. Dianna Souder	
Parent	Tamara Simmons	
Counselor	Bianca Walker	
Counselor	Marquis Hebert	
Media Specialist	Ingrid Hanson	
Parent Facilitator	Elaine Hill	
Teacher	David Stickle	
Teacher	Dr. LaQuananisha Adams	
Teacher	Dr. Charity Johnson	
Teacher	Brandy Swann	
Teacher	Rochelle Smith	
Teacher	Leah Gaubert	
Teacher	Dr. Sashelle Alexander	
Teacher	Dr. Zatambra Smith	
Teacher	Yolanda Spencer	
Teacher	Amber Griffin	
Teacher	Courtney Moultrie	
Teacher	Kevin Anderson	

Add signature pages here

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	Betty Gray Middle school will increase the percent of ELL and SWD student groups scoring at levels 2 or above in the vocabulary acquisition domain from 25% to 35% as measured by the 2024-2025 ELA End-Of-Grade Georgia Milestone assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	• 6th grade did not meet the goal as Milestone data showed that 10 ELL students scored a level 2 or above on the vocabulary acquisition domain, representing 17.8%, and 6 SWD students scored a level 2 or above at 33.3%. While both groups fell short of the 35% target, cumulatively the grade level averaged 46.0%, with 104 out of 226 students scoring at or above level 2 on vocabulary acquisition. • 7th grade did not meet the goal as Milestone data showed that 6 ELL students scored a level 2 or above on the vocabulary acquisition domain, representing 12.8%, and 2 SWD students scored a level 2 or above at 11.1%. While both groups remain below the 35% goal, cumulatively the grade level averaged 46.9% on vocabulary acquisition. • 8th grade partially met the goal as Milestone data showed that 7 ELL students scored a level 2 or above on the vocabulary acquisition domain at 17%, and 7 SWD students scored a level 2 or above at 23.5%. Cumulatively, the grade level averaged 48.5%, with 111 out of 229 students demonstrating proficiency by scoring at or above level 2 on vocabulary acquisition.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	• Continued use of 360 graphic organizers to support vocabulary understanding and application • Ongoing professional learning on explicit vocabulary instruction and scaffolding for ELL and SWD students • Integration of Tier 2 academic vocabulary into daily instruction across content areas • Small group vocabulary interventions based on formative assessment data • Vocabulary usage reinforced through reading, writing, and peer discussion activities
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the	n/a

success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

Previous Year's Goal #2	Betty Gray Middle School will increase the percent of ELL and SWD student groups scoring at levels 2 or above in the number systems domain from 23% to 33% as measured by the 2024-2025 Math End-Of-Grade Georgia Milestone assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☒ **NO** ☐ **Partially**	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	• 6th grade did not meet the goal as Milestone data in the numerical reasoning domain showed 8 ell students at a level 2 or above at 13%, and for SWD students no students in a level 2 or above at 0%. Cumulatively for the goal, 6th grade SWD and ELL demonstrated 12% at a level 2 or above, not meeting the goal of 33%. • 7th grade partially met the goal as Milestone data in the numerical reasoning domain showed 9 ell students at a level 2 or above at 18% , and for SWD 7 students at a level 2 or above, at 41%. While the SWD did exceed the 33%, cumulatively the grade level averaged 27% at a level 2 or above, scoring above the previous year, but not meeting the 33% benchmark for goal proficiency. • 8th grade did not meet the goal as Milestone data in the numerical reasoning domain shows 15 ell students scored a level 2 or above at 31%, and for SWD, 2 students at level 2 or above at 14%. While EL did outperform the previous year's benchmark of 23%, it did not meet the 33% threshold for goal proficiency. The grade level scored cumulatively 27% at a level 2 or above, scoring above the previous year, but not meeting the 33% benchmark for goal proficiency. • Schoolwide data shows that EL scholars performed with 79% scoring in a level 1, and 21% at a level 2 or above. SWD schoolwide data shows that 76% scoring in a level 1 and 24% scoring at a level 2 or above. Overall, the goal was not met.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	• More training and focus on mathematical modeling and real world application • Common assessment training and auditing to determine current DOK levels in all domains by standards • Common assessment debriefings to promote reflection and identifying strengths and weaknesses • BEACON debriefings to promote reflection on domains for continual monitoring of student performance
If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the	n/a

goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

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

ELA DATA				
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	**FY22** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY23** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6th Grade	20.05	28.03	28	
7th Grade	X	X	26	
8th Grade	X	X	32	

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 (%)**		
	Support Needed									**Near Target**						**Prepared**								
	SN	**NT**	**P**	**SN**	**NT**	**P**	**SN**	**NT**	**P**	**SN**	**NT**	**P**	**SN**	**NT**	**P**	**SN**	**NT**	**P**	**SN**	**NT**	**P**	**SN**	**NT**	**P**
6th Grade	31	51	18	30	52	18	29	51	19	30	52	18	32	49	19	33	47	20	45	40	15	30	55	15
7th Grade	34	44	22	35	47	18	29	56	15	37	43	20	35	49	17	33	44	23	49	36	15	36	47	17
8th Grade	26	41	32	25	49	26	31	45	24	26	46	28	29	42	29	27	43	30	39	39	22	29	42	30

