

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2026 - 2027
School Name:	Milford Elementary
Principal Name:	Dr. Tiffany Jones
Date Submitted:	
Revision Date(s):	

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Milford Elementary
<i>Team Lead</i>	
<i>Position</i>	
<i>Email</i>	
<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:

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Dr. Tiffany Jones	Tiffany Jones
Assistant Principal	Dawn Allison-Ruiz	Dawn Allison-Ruiz
EIP Literacy Lead	Denotra Hill	Denotra Hill
EIP Math Lead	Tykier Brown	Tykier Brown
Kindergarten Teacher	Courtney Roberson	Courtney Roberson
1 st Grade Teacher	Marsi Arcaro	Marsi Arcaro
2 nd Grade Teacher	Katie Busby	Katie Busby
3 rd Grade Teacher	Tiffany Paige	Tiffany Paige
4 th Grade Teacher	Natasha Neal	Natasha Neal
5 th Grade Teacher	Tijana Mitchell	Tijana Mitchell
Counselor	Kelly Jenkins	Kelly Jenkins

Specialist Teacher	Matthew Long	Matthew Long
SPED Teacher	LiTosha Simmons	LiTosha Simmons
Advanced Learning Teacher	Courtney Weldon	Courtney Weldon
Lilia Rios	Parent Facilitator	Lilia Rios
Madayline Pereyra	Parent	Madayline Pereyra

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	- By May 2026, students in 1st-2nd grades will increase their level of achievement to prepared, by 15% from August 2025 to May 2026 on the Beacon Assessment. - The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students performing at proficient or higher on the Georgia ELA Milestones assessment will increase by 10 % from May 2025 to May 2026.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	- In August 2025, 4.47% of first-grade students scored Prepared on the Beacon assessment. By March 2026, the percentage of students scoring Prepared increased to 17.91%, representing a 13.44 percentage point increase. Although first grade demonstrated significant improvement in student performance, the goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring Prepared by 15 percentage points was narrowly missed by 1.56 percentage points. - In August 2025, 3.27% of Milford's second-grade students scored Prepared on the Beacon assessment. By March 2026, 20% of second-grade students scored Prepared, representing a 16.73 percentage point increase. As a result, second grade met and exceeded the goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring Prepared by 15 percentage points.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	

If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	Overall, the data indicate substantial growth in both grade levels, demonstrating that the instructional strategies and supports implemented are positively impacting student achievement. Continued focus on strengthening Tier 1 instruction and targeted interventions will help sustain and further accelerate this progress.
---	---

Previous Year's Goal #2	- By May 2026, students in 1st and 2nd grade will increase their level of performance to prepared by 15% from August 2025 to May 2026 on the Beacon Assessment. - By May 2026, students in 3rd-5th grades will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 32% (52 students) to 42% (67 students) on the Math Milestones assessment.
Was the goal met? ☒ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	- In August 2025, 3% of first-grade students scored Prepared on the Beacon math assessment. By March 2026, 21.74% of first-grade students scored Prepared, representing an increase of 18.74 percentage points. As a result, first grade met and exceeded the goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring Prepared by 15 percentage points. - In August 2025, 0% of Milford's second-grade students scored Prepared on the Beacon math assessment. By March 2026, 20% of second-grade students scored Prepared, representing an increase of 20 percentage points. Therefore, second grade also met and exceeded the goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring Prepared by 15 percentage points. - The 2025–2026 Math Milestones results for grades 3–5 indicate that we exceeded our goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Distinguished from 32% to 42%. Based on the assessment data, 46% of students in grades 3–5 achieved Proficient or Distinguished levels of performance.
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	Overall, the data demonstrates strong growth in math achievement across all grade levels, indicating that the instructional strategies and supports implemented during the year contributed to improved student outcomes. These results will inform continued focus on strengthening Tier 1 instruction and targeted interventions as part of planning for the SY27 Title I program.

Previous Year's Goal #3	
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	
Reflecting on Outcomes	

If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?	

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

ELA DATA				
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished

3 rd Grade	22%	21.8%	33%	
4 th Grade	36.2%	22%	31%	
5 th Grade	42.2%	44.2%	23%	

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Foundations			Language			Texts			Interpreting Texts			Constructing Texts		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	53.73%	20.90%	25.37%	50.75%	32.84%	16.42%	38.81%	43.28%	17.91%	41.79%	38.81%	19.40%	56.72%	25.37%	17.91%
2 nd Grade	38.46%	32.21%	29.23%	49.23%	27.69%	23.08%	38.46%	38.46%	23.08%	36.92%	40%	23.08%	49.23%	41.54%	9.23%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3 rd Grade	10.29%	64.71%	25.00%	8.82%	70.59%	20.59%	7.35%	79.41%	13.24%	25%	55.88%	19.12%	4.41%	79.41%	16.18%	7.35%	75%	17.65%	17.65%	67.65%	14.71%
4 th Grade	17.65%	66.67%	23.53%	21.57%	68.63%	17.65%	17.65%	72.55%	17.65%	47.06%	45.10%	15.69%	19.61%	72.55%	15.69%	19.61%	70.59%	9.80%	27.45%	64.71%	15.69%
5 th Grade	38.60%	47.37%	17.54%	31.58%	50.88%	21.05%	22.81%	64.91%	15.79%	57.89%	31.58%	14.04%	45.61%	45.61%	12.28%	40.35%	50.88%		43.86%	52.63%	7.02%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:

Beacon Assessment – ELA
(Grade Levels & Subgroups)

Grade Levels (all students):

	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	30	24	11
2 nd Grade	27	25	13
3 rd Grade	4	50	11
4 th Grade	12	35	7
5 th Grade	21	30	7

- Strong growth in K–2 foundational skills as evidenced by increased “Prepared” levels on Beacon
- Majority of students performing at “Near Target,” indicating readiness to move to proficiency
- Consistent performance in interpreting texts (reading comprehension strands stronger than writing)

EL:

	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	22	14	1
2 nd Grade	18	11	2
3 rd Grade	3	29	0
4 th Grade	10	16	1
5 th Grade	13	4	0

- Demonstrating growth in foundational reading skills and basic comprehension
- Benefit from small group instruction and targeted language supports

SWD:

	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	5	2	1
2 nd Grade	8	6	0
3 rd Grade	3	10	1

Grade Levels (all students):

	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	30	24	11
2 nd Grade	27	25	13
3 rd Grade	4	50	11
4 th Grade	12	35	7
5 th Grade	21	30	7

- Low percentage of students reaching “Prepared” across grade levels
- Constructing texts (writing) remains a consistent area of need
- Listening comprehension is a weakness across grades 3–5
- Vocabulary and grammar deficits impact overall comprehension and written responses

EL:

	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1 st Grade	22	14	1
2 nd Grade	18	11	2
3 rd Grade	3	29	0
4 th Grade	10	16	1
5 th Grade	13	4	0

- Significant gaps in academic vocabulary and language development
- Difficulty with grammar conventions and constructing written responses
- Limited opportunities for structured speaking, listening, and language application within Tier 1 instruction
- Challenges with comprehension of complex texts due to language barriers