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY25 ELA Milestones **(Grade Levels & Subgroups)**	• 8th grade shows the highest number of students reading at or above grade level (142 students), followed by 7th (120 students) and 6th (108 students). • 87 students in 8th grade scored at Level 2 (Developing), the highest number across all grades. • 6th grade had the highest number of students reaching Level 4 (Distinguished) with 22 students, suggesting a small but notable group of high performers early in middle school. In the **Reading Literary** domain: • 8th grade had the highest number of students scoring at "Proficient" or higher levels (notably higher counts in mid- to top-tier categories). In the **Writing and Language** domain: • 6th grade showed strong foundational performance with many students at "Developing" or higher, indicating early writing competency.	**High Proportion of Students at Level 1 (Beginning Learner) in 6th and 7th Grades** • 6th grade: 108 students (46.8%) at Level 1 • 7th grade: 96 students (45.9%) at Level 1 These numbers reflect nearly half of students entering or in the middle of the grade band struggling significantly with grade-level content. **Reading Below Grade Level in Early Grades** • 6th grade has the highest number of students reading below grade level (123 students), indicating critical need for early interventions in vocabulary, comprehension, and decoding skills. • 7th grade still shows 89 students reading below grade level. • Only 11 students in 7th and 15 in 8th grade scored at Level 4, showing limited representation of high achievement at upper levels despite potential seen in Level 2 and 3 counts. • Across all grades, the **Writing** and **Language** domain data show high numbers of students in "Beginning" or "Developing" stages, suggesting a need for explicit grammar, usage, and structured writing instruction.
FY24 ELA Milestones **(Grade Levels & Subgroups)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** • In Grade 8, 70 out of 220 students (31.9%) scored in Levels 3 and 4, indicating emerging proficiency and stronger performance compared to other grade levels. <u>Domain Analysis</u> • In the Reading Literary Text domain, 29.6% of Grade 8 students scored in Level 3, marking the highest-performing ELA domain in the school. • The Writing domain, while below expectations overall, showed relatively stronger performance compared to other ELA areas, particularly in Grade 8 where 27.7% reached Level 3. • The Key Ideas domain showed some moderate success in Grade 8, where 24.1% of students	**Grade Levels (all students):** • In Grade 6, 147 out of 207 students (71%) scored in Levels 1 and 2, demonstrating a significant need for foundational reading and writing skill development. • In Grade 7, 166 out of 225 students (73.8%) performed in Levels 1 and 2, reflecting a persistent challenge in achieving proficiency. <u>Domain Analysis</u> • Reading comprehension is a schoolwide area of concern, with only 18.4% of Grade 6, 19.1% of Grade 7, and 28.6% of Grade 8 students scoring in Level 3 on the Reading domain. • In the Reading Informational Text domain, fewer than 25% of students reached Level 3 across all grades, with 17.4% in Grade 6, 16.4% in Grade 7, and 22.3% in Grade 8 demonstrating proficiency. • The Key Ideas domain, which assesses understanding of central ideas and supporting details, showed limited proficiency in the

	scored in Level 3, compared to lower performance in the earlier grades. **EL:** • In Grade 8, 30 out of 101 ELL students (29.7%) scored in Levels 3 and 4, indicating promising academic progress. **SWD:** • In Grade 7, 4 out of 23 SWD students (17.4%) scored in Levels 3 and 4, demonstrating growth and potential among this subgroup.	lower grades, with 15.5% of Grade 6 and 20.4% of Grade 7 students scoring in Level 3. • Writing remains below expected levels across the school, with only 20.8% of Grade 6, 21.3% of Grade 7, and 27.7% of Grade 8 students demonstrating proficiency in the Writing domain. • The Language domain, which supports grammar, conventions, and mechanics necessary for effective writing, had the lowest performance across all domains, with just 16.4% of Grade 6, 12.4% of Grade 7, and 10.5% of Grade 8 students scoring in Level 3. • In the Vocabulary Acquisition and Use domain, fewer than 20% of students across all grades demonstrated proficiency, with 13.0% in Grade 6, 16.0% in Grade 7, and 19.1% in Grade 8 scoring in Level 3. **EL:** • In Grade 6, 64 out of 77 ELL students (83.1%) scored in Levels 1 and 2, indicating substantial language development needs. • In Grade 7, 77 out of 93 ELL students (82.8%) performed in Levels 1 and 2, revealing persistent language barriers to ELA proficiency. **SWD:** • In Grade 6, 35 out of 38 SWD students (92.1%) scored in Levels 1 and 2, indicating urgent need for intensive support. • In Grade 8, 29 out of 29 SWD students (100%) scored in Levels 1 and 2, showing a critical proficiency gap.
Beacon Assessment – ELA **(Grade Levels & Subgroups)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** Across all three grades, the domain *Craft and Structure/Integration of Knowledge* showed consistent improvement, especially in 7th grade: • 6th Grade showed a +3% increase in "Prepared" (from 18% to 21%), a +3% increase in "Near Target" (from 51% to 54%), and a +3% increase in "Support Needed" (from 31% to 34%). • 7th Grade demonstrated strong gains, with a +10% increase in "Prepared" (from 21% to 31%), a +1% increase in "Near Target" (from 40% to 41%), and a -	**Grade Levels (all students):** The domain *Conventions of Standard English* remains a challenge across all grades, with over one-third of students still needing support by Spring: • 6th Grade showed no change in "Prepared" (remained at 14%), a +4% increase in "Near Target" (from 41% to 45%), and a -4% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 45% to 41%). • 7th Grade posted a +2% increase in "Prepared" (from 15% to 17%), a +2% increase in "Near Target" (from 29% to 31%), and a -4% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 56% to 52%). • 8th Grade saw the greatest improvement with a +6% increase in "Prepared" (from 17% to 23%), a +4% increase in "Near Target"

	10% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 39% to 29%). • 8th Grade showed a +7% increase in "Prepared" (from 22% to 29%), a +3% increase in "Near Target" (from 52% to 55%), and a -1% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 26% to 25%). The domain *Informational Text* demonstrated the strongest overall gains in ELA, with marked improvement across all grades: • 6th Grade showed a +5% increase in "Prepared" (from 14% to 19%), a +4% increase in "Near Target" (from 52% to 56%), and a -1% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 34% to 33%). • 7th Grade improved by +6% in Prepared (from 14% to 20%), a +4% increase in "Near Target" (from 43% to 47%), and a -10% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 43% to 33%). • 8th Grade posted a +15% increase in "Prepared" (from 17% to 32%), a +1% increase in "Near Target" (from 37% to 38%), and a -7% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 29% to 22%). *Key Ideas and Details* reflected steady gains across all grade levels, especially in 8th grade: • 6th Grade showed a +3% increase in "Prepared" (from 17% to 20%), a +2% increase in "Near Target" (from 49% to 51%), and a -1% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 34% to 33%). • 7th Grade demonstrated a +7% increase in "Prepared" (from 18% to 25%), a +1% increase in "Near Target" (from 37% to 38%), and an -8% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 45% to 37%). • 8th Grade showed a +10% increase in "Prepared" (from 16% to 26%), a +5% increase in "Near	(from 44% to 48%), and a -9% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 48% to 39%). Though not the strongest domain overall, *Literary Text* showed steady improvement across all grades: • 6th Grade posted a +1% increase in "Prepared" (from 20% to 21%), a +2% increase in "Near Target" (from 45% to 47%), and a -1% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 35% to 34%). • 7th Grade showed a +5% increase in "Prepared" (from 15% to 20%), a +2% increase in "Near Target" (from 40% to 42%), and a -7% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 45% to 38%). • 8th Grade improved by +3% in Prepared (from 19% to 22%), a +4% increase in "Near Target" (from 53% to 57%), and a -3% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 25% to 22%). Though lower-performing overall, *Writing Skills* showed positive trends in 7th grade and consistent support reduction: • 6th Grade posted a +3% increase in "Prepared" (from 18% to 21%), a +1% increase in "Near Target" (from 43% to 44%), and a -5% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 39% to 34%). • 7th Grade showed a +3% increase in "Prepared" (from 13% to 16%), a +11% increase in "Near Target" (from 40% to 51%), and a -14% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 47% to 33%). **EL:** Across 6th grade, the ELL subgroup demonstrated minimal growth in English Language Arts performance: • Prepared increased by +2% (from 0% to 2%) • Near Target remained unchanged at 30% • Support Needed decreased by -3% (from 70% to 67%) **SWD:** • In 6th grade ELA, 68.5% of students scored in the Support Needed category, the highest percentage across all grade levels. • In 7th grade ELA, 61.5% of students required support, with only 6.0% scoring in the Prepared category.

	Target" (from 42% to 47%), and a -5% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 29% to 24%). Across all three grades, the domain *Vocabulary Acquisition and Use* demonstrated steady gains in proficiency and reductions in support needs: • 6th Grade showed a +6% increase in "Prepared" (from 18% to 24%), a +1% increase in "Near Target" (from 43% to 44%), and a -6% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 39% to 33%). • 7th Grade demonstrated strong growth with a +12% increase in "Prepared" (from 12% to 24%), a -3% decrease in "Near Target" (from 52% to 49%), and a -9% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 36% to 27%). • 8th Grade posted a +8% increase in "Prepared" (from 14% to 22%), a +5% increase in "Near Target" (from 56% to 61%), and a -5% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 30% to 25%). The *Reading* domain demonstrated broad gains in readiness across all grades, most notably in 7th and 8th: • 6th Grade showed a +7% increase in "Prepared" (from 15% to 22%), a +2% increase in "Near Target" (from 51% to 53%), and a -1% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 34% to 33%). • 7th Grade posted a +12% increase in "Prepared" (from 13% to 25%), a +4% increase in "Near Target" (from 47% to 51%), and a -16% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 40% to 24%). • 8th Grade demonstrated the strongest gains with a +14% increase in "Prepared" (from 12% to 26%), a +3% increase in "Near Target" (from 62% to 65%), and a -5% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 26% to 21%). The domain *Research* showed clear improvement in both readiness and support reduction:	• In 8th grade ELA, 55.5% of students scored in Support Needed, and only 3.0% were classified as Prepared, indicating limited proficiency at the end of middle school. • Across all grade levels, the Prepared category remained below 6%, highlighting a significant gap in students meeting grade-level standards.

	• 6th Grade maintained the same level in “Prepared” (20% to 20%), gained +6% in Near Target (from 42% to 48%), and saw a -6% decrease in “Support Needed” (from 38% to 32%). • 7th Grade improved by +10% in Prepared (from 12% to 22%), +5% in Near Target (from 45% to 50%), and reduced “Support Needed” by -15% (from 43% to 28%). • 8th Grade showed a +8% increase in “Prepared” (from 13% to 21%), a +5% increase in “Near Target” (from 58% to 63%), and a -6% decrease in **“Support Needed” (from 29% to 23%).** **EL:** Across 8th grade, the ELL subgroup demonstrated the most balanced growth across performance bands, positioning it as an emerging strength: • Prepared increased by +3% (from 0% to 3%) • Near Target increased by +6% (from 51% to 57%) • Support Needed decreased by -9% (from 49% to 40%) Across 7th grade, the ELL subgroup demonstrated the most substantial improvement in reducing support needs and increasing readiness: • Prepared increased by +6% (from 0% to 6%) • Near Target increased by +20% (from 14% to 34%) • Support Needed decreased by -26% (from 86% to 60%) **SWD:** The percentage of students scoring Near Target increased from 29.0% in Grade 6 to 42.0% in Grade 8, indicating incremental improvement in proficiency as students progress through grade levels.	

	• 7th grade had the highest percentage of students in the Prepared category (6.0%), though overall readiness remains low.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Inconsistent implementation of school wide writing strategy • inconsistent exposure to standard-aligned writing tasks and expectations for student output. • limited emphasis on grammar and language conventions in daily instruction	
ACCESS Scores **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** 1. Increased Progress Toward English Language Proficiency (ELP): a. The 2024 ELP score rose to 37.25, up from 25.90 in 2023 — the highest growth in five years. b. 12.3% of students gained more than one proficiency band, demonstrating that interventions and instruction are beginning to impact. 2. Majority of Students in Developing Proficiency Range: a. Across all grades, 47.7% of students scored in the 3.0–3.9 range, which is considered approaching proficiency. b. This indicates a solid foundation that can be built upon with targeted supports. 3. 8th Grade Students Show Higher Proficiency Movement: a. 20.8% of 8th graders reached the 4.0–4.9 range — the highest percentage among grade levels, suggesting potential for exit eligibility in the near term with the right support.	**Grade Levels (all students):** 1. Low Proficiency and High Percentage in Beginning Levels: a. 20.3% of all ELL students scored at Level 1.0–1.9, with 7th grade particularly concerning at 28.3% in that band. b. Only 13.1% of students scored 4.0 or above, and none scored 5.0–6.0, meaning no students exited ESOL status based on ACCESS scores. 2. Limited Growth for Most ELLs: a. 63.9% of students showed no measurable growth in language proficiency between ACCESS cycles, despite interventions. 3. Persistent Gaps in Reading, Writing, and Speaking: a. Though not disaggregated by component in the file, based on school-level trends and CCRPI/ACCESS correlations, the lowest areas remain reading, writing, and academic speaking (not casual conversation). b. These areas directly impact performance across all content areas and hinder movement toward exit.

<table>
<tr><td>Check the system that contributes to the root cause::

☐ Coherent Instruction
☐ Professional Capacity
☐ Effective Leadership
☒ Supportive Learning Environment</td><td colspan="2">Root Cause Explanation:
• Limited usage of ELLevation strategies during instruction
• Limited opportunities for enhancing English speaking skills</td></tr>
<tr><td>ELA Common Assessments
(Grade Level Reading & Writing)</td><td>Grade Levels (all students):
• 81% proficiency in Key Ideas & Details (RI1-3)
• 82% in Vocabulary in Context (L4)
• 82.3% in Supporting Claims with Evidence (W1b)

EL:
• 50% proficiency in Key Ideas & Details
• 49% in Writing and Vocabulary
• Solid performance in supporting claims with scaffolding

SWD:
• 50% proficiency in Key Ideas & Details
• 52% in Writing Claims and Evidence (W1b)
• 52% in Vocabulary in Context</td><td>Grade Levels (all students):
• Only 39% proficiency in Text Structure (RI5)
• 7.7% in Conventions (W2)
• 66.5% in Organizing Writing (W1a)

EL:
• Below 50% in nearly all areas
• Limited grammar and structure understanding
• Difficulty organizing written arguments clearly