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4th Grade</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>5th Grade</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr> </table> • Growth observed when provided with targeted interventions and scaffolded instruction • Increased engagement during small group and differentiated instruction	4 th Grade	3	4	0	5 th Grade	2	3	0	SWD: <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td><td>Support Needed</td><td>Near Target</td><td>Prepared</td></tr> <tr> <td>1st Grade</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>2nd Grade</td><td>8</td><td>6</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>3rd Grade</td><td>3</td><td>10</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr> <td>4th Grade</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr> <td>5th Grade</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr> </table> • Difficulty with reading comprehension and constructing written responses • Struggles with vocabulary, grammar, and language processing		Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	1 st Grade	5	2	1	2 nd Grade	8	6	0	3 rd Grade	3	10	1	4 th Grade	3	4	0	5 th Grade	2	3	0
4 th Grade	3	4	0																															
5 th Grade	2	3	0																															
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared																															
1 st Grade	5	2	1																															
2 nd Grade	8	6	0																															
3 rd Grade	3	10	1																															
4 th Grade	3	4	0																															
5 th Grade	2	3	0																															
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Beacon ELA data indicates that students in grades 1–2 demonstrate gaps in foundational skills, particularly in vocabulary development and grammar, which impacts their ability to construct written responses. Additionally, language learners require increased exposure to structured language opportunities embedded within Tier 1 instruction. For grades 3–5, student performance data highlight a need to further develop listening comprehension skills. Students have had limited exposure to structured listening opportunities, including consistent read-alouds, which impacts their ability to interpret and respond to text. Instructional practices have also relied heavily on repeated verbal directions rather than intentional opportunities for students to process and apply information independently. This indicates a need to strengthen Tier 1 instruction through planning for language development, structured listening opportunities, and consistent integration of read-alouds and student discourse. Beacon ELA data indicate that while students are moving from Support Needed to Near Target, there is a lack of movement into the Prepared level across grades 3–5. This suggests that Tier 1 instruction has not consistently provided the level of rigor, student ownership, and actionable feedback needed for students to fully master grade-level standards. Additionally, students have had limited opportunities to track their progress, set goals, and reflect on their learning.																																	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: • Students demonstrate strong listening skills (4.1), indicating they are able to comprehend English at a high level.	Grade Levels (all students): EL: • Speaking average of 2.9 and writing average of 2.8 are the lowest domains, indicating students are struggling to express ideas using academic language.																																

Commented [AM1]: Consider adding tables or charts to highlight the percentage and/or number of students scoring at specific proficiency levels. Ex. the percentage of students demonstrating listening skills.

- Students can follow directions, understand teacher instruction, and access grade-level content when supported verbally. - The higher listening domain provides a strong foundation to leverage oral language and build other language domains (speaking, reading, and writing) 52% of students scored Bridging or Reaching in listening	Percentage of students scoring in each range Listening	
	Entering Knows and uses minimal social language and minimal academic language with visual and graphic support	16%
	Emerging Knows and uses social English and general academic language with visual and graphic support	13%
	Developing Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support	16%
	Expanding Knows and uses English and some technical academic language	7%
	Bridging Knows and uses social and academic language working with grade level material	18%
	Reaching Knows and uses social and academic language at the highest level measured by the ACCESS test	34%
	Percentage of students scoring in each range Speaking	
	Entering Knows and uses minimal social language and minimal academic language with visual and graphic support	18%
	Emerging Knows and uses social English and general academic language with visual and graphic support	33%
	Developing Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support	32%
	Expanding Knows and uses English and some technical academic language	13%
	Bridging Knows and uses social and academic language working with grade level material	3%
	Reaching Knows and uses social and academic	1%
	Percentage of students scoring in each range Writing	
	Entering Knows and uses minimal social language and minimal academic language with visual and graphic support	34%
	Emerging Knows and uses social English and general academic language with visual and graphic support	14%
	Developing Knows and uses social English and some specific academic language with visual and graphic support	37%
	Expanding Knows and uses English and some technical academic language	13%
	Bridging Knows and uses social and academic language working with grade level material	2%
	Reaching Knows and uses social and academic	0%

		language at the highest level measured by the ACCESS test		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Students have not had consistent, structured opportunities to produce academic language through speaking and writing actively.			
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD:		
	Root Cause Explanation:			

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment		
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: 	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership	Root Cause Explanation: 	

☐ Supportive Learning Environment

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
GOAL #1: ELA	- By May 2027, students in 1st- 2nd grades will increase their level of achievement to prepared, by 10% from August 2026 to May 2027 on the Beacon Assessment. - The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students performing at proficient or higher on the Georgia ELA Milestones assessment increase by 10% from May 2026 to May 2027.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	For grades 3–5, student performance data highlight a need to further develop listening comprehension skills. Students have had limited exposure to structured listening opportunities, including consistent read-aloud, which impacts their ability to interpret and respond to text. Instructional practices have also relied heavily on repeated verbal directions rather than intentional opportunities for students to process and apply information independently.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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 classrooms will implement daily structured read-aloud for 5–7 minutes, as evidenced by lesson plans and walkthroughs. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - Provide professional learning on effective read-aloud strategies, including questioning, stopping points, and student discourse. - August-September:	Evaluation Performance Target: Decrease the percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring support needed on the Interpreting text (Reading and Listening Interpreting) section of the Beacon Assessment by 30% as evidenced by the August Beacon to March 2027 Beacon assessment. Decrease the percentage of 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students scoring support needed on the Interpreting Text: Listening section of the Beacon by 30%, as evidenced by the August Beacon to March 2027 Beacon assessment. Evaluation Tool(s):	- Wonders PMAs - Read-Aloud Books - Professional Learning
Target Student Group			
☒ All Students ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. Teachers will implement daily structured read-aloud (5–7 minutes) with intentional student discourse to strengthen listening comprehension, vocabulary development, and understanding of text.	- Teachers implement daily read-aloud with structured discussion (think-pair-share, turn-and-talk). - October-December: - Teachers embed structured listening opportunities requiring students to respond to text through speaking and writing. - January-February: - Teachers refine questioning to promote deeper comprehension and reduce repeated directions. - March-April: - May: Artifacts to be Collected: Walkthrough observation data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	- Wonders PMS - Beacon Assessment - Walkthrough observation Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Students have not had consistent, structured opportunities to produce academic language through speaking and writing actively.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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 teachers will implement daily structured opportunities for academic language development (speaking, reading, and writing) as evidenced by lesson plans, walkthroughs, and student work.	Evaluation Performance Target: Increase overall ACCESS speaking, reading, and writing average by at least 0.5 from 2026 to 2027	• Wonders • ELlevation platform • Thinking Classroom strategies • Sentence stems/frames • Anchor charts • Professional learning • Speaking Rubric
Target Student Group ☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD	Implementation Plan: • Pre-planning ○ Provide professional learning on academic language strategies, including structured student discourse (think-pair-share, turn-and-talk), sentence frames/stems, explicit vocabulary instruction, and writing connected to text. ○ Speaking Rubric will be posted in each classroom	Evaluation Tool(s): • ACCESS for ELLs • CFA/CSA data • Beacon • Wonders PMA data • Student work samples • Walkthrough observation data • ESOL teachers will conference with ESOL students at the BOY, MOY, and EOY to discuss goals and complete the Speaking Rubric.	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	2. Teachers will implement daily structured academic language opportunities across all content areas by increasing student discourse, explicitly teaching academic vocabulary, and incorporating writing connected to text. Instruction will include sentence frames, collaborative discussion strategies, and targeted small group support.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: During the grade-level quarterly planning, teacher teams will analyze student data and develop plans for students who did not show proficiency for students who have demonstrated proficiency on the learning target. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	

	○ Teachers will model writing and explicitly teach grammar, syntax, and complete thoughts. ○ Students will begin using academic vocabulary in speaking and writing. • January-February: ○ Students will apply academic language across content areas, including explaining reasoning in math and providing observations and explanations in science. • March-April: ○ Teachers will increase rigor by requiring extended verbal and written responses using academic vocabulary and evidence from text. ○ Students will consistently use complete sentences in both speaking and writing across all content areas. • May: Reflect on implementation and analyze ACCESS and classroom data to determine impact. Artifacts to be Collected: • Speaking Rubric • Walkthrough observation data (student talk vs. teacher talk) • Student discussion stems and anchor charts Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Beacon ELA data indicate that while students are moving from Support Needed to Near Target, there is a lack of movement into the Prepared level across grades 3–5. This suggests that Tier 1 instruction has not consistently provided the level of rigor, student ownership, and actionable feedback needed for students to fully master grade-level standards. Additionally, students have had limited opportunities to track their progress, set goals, and reflect on their learning.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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 teachers will implement student data notebooks with consistent use of assessment prediction as evidenced by student artifacts and walkthroughs. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - Student Data Binders will be delivered to teachers - Teachers will also receive Teacher Data Binders - August-September: - Students set up data notebooks and begin tracking CFA/CSA results. Teachers introduce assessment, prediction and model goal setting. - October-December: - Students consistently track data and reflect on performance. Teachers conduct conferences with students to review data and provide actionable feedback. - January-February: - Students use data to set specific, measurable goals and monitor progress. Teachers refine feedback to focus on moving students from Near Target to Prepared.	Evaluation Performance Target: Increase the percentage of students performing at the Near Target or Prepared Level on Beacon Assessments. When administering PMAs, 75% of students will score 80% or higher on the comprehension portion of the Wonders PMAs. Evaluation Tool(s): - Beacon Assessments - Student data notebooks - Student goal setting - PMA assessment data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: CCC team will analyze PMA data and Beacon data along with student data notebook trends to monitor movement from Near Target to Prepared and adjust Tier 1 instruction	- Student data binders - PMA and Beacon assessment data sheets - Professional learning - WIN groups
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
3. Teachers will implement student data notebooks, including regular assessment tracking, prediction to increase student ownership of learning and move students from Near Target to Prepared.			