SWD:
• Low writing conventions and organization (approx. 52%)
• Significant gaps in grammar and syntax
• Below 50% in reading structure</td></tr>
<tr><td>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:

☒ Coherent Instruction
☐ Professional Capacity
☐ Effective Leadership
☒ Supportive Learning Environment</td><td colspan="2">Root Cause Explanation:
• Limited use of modeled writing, oral rehearsal, and differentiated feedback
• Inconsistent use of scaffolding and structured opportunities for students to practice applying vocabulary in reading analysis and written expression
• Limited targeted writing instruction</td></tr>
</table>

School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	• 100% of teachers implemented 360 graphic organizers to support vocabulary acquisition and student organization of key concepts. • 100% of teachers used explicit vocabulary strategies, aligning with schoolwide goals to improve academic language and comprehension. • 100% of teachers utilized project-based learning, reinforcing engagement and real-world application of literacy skills. • Teachers demonstrated a commitment to refining instructional strategies, with increased use of techniques to boost student engagement in Semester 2. • A clear instructional focus on English language conventions and embedding writing into research tasks was observed in Semester 2, indicating intentional planning aligned to ELA standards.	• While writing tasks were present, there was a lack of consistent schoolwide writing strategies, resulting in varied expectations for student writing across classrooms. • Instructional practices varied among teachers in how standards were addressed, particularly in writing, leading to uneven rigor and support for grade-level expectations. • Despite improvements in vocabulary and engagement strategies, writing instruction remains an area of growth, requiring deeper alignment, modeling, and structured supports.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • lack of a consistently observed schoolwide writing model used in lessons • inconsistent structured feedback processes across grades	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☒ **Social Studies Common Assessments**	**Grade Levels (all students):** • 86% proficiency on SS8H3b (Declaration of Independence) • 65% proficiency on Government Structures (SS8CG1–3) **EL:** • Demonstrated understanding in concrete historical events (e.g., Revolution topics) • Better performance when supported with visuals or guided notes	**Grade Levels (all students):** • 46% struggled with SS8H3d (Articles of Confederation) • 66% struggled with SS8CG6 (Purpose of Local Government) • Gaps in understanding abstract concepts and state/local roles **EL:** • Limited comprehension of purpose and functions in state/local government • Struggle with academic language used in assessments

	SWD: • Participated in government content with some success when visuals and structured supports were used • May benefit from historical content over abstract governance concepts	**SWD:** • Difficulty accessing abstract concepts (e.g., Articles, government roles) • Challenges interpreting academic vocabulary in assessments
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • structured supports needed to help student performance with informational writing tasks • more scaffolding of content	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	• By May 2026, 14% of students (81 students) to 25% of students (143 students) will increase the level of achievement by 100 points on the ELA BEACON from fall to spring.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Lack of school-wide writing strategy, using student discourse and structured feedback. • Need more consistent use of scaffolding and structured opportunities for students to practice applying vocabulary in reading analysis and written expression • Some formative assessment practices are in place but not consistently used to inform immediate instructional adjustments. • Dedicated time for Writing Connected to Text is not evident • Limited small group instruction to target diverse learners
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 1. ELA teachers will participate weekly in structured collaborative planning, to ensure that instruction aligns to learning targets, DOK 2-3 rigor of the standard through lesson internalization protocols, and design common	**Implementation Performance Target:** By the end of Semester 1, 100% of teachers will have participated in collaborative planning, resulting in team completion of common formative assessments aligned to standards, learning targets and DOK 2-3 levels. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning:** Teachers will receive district assessment expectations • **August-September**: Teachers will receive professional learning for district assessment expectations, learning targets, lesson internalization protocols to align the rigor of the standard to the lesson/learning experience, Scaffolds and supports for English Learners and Students with Disabilities, and teaching to the DOK levels. Teacher teams create a plan for the design of CFAs, for the remainder of the year. • **October-December:** Teachers will create at least one common formative assessment (CFA) aligned to district & school expectations, and include connected standards and learning targets printed next to each question. CCCs analyze CFA results and use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By March 2026, 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the Common Formative Assessments. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Common Formative Assessments **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Other_____ **Data Analysis Plan:** • Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFAs **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	**District Resources** **CTLS Assess** **Local School Resources**

formative assessments that are similarly aligned.	• **January-February:** Teachers will continue to create CFAs and receive support in the implementation of district assessment expectations, learning targets, lesson internalization protocols and instructional strategies for teaching to the DOK levels. CCCs analyze CFA results and use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments. • **March-April:** Teachers will continue to create CFAs aligned with district & school expectations, to include connected standards and learning targets printed next to each question. CCCs analyze CFA results and use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments. • **May:** Teachers will reflect on common formative assessment design process and plan next steps. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Common formative assessments • Checklists for Audit of CFA design **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly through CCC minutes/data debriefings		

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Inconsistent writing expectations across grade levels and content areas • Need more consistent use of scaffolding and structured opportunities for students to practice applying vocabulary in reading analysis and written expression • Lack of school-wide writing strategy, using student discourse and structured feedback. • Some formative assessment practices are in place but not consistently used to inform immediate instructional adjustments. • Dedicated time for Writing Connected to Text is not evident • Limited small group instruction to target diverse learners
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
☒ Gen Ed
☒ EL
☒ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
2. Content area teachers in Science and Social studies will implement a biweekly Common Assessment writing-to-text task, aligned to disciplinary literacy standards, using shared rubrics and anchor papers to support consistency in writing expectations and improvement in content-based writing skills.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	By the end of Semester 1, 100% of Science and Social Studies teachers will have participated in collaborative planning, resulting in team completion of common formative Writing assessments aligned to standards, learning targets and DOK 2-3 levels.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• **Preplanning:** Content area teachers will receive district assessment expectations and information on the updated ELA standards related to Writing. Teachers will receive PL on the standards with a focus on writing.
	• **August-April**:
	  • Teachers will receive ongoing PL for content-related writing strategies, modeled writing during teaching, and share best practices for providing immediate and targeted feedback to students.
	  • During CCC team meetings, teachers will create a shared rubric and design common formative writing assessments for each unit, to include connected standards and learning targets printed next to each question.
	  • During CCC team meetings, teachers will collaboratively analyze CFA results, use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments, and
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		By March 2026, 70% of Science and Social Studies students in grades 6-8 will score at the proficient level on the Common Writing Rubric.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• Student growth data from Common Formative Assessments
		• Common Writing Rubric
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☒ Every 2 weeks
		☒ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☐ _____
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		Grade level teams will evaluate the student results for the CFAs
		
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
		☒ Principal
		☒ Assistant Principals
		☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
			District Resources
			
			CTLS Assess
			
			Local School Resources

	share effective strategies across content areas to reinforce writing skills. • **May:** Teachers will reflect on common formative assessment design and process, then plan next steps **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Common assessments • Common Writing Rubric • CCC Collaborative Analysis Notes and Team Feedback **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** • Monthly	☒ CCC Leads	

MATH DATA				
MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	**FY22** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY23** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6th Grade	26.7	24	19	
7th Grade	X	X	26.7	
8th Grade	X	X	35.5	

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**
6th Grade	62	34	5	64	33	3	55	36	9	59	37	5
7th Grade	53	38	9	51	33	16	56	32	13	45	37	18
8th Grade	71	26	3	55	28	16	48	33	19	67	23	10

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY25 MATH Milestones	• In the Linear Problems domain (Grade 8), 34.4% of students met target, indicating a significant area of strength in multi-step problem solving. • The Algebraic Reasoning domain showed improvement across grades, with 28.9% of Grade 8 and 23.7% of Grade 7 students meeting target—suggesting strong performance in higher-order algebraic thinking. • In the Geometry domain, 27.1% of Grade 8 students met target, showing a positive trend in spatial reasoning and measurement concepts compared to 17.9% in Grade 6. • The Linear Relationships domain (Grade 8) also showed relative strength, with 23.4% of students meeting target—the highest performance in this domain across all grades.	• Numerical Reasoning was a consistent area of need across all grade levels, with only 22.7% of Grade 8, 21.6% of Grade 7, and 22.7% of Grade 6 students meeting target. In Grade 6, foundational domains showed significant gaps: • Compare Rational Numbers: Only 17.0% met target • Coordinate Plane Concepts: Just 16.6% met target • Data Problems and Ratios and Rates: Both below 20% The Graphical Reasoning domains in Grade 8 revealed further gaps: • Graphical Properties: Only 15.1% met target • Linear Relationships and Graphical Reasoning Domain: Both below 25% • Probability and Proportional Reasoning in Grade 7 also underperformed, with less than 20% of students meeting target in each
FY24 MATH Milestones **(Data by grade & subgroup)**	• In Grade 8, 78 out of 220 students (35.5%) scored in Levels 3 and 4, indicating relative strength and promising proficiency in Math. <u>Domain Analysis</u> • In the Linear Relationships domain (Grade 8), 34.1% of students scored in Level 3, the highest math domain performance in the school. • The Linear Problems domain (Grade 8) also showed strength, with 29.1% of students scoring in Level 3. • In the Algebraic Reasoning domain, Grade 7 showed 21.3%, and Grade 8 reached 27.7%, indicating stronger performance in higher-level algebraic thinking compared to foundational number skills.	• In Grade 6, 168 out of 206 students (81.6%) scored in Levels 1 and 2, indicating a significant need for conceptual support and number fluency. • In Grade 7, 165 out of 225 students (73.3%) performed in Levels 1 and 2, signaling a schoolwide gap in foundational Math skills. <u>Domain Analysis</u> • In the Numeric Reasoning domain, Level 3 proficiency was limited, with 16.5% in Grade 6, 12.0% in Grade 7, and 21.4% in Grade 8, indicating foundational gaps in number concepts and reasoning. • In the Expressions domain, 11.7% of Grade 6 and 21.3% of Grade 7 students scored in Level 3, averaging just 16.5% overall.

	• The Geometric Reasoning domain improved in the upper grades, with 24.5% of Grade 8 students scoring in Level 3. **EL:** • In Grade 8, 11 out of 63 ELL students (17.5%) scored in Level 3, demonstrating emerging proficiency and suggesting that language and math instruction in upper grades may be effectively aligned. • In Grade 7, 2 out of 43 ELL students (4.7%) reached Level 3, indicating small but important growth that can be used to inform early intervention strategies. **SWD:** In Grade 8, 3 out of 29 SWD students (10.3%) scored in Levels 3 and 4, reflecting emerging proficiency for this subgroup.	• The Probability Reasoning domain was measured in Grade 7 only, where 13.8% of students reached Level 3. • In the Rational Numbers domain (Grade 6), only 16.0% of students scored in Level 3, indicating difficulty with fraction and decimal reasoning. • In the Compare Rational domain (Grade 6), 15.0% of students scored in Level 3. • In the Data Problems domain (Grade 6), only 11.7% of students scored in Level 3, one of the lowest performances overall. • The Equations domain (Grade 6) had 13.1% of students scoring in Level 3. • In the Coordinate Plane domain (Grade 6), only 17.5% of students reached Level 3. • The One Variable domain (Grade 8) showed limited proficiency, with only 15.9% of students scoring in Level 3. • The Functions domain (Grade 8) showed low performance, with 14.1% of students reaching Level 3. **EL:** • In Grade 6, 100% of ELL students (41/41) scored in Levels 1 and 2, indicating significant challenges with conceptual understanding and academic language development. • In Grade 7, 95.3% (41/43) of ELL students scored in Levels 1 and 2, reflecting the need for greater scaffolding and integration of language acquisition with math content. • In Grade 8, 82.5% (52/63) of ELL students scored in Levels 1 and 2, suggesting that despite some gains, most students still require language-rich supports to reach proficiency.

		SWD: • In Grade 6, 94.4% of SWD students scored in Levels 1 and 2 (17 out of 18). • In Grade 7, 100% of SWD students (23/23) scored in Levels 1 and 2.
BEACON Assessment – MATH **(Grade Level & Subgroups)**	Across all three grades, the domain *Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning* demonstrated the most notable growth in math, especially in 6th and 7th grades: • 6th Grade showed a +9% increase in the "Prepared" category (from 1% to 10%), a +13% increase in "Near Target" (from 30% to 43%), and a -22% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 69% to 47%). • 7th Grade demonstrated the strongest growth, with a +12% increase in "Prepared" (from 7% to 19%), a +9% increase in "Near Target" (from 33% to 42%), and a -14% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 60% to 46%). • 8th Grade experienced a -1% decrease in "Prepared" (from 13% to 12%), a +3% increase in "Near Target" (from 26% to 29%), and a -10% drop in "Support Needed" (from 61% to 51%), indicating some gains in reducing need despite a decline in proficiency. Across all three grades, the domain *Geometric and Spatial Reasoning* demonstrated consistent growth across all performance bands, with particularly strong movement in 7th grade: • 6th Grade showed a +2% increase in the "Prepared" category (from 3% to 5%), a +3% increase in "Near Target" (from 31% to 34%), and a -5% decrease in	The domain *Numerical Reasoning* remains a schoolwide area of concern but shows meaningful movement into readiness and near readiness: • 6th Grade showed no change in the "Prepared" category (remained at 3%), a +5% increase in "Near Target" (from 25% to 30%), and a -5% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 72% to 67%). • 7th Grade posted a +7% increase in "Prepared" (from 5% to 12%), a +8% increase in "Near Target" (from 32% to 40%), and a -6% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 63% to 57%). • 8th Grade saw a +5% increase in "Prepared" (from 3% to 8%), a +11% increase in "Near Target" (from 24% to 35%), and a -15% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 73% to 58%). Across all three grades, the domain *Measurement and Data Reasoning* showed uneven growth, with the most significant improvement observed in 8th grade: • 6th Grade showed a +1% increase in the "Prepared" category (from 8% to 9%), a -2% decrease in "Near Target" (from 36% to 34%), and a +1% increase in "Support Needed" (from 56% to 57%), indicating a slight regression in student performance distribution. • 7th Grade demonstrated modest growth with a +8% increase in "Prepared" (from 7% to 15%), no change in "Near Target" (remained at 36%), and a -9% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 57% to 48%).