	- March-April: - Students use data to set specific, measurable goals and monitor progress. Teachers refine feedback to focus on moving students from Near Target to Prepared. - May: Artifacts to be Collected: - Student data notebooks - Assessment Prediction/reflection forms Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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: Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - August-September: - October-December: - January-February: - March-April: - May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
(4) (Insert action step here)			

MATH DATA				
MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY26 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	31%	43.6%	37%	55%
4 th Grade	51.1%	38.9%	34%	54%
5 th Grade	31.1%	32.7%	25%	29%

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kinder (Winter Administration)	12.77%	19.15%	68.09%	27.66%	46.81%	25.53%	21.28%	25.53%	53.19%	19.15%	29.79%	51.06%
1 st Grade	26.09%	53.62%	20.29%	33.33%	44.93%	21.74%	.25%	46.38%	46.38%	24.64%	44.93%	30.43%
2 nd Grade	23.08%	58.46%	18.46%	33.85%	50.77%	15.38%	46.15%	35.38%	18.46%	20.00%	40.00%	40.00%
3 rd Grade	5.88%	89.71%	4.41%	1.47%	83.82%	14.71%	5.88%	83.82%	10.29%	23.53%	70.59%	5.88%
4 th Grade	29.09%	56.36%	14.55%	30.91%	61.82%	7.27%	45.45%	47.27%	7.27%	50.91%	45.45%	3.64%
5 th Grade	59.32%	35.59%	5.08%	57.63%	40.68%	1.69%	50.85%	40.68%	8.47%	67.80%	30.51%	1.69%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	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 – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): <table><thead><tr><th></th><th>Support Needed</th><th>Near Target</th><th>Prepared</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Kindergarten</td><td>7</td><td>12</td><td>27</td></tr><tr><td>1st Grade</td><td>7</td><td>45</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>2nd Grade</td><td>19</td><td>34</td><td>13</td></tr><tr><td>3rd Grade</td><td>1</td><td>61</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>4th Grade</td><td>20</td><td>33</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>5th Grade</td><td>35</td><td>23</td><td>1</td></tr></tbody></table> - Majority of students across grades are performing at “Near Target,” indicating foundational understanding of standards - K–2 shows stronger performance trends, with higher percentages of students scoring Near Target or Prepared on the EOY Beacon Assessment. - Evidence of growth across grade levels compared to prior performance 68% of kindergarten students scored prepared in the numerical reasoning domain 53% of kindergarten students scored prepared in measurement and data reasoning prepared measurement 40% of 2nd grade students scored prepared in geometric and spatial reasoning		Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Kindergarten	7	12	27	1 st Grade	7	45	14	2 nd Grade	19	34	13	3 rd Grade	1	61	1	4 th Grade	20	33	2	5 th Grade	35	23	1	Grade Levels (all students): <table><thead><tr><th></th><th>Support Needed</th><th>Near Target</th><th>Prepared</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Kindergarten</td><td>7</td><td>12</td><td>27</td></tr><tr><td>1st Grade</td><td>7</td><td>45</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>2nd Grade</td><td>19</td><td>34</td><td>13</td></tr><tr><td>3rd Grade</td><td>1</td><td>61</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>4th Grade</td><td>20</td><td>33</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>5th Grade</td><td>35</td><td>23</td><td>1</td></tr></tbody></table> - Very low percentages of students reached the Prepared performance level, particularly in grades 3–5. - A significant increase in students scoring Support Needed was evident in the upper grades, especially in 4th and 5th grade. - Students continue to struggle with applying mathematical reasoning, problem-solving strategies, and conceptual understanding to solve complex tasks. - Only 4% of 3rd grade students scored at the Prepared level in the domain of Numerical Reasoning. - Only 5% of 5th grade students scored at the Prepared level in Numerical Reasoning,		Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Kindergarten	7	12	27	1 st Grade	7	45	14	2 nd Grade	19	34	13	3 rd Grade	1	61	1	4 th Grade	20	33	2	5 th Grade	35	23	1
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared																																																							
Kindergarten	7	12	27																																																							
1 st Grade	7	45	14																																																							
2 nd Grade	19	34	13																																																							
3 rd Grade	1	61	1																																																							
4 th Grade	20	33	2																																																							
5 th Grade	35	23	1																																																							
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared																																																							
Kindergarten	7	12	27																																																							
1 st Grade	7	45	14																																																							
2 nd Grade	19	34	13																																																							
3 rd Grade	1	61	1																																																							
4 th Grade	20	33	2																																																							
5 th Grade	35	23	1																																																							

		Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kindergarten	5	7	7	
1 st Grade	6	28	4	
2 nd Grade	12	16	3	
3 rd Grade	1	30	0	
4 th Grade	14	13	0	
5 th Grade	16	1	0	

- Students are primarily performing in the “Near Target” range, showing developing understanding of math concepts
- K–2 EL students demonstrate stronger foundational skill development

SWD:

	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
Kindergarten	0	3	2
1 st Grade	4	4	0
2 nd Grade	3	7	1
3 rd Grade	1	13	0
4 th Grade	3	4	0
5 th Grade	2	3	0

- Some students are approaching proficiency (“Near Target”), particularly in lower grades
- Students benefit from small group and scaffolded instruction

 indicating a need for increased emphasis on number sense and computational fluency. - In Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning, only 2% of 5th grade students scored at the Prepared level. - In Measurement and Data Reasoning, only 7% of 4th grade students reached the Prepared level. - Prepared performance levels in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning were particularly low across the upper grades, with only 6% of 3rd grade students, 4% of 4th grade students, and 2% of 5th grade students scoring at the Prepared level. This trend highlights a significant need for focused instruction and opportunities for students to develop geometric reasoning and spatial visualization skills. - **EL:** **EL:** | | | | | |-----------------------|----------------|-------------|----------| | | Support Needed | Near Target | Prepared | | Kindergarten | 5 | 7 | 7 | | 1 st Grade | 6 | 28 | 4 | | 2 nd Grade | 12 | 16 | 3 | | 3 rd Grade | 1 | 30 | 0 | | 4 th Grade | 14 | 13 | 0 | | 5 th Grade | 16 | 1 | 0 | - Very few EL students reaching “Prepared” across grade levels - Performance declines in upper grades, with little to no students scoring prepared in third through 5th |

		grade. • Language barriers impact comprehension of word problems and mathematical vocabulary • Difficulty explaining reasoning and justifying answers SWD: <table><tr><th></th><th>Support Needed</th><th>Near Target</th><th>Prepared</th></tr><tr><td>Kindergarten</td><td>0</td><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>1st Grade</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>2nd Grade</td><td>3</td><td>7</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>3rd Grade</td><td>1</td><td>13</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>4th Grade</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>5th Grade</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr></table> • Minimal to no students reaching “Prepared” across grade levels • High percentage of students in “Support Needed,” especially as grade levels increase • Difficulty with multi-step problem solving and conceptual understanding • Limited independence with grade-level tasks and application of skills		Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Kindergarten	0	3	2	1 st Grade	4	4	0	2 nd Grade	3	7	1	3 rd Grade	1	13	0	4 th Grade	3	4	0	5 th Grade	2	3	0
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared																											
Kindergarten	0	3	2																											
1 st Grade	4	4	0																											
2 nd Grade	3	7	1																											
3 rd Grade	1	13	0																											
4 th Grade	3	4	0																											
5 th Grade	2	3	0																											
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Analysis of Beacon Math data indicates that a significant percentage of students, particularly in grades 3–5, are performing in the Support Needed and Near Target ranges across all domains, with limited movement into the Prepared level (e.g., 5th grade Prepared rates range from 1.69%–8.47%). While students demonstrate partial understanding, they are not consistently applying mathematical reasoning, problem-solving, and conceptual understanding at a level required for mastery. These trends suggest that instruction has relied heavily on procedural teaching and teacher-directed instruction, with limited opportunities for students to engage in deep thinking, problem-solving, and mathematical discourse. Students have not consistently been required to explain their reasoning, collaborate, or engage in productive struggle.																													
MATH Common Assessments	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students):	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students):																												

Commented [AM2]: In addition to discussing the proficiency levels, consider expanding on the strengths and weaknesses regarding the domains (i.e., numerical reasoning, measurement, etc.)