	"Support Needed" (from 66% to 61%). • 7th Grade demonstrated the most significant growth in this domain, with a +9% increase in "Prepared" (from 7% to 16%), a +7% increase in "Near Target" (from 37% to 44%), and an -11% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 56% to 45%). • 8th Grade posted continued, if slower, gains with a +1% increase in "Prepared" (from 9% to 10%), a +1% increase in "Near Target" (from 30% to 31%), and a -8% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 61% to 53%). **EL** Grade 8 ELL students demonstrated higher performance than earlier grades, with 15.4% Near Target and 2.3% Prepared, indicating small gains that may reflect successful scaffolding or instructional strategies in upper grades. **SWD** • The percentage of students scoring Near Target increased by grade, from 26.7% in Grade 6 to 38.6% in Grade 8, suggesting that more students are approaching proficiency in later grades. • 7th grade had the highest percentage of students in the Prepared category (4.3%), though this still indicates limited mastery.	• 8th Grade showed the most notable improvement, with a +10% increase in "Prepared" (from 6% to 16%), a +6% increase in "Near Target" (from 25% to 31%), and a -19% decrease in "Support Needed" (from 69% to 50%). **EL** • A very high percentage of ELL students scored in the Support Needed category across all grades, with 89.8% in Grade 7 and 88.7% in Grade 6. • Prepared levels were extremely low, with fewer than 1% of students scoring in the proficient range in Grades 6 and 7. • In Grade 8, although slightly stronger, 82.3% of ELL students still required support in Math. **SWD** • In 6th grade Math, 70.5% of students were identified as Support Needed, the highest across all grades. • 7th grade Math also demonstrated high need, with 64.3% of students scoring in the Support Needed category. • Prepared levels remained below 5% across all grades, with 6th and 8th grades both under 4%, indicating minimal proficiency on grade-level standards.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Instruction tends to focus more on procedural fluency than deep conceptual understanding. • Limited mathematical modeling • Language scaffolds for English Learners are not yet fully integrated to support access to complex math tasks. • Instructional strategies for Students with Disabilities are not always closely aligned with IEP goals. • Small group instruction is more commonly used for remediation than for targeted domain support. • Formative assessment practices are in place but not consistently used to inform immediate instructional adjustments.	

MATH Common Assessments **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** 6th Grade: • 70% proficiency in Rates & Ratios (6.NR.4) • 72% proficiency in Number System Fluency (6.NR.1/6.NR.2) 7th Grade: • 78% proficiency in Unit Rates & Proportional Relationships (MA.7.PAR.4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 4.8) • 74% proficiency in Solving Two-Step Equations (MA.7.PAR.3.1) 8th Grade: • 85–89% proficiency in Defining Functions • 96% proficiency in Comparing Function Properties **EL:** 6th Grade: • 79% proficiency in Rates & Ratios • Stronger performance in procedural fluency when provided with scaffolds and visual supports 7th Grade: • 76% proficiency in Unit Rates • 69% proficiency in Basic Equation Solving • Difficulty in understanding distribution and variable terms in abstract formats **SWD:** 6th Grade: • 76% proficiency in Rates & Ratios	**Grade Levels (all students):** 6th Grade: • 64% proficiency in Measurement Conversions • 60% proficiency in Statistical Reasoning 7th Grade: • 63% proficiency in Distribution in Expressions • 59% proficiency in Identifying Operations in Word Problems 8th Grade: • 50–69% proficiency in Writing and Constructing Functions **EL:** 6th Grade: • 60% proficiency in Interpreting Statistical Data 7th Grade: • Difficulty with Distributive Property and Interpreting Algebraic Expressions 8th Grade: • Challenges with Constructing Functions and Abstract Reasoning **SWD:** 6th Grade: • 47% proficiency in Statistical Reasoning

	• Strong performance with step-based procedural tasks 7th Grade: • 71% proficiency in Unit Rate and Proportional Reasoning • 64% proficiency in Equation Solving with Supports • Difficulty translating word problems to algebraic form	7th Grade: • Difficulty Translating Real-World Problems into Equations 8th Grade: • Struggles with Academic Vocabulary and Real-World Application Tasks
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Limited integration of real-world mathematical modeling • Academic vocabulary and unfamiliar types of problems present barriers for English Learners. • Inconsistent use of modeling and multi-modal strategies hinders abstract reasoning for SWDs. • Inconsistent small group practices limit targeted support. • Limited use of DOK 2-4 level assessment questions which affects readiness for Milestones. • Emphasis on procedure over application in classroom setting	
School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	• 100% of teachers implemented 360 graphic organizers and explicit vocabulary strategies to support academic understanding of mathematical terminology. • 100% of teachers utilized project-based learning for STEM integration, promoting real-world application of math content. • Teachers consistently integrated technology and used student whiteboards to support active problem solving and model mathematical reasoning. • Station rotations were observed as a consistent structure to differentiate instruction and engage students in targeted practice. • 75% of teachers incorporated the mathematical modeling framework, with increased implementation observed in Semester 2, following	• Math manipulatives were infrequently observed during instruction, limiting opportunities for hands-on exploration and concrete understanding of abstract concepts. • Real-world math applications were rarely visible during classroom instruction, despite being noted in lesson plans, indicating a gap between planning and instructional delivery. • While mathematical modeling increased in Semester 2, its use was inconsistent across teachers, particularly outside of STEM-embedded projects.

	professional learning in project-based learning (PBL).	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Inconsistent use of modeling, manipulatives, and real-world applications limits conceptual depth. • Gaps between planning and practice indicate a need for targeted coaching. • Modeling strategies introduced in training are not yet fully embedded in instruction.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☒ _Common Assessment_____	Grade Level: • 64% of students showed proficiency in **Key Ideas and Details** related to matter. • Students performed well identifying **states of matter**, **particle movement**, and **conservation of matter**. • Models and visual representations supported higher achievement on concrete standards (S8P1.a, b, d). ELL • Students demonstrated stronger performance on structured, model-based items SWD • Students benefited from hands-on activities and visual aids, performing better on questions involving models or diagrams.	Grade Level: • On **S8P1.c**, 55% of students did not meet expectations. • Students struggled to differentiate **chemical vs. physical properties**, particularly on applied examples (e.g., tarnishing vs. density). • Performance declined when required to reason beyond recall, especially for vocabulary-heavy questions and unfamiliar scenarios. ELL • Students struggled with academic vocabulary, multi-step reasoning, and independent analysis of unseen content. SWD • Struggled with knowledge transfer, particularly when interpreting unfamiliar terminology or scenarios not directly modeled in class
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** • Limited exposure to abstract reasoning and academic vocabulary reduces access to complex content. • Inconsistent scaffolding impacts EL and SWD success with multi-step tasks. • Small group and visual supports are underused, limiting differentiated instruction. • Assessments and routines emphasize recall over conceptual reasoning and DOK 2–3 practice.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	By May 2026, 14% of students (81 students) to 25% of students (143 students) will increase the level of achievement by 100 points on the Math BEACON from fall to spring.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Instructional practices emphasize procedural fluency over conceptual understanding, limiting students' ability to apply math in real-world and multi-step contexts. • Scaffolds and supports for English Learners and Students with Disabilities need strengthening to ensure access to content and academic vocabulary. • Continued support for mathematical modeling is needed to enhance students' real-world problem-solving skills. • Formative assessment data is not consistently used to adjust instruction in real time, reducing opportunities to address misconceptions and target learning needs.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☒ Other: District

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* 1. Math teachers will participate weekly, in structured collaborative planning, to ensure that instruction aligns to learning targets, DOK 2-3 rigor of the standard	**Implementation Performance Target:** By the end of Semester 1, 100% of Math teachers will have participated in collaborative planning, resulting in team completion of common formative assessments aligned to standards, learning targets and DOK 2-3 levels. **Implementation Plan:** • **Preplanning:** Teachers will receive district assessment expectations • **August-September**: Teachers will receive professional learning for district assessment expectations, learning targets, lesson internalization protocols to align the rigor of the standard to the lesson/learning experience, Scaffolds and supports for English Learners and Students with Disabilities, and teaching to the DOK levels. Teacher teams create a plan for the design of CFAs, for the remainder of the year. • **October-December:** Teachers will create at least one common formative assessment (CFA) aligned to district & school expectations, and include connected standards and learning targets printed next to each	**Evaluation Performance Target:** By March 2026, 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the Common Formative Assessments. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Common Formative Assessments **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Other_____ **Data Analysis Plan:** • Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFAs	District Resources CTLS Assess Local School Resources

through lesson internalization protocols, and design common formative assessments that are similarly aligned.	question. CCCs analyze CFA results and use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments. • **January-February:** Teachers will continue to create CFAs and receive support in the implementation of district assessment expectations, learning targets, lesson internalization protocols and instructional strategies for teaching to the DOK levels. CCCs analyze CFA results and use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments. • **March-April:** Teachers will continue to create CFAs aligned with district & school expectations, to include connected standards and learning targets printed next to each question. CCCs analyze CFA results and use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments. • **May:** Teachers will reflect on common formative assessment design process and plan next steps. **Artifacts to be Collected:** • Common formative assessments • Walkthrough/Checklists for Audit of CFA design **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly through CCC minutes/data debriefings	**Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Continued support for mathematical modeling is needed to enhance students' real-world problem-solving skills. • Scaffolds and supports for English Learners and Students with Disabilities need strengthening to ensure access to content and academic vocabulary. • Instruction focuses on procedural fluency more than deep conceptual understanding.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
☒ Gen Ed
☒ EL
☒ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
 	
2. Grades 6-8 Math teachers will enhance core math instruction and Tier 2 instruction by integrating mathematical modeling and scaffolded vocabulary strategies, to include targeted support for English Learners and Students with Disabilities.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	By December 2025, 100% of math teachers will implement mathematical modeling and scaffolded vocabulary strategies, to include targeted support for English Learners and Students with Disabilities.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• **Preplanning:** Teachers will review Math data (Milestones and Spring Beacon,) to identify instructional gaps and priority standards. Identify key instructional focus areas.
	• **August-September:**
	  • Teachers will receive professional learning on mathematical modeling, anchor charts and scaffolds for Math vocabulary.
	  • CCC teams will identify high-leverage tasks aligned to Milestones and grade-level standards, co-plan aligned lessons for each unit, plan to incorporate visual models, manipulatives, and real-world problem-solving and plan to use specific EL/SWD scaffolds
	• **October-December:**
	  • CCC teams identify trends in student misconceptions and plan targeted interventions.
	  • Teachers will receive continued support in implementation of anchor charts with content vocabulary and mathematical modeling with manipulatives
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		By March 2026, 70% of students will score 70% or higher on the Common Formative Assessments.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• Common Formative Assessments
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☒ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☒ Other_____
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		• Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFAs
			District Resources
			
			CTLS Assess
			
			Local School Resources

	• **January-February:**
	  • Teachers will analyze data results and use them to inform immediate instructional adjustments.
	• **March-April:**
	  • Teachers will receive continued support in implementation of anchor charts with content vocabulary and mathematical modeling with manipulatives for each unit
	• **May:**
	  • Teachers will reflect on the mathematical modeling and vocabulary scaffold implementation process and plan next steps.
	
	Artifacts to be Collected:
	• Common formative assessments (with the strategy application)
	• Walkthrough/Observation Checklists
	• Samples of anchor charts
	
	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
	☒ Principal
	☒ Assistant Principals
	☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists
	
	Frequency of Monitoring:
	Monthly		

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement *(Required Components)*			
Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	**Date(s) Scheduled**	**Date Completed**	**"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed**
1. Required Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline: September 30, 2025 Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	September 11, 2025		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline: November 3, 2025 Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	October 14-17, 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline: April 30, 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.	April 16, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required TWO Building Staff Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) – Deadlines: September 26, 2025 and February 16, 2026 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	September 11,2025 October 13, 2025 February 5, 2026 March 2, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
5. Required Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school) Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. **Briefly describe the transition activities here:** *- Entering: Rising 6th grade parent night, Rising 6th grade academy, Summer Meet and Greet, Betty Gray Open House*	Rising 6th March 24, 2026 7pm Meet and Greet July 31, 2025 Rising 6th Grade Academy July 21-23 Open House September 18, 2025 @6:30 pm		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d*	***List documents translated for parents:*** Family Compact Input Surveys (Fall and Spring) Parent and Family Engagement Policy Family and Community Engagement Policy Informational Flyers for school events and invitations to Title I events		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities *(Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)*							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities (Must be listed in the school policy)	**"Shall" Addressed**	**Goal(s) Addressed**	**Resources**	**Funding Source(s)** *SWP Checklist 5.e*	**Date**	**How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.**	**Team Lead**
Hispanic Heritage Month	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Community Entertainment Group	Local School	TBD	Informational Flyers CTLS Messages to families Sign In Sheet	Assistant Principal
Curriculum Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Teacher Resources Community Resources	Local School	March 12th	Sign In Sheet Flyer Title Feedback Survey	Academic/instructional Coach
Career Day	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Community Resources	Local School	May 15th	Community Partner Sign Up Community Parent Sign Up	Counselor

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:

Based on current test data (Beacon and District Interims), we have determined professional development needs to focus on instructional strategies to ensure higher levels of achievement. For the 2025-2026 school year we know there will be a greater emphasis on closing the gap with our EL and SWD student groups so we will continue working with those offices to provide on-going support through the school year to enhance instructional effectiveness to promote higher achievement.

Using 20-day funds, teachers will be given the opportunity to work extended day opportunities serving students beyond the regular class day to provide remediation and/or acceleration based on identified needs.

School Focused Staff Development funds will also be used to afford teacher collaboration opportunities as well as attend professional learning training.

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:
The monitoring process will begin in the weekly CCCs by teams answering the four critical questions: 1. What do we want our students to know and be able to do? 2. How will we know when they have learned it? 3. What will we do when they haven't learned it? 4. What will we do to extend the learning when they already know it? Data analysis of common assessments, Beacon, ACCESS, EOG data will help teachers identify those students in need of additional support i.e., remediation or acceleration. Beyond the CCCs data analysis process, interim assessment data and quarterly grade distribution analysis will also be used as monitoring tools. Along with administrative observations and feedback to monitor, subject coordinators will also be involved in walking classrooms to assist with monitoring the implementation and results of the plan.

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:
The following data points will be used to determine the effectiveness in increasing student achievement:

- The 3 administrations of the DRC Beacon August-December-March
- District Benchmark Assessment Data
- On-going common formative and summative assessments per unit
- Quarterly Grade Distribution Analysis

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:
The data obtained from the 2nd administration of the Beacon assessment will drive necessary changes to support students and will be compared to previous year for progress monitoring of student achievement.
Discussions during weekly CCCs centered around questions 3 & 4 will also determine if progress is being made and will dictate the necessary changes if improvements are not noted. On-going common assessment data per unit will also inform instructional changes to ensure higher achievement.

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: To prevent and address problem behavior, BGMS uses the PBIS framework to teach the expected behaviors for all main areas around school and reinforce those expected behaviors with PBIS points which can be redeemed in the school's store for various items. The PBIS Tier 2 team will meet monthly to review data and identify additional interventions for students in need at Tier 2. All administrators and school counselors have also been trained in the use of restorative practices to address recurring behaviors.

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: Student achievement results and overall school goals will drive the professional development plan. As a school striving to obtain STEM certification, there will be a continued school-wide focus on project-based learning and planning for PB learning to promote higher levels of student engagement and achievement. In addition, ongoing training in mathematical modeling to enhance real world connections will be utilized to support student achievement. Our data also shows the need for support with SWD and EL student groups so a greater emphasis will be placed on professional learning to ensure higher levels of performance of these two student groups. The staff will also have opportunities to attend local, state, and national professional learning conferences and professional growth workshops. Additionally, a new teacher mentoring program will be implemented to support teachers new to the profession and/or district.

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:
Beginning November 2025 Betty Gray Middle School (BGMS) Showcase sessions will be held at 9:30am to give parents an opportunity to tour the school during the day and meet with the principal for an overview of BGMS as a Q&A session. A Rising 6th Grade Parents' Night will also be held on March 26 at 6:30pm. Additionally, all Elementary schools will visit BGMS for a tour and presentation in April/May as determined by each local elementary school. Parents will also have the opportunity to set up individual visits to learn about the school. Betty Gray MS will also focus on building a partnership with Pebblebrook High School to foster a strong vertical alignment between teachers, counselors, and administrators. This is done to ensure students, parents, and teachers have a solid understanding of the academics, social programs, criteria, and pre-requisites available and needed to matriculate to the next level. Activities created to facilitate effective transitions from middle school to high school will include a partnered 8th Grade Night, where students will visit and get a first-hand glimpse of academics, clubs, and organizations. Additionally, coordinators from various local magnet programs will speak with 8th grade students and inform them of the requirements needed for entrance and acceptance into their programs. School counselor will also assist students with obtaining the necessary documents, recommendations, and support with the application process.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

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

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

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)*			
Position	**Supports Goal(s)**	**Supports which system(s)**	**How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?**
Parent Facilitator	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	Foster positive relationships between families and school staff; Serve as a bridge between home and school, especially for families who may feel disconnected; Promote open, respectful, and culturally sensitive communication
ELA Teacher 1.0	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	This position is dedicated to reducing class sizes to provide targeted support for students striving in English Language Arts (ELA). The teacher will create and implement engaging lessons grounded in evidence-based strategies to ensure effective instruction. By analyzing assessment data, the teacher will tailor instruction to meet student needs and facilitate activities that foster both academic success and social development. Collaboration with colleagues on curriculum, instructional strategies, and data-driven decision-making will drive ongoing professional growth. Furthermore, the teacher will actively engage with families to support student progress and success.
Science Teacher .50	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The teacher in this position will provide targeted support for students striving in Science. The teacher will create and implement engaging lessons grounded in evidence-based strategies to ensure effective instruction. By analyzing assessment data, the teacher will tailor instruction to meet student needs and facilitate activities that foster both academic success and social development. Collaboration with colleagues on curriculum, instructional strategies, and data-driven decision-making will drive ongoing professional growth. Furthermore, the teacher will actively engage with families to support student progress and success.

School Improvement Goals *Include goals on the parent compacts and policy*	
Goal #1	By May 2026,14% of students (81 students) to 25% of students (143 students) will increase the level of achievement by 100 points on the ELA BEACON from fall to spring.
Goal #2	By May 2026, 14% of students (81 students) to 25% of students (143 students) will increase the level of achievement by 100 points on the Math BEACON from fall to spring