	EL: SWD:	EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: 	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: 	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey		

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

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
GOAL #2: MATH		By May 2027, students in 1st and 2nd grade will increase their level of performance to prepared by 10% from August 2026 to May 2027 on the Beacon Assessment. By May 2027, students in 3rd—5th grades will increase their level of achievement to proficient and distinguished by 10% on the Math Milestones assessments.	
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:		Analysis of Beacon Math data indicates that a significant percentage of students, particularly in grades 3–5, are performing in the Support Needed and Near Target ranges across all domains, with limited movement into the Prepared level (e.g., 5th grade Prepared rates range from 1.69%–8.47%). While students demonstrate partial understanding, they are not consistently applying mathematical reasoning, problem-solving, and conceptual understanding at a level required for mastery.	
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>		☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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 classrooms will implement Thinking Classroom strategies daily as evidenced by lesson plans, walkthroughs, and student engagement.	Evaluation Performance Target: Increase the percentage of students performing at the Prepared level on Beacon. When administering the Unit Summative Assessments 75% of students will score 80% or higher.	- Thinking Classroom Professional (Metro Resa) - Whiteboards
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Thinking Classroom Implementation Plan - Preplanning: - Thinking tasks added to Milford's OneNote Notebook	Evaluation Tool(s): - Beacon Assessment data - CFA/CSA data - Walkthrough observation data - Student work samples	
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	August-September:		

1. Teachers will implement Thinking Classroom strategies daily to increase student discourse, problem-solving, and engagement in order to strengthen conceptual understanding and move students from Near Target to Prepared.	○ 100% of teachers implementing thinking classrooms ○ Random Grouping ○ Collaborative Work ○ Vertical Whiteboards • October-December: ○ Verbal Task Delivery ○ Students help students ○ Strategic hints • January-February: ○ Responding with prompts • March-April: ○ Growth Focused Grading (Kinder-3rd) ○ Notes About Thinking (4th–5th) • May: Artifacts to be Collected: • Walkthrough observation data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ <u>At the end of each math unit</u> Data Analysis Plan: • CCC teams will analyze Beacon and CFA/CSA data to monitor student movement from Support Needed and Near Target to Prepared and adjust instruction accordingly. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	• Math Task • Thinking Classroom Book • Thinking Tasks Book
--	--	--	---

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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 teachers will implement student data notebooks with consistent use of assessment prediction, goal setting, and student conferencing as evidenced by student artifacts and walkthroughs.	Evaluation Performance Target: Increase the percentage of students performing at the Prepared Level on Beacon Assessments. 75% of students will score 80% or higher on Common Math Assessments.	• Student 3 ring binders • Common Formative and Common Summative Assessment Data • Beacon assessment data sheets • Professional learning • WIN groups
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. Teachers will implement student data notebooks, including regular assessment tracking, prediction, goal setting, and student-teacher conferences, to increase student ownership of learning and move students from Near Target to Prepared.	Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: ○ Students set up data notebooks and begin tracking CFA/CSA results. Teachers introduce assessment prediction and model goal setting. • October-December: ○ Students consistently track data and reflect on performance. Teachers conduct conferences with students to review data and provide actionable feedback. • January-February: ○ Students use data to set specific, measurable goals and monitor progress. Teachers refine feedback to focus on moving students from Near Target to Prepared. • March-April: ○ Students use data to set specific, measurable goals and monitor progress. Teachers refine feedback	Evaluation Tool(s): • Beacon Assessments • Student data notebooks • Student goal setting • Common Assessment Data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: CCC team will analyze CSA, CFA, and Beacon data, along with student data notebook trends to monitor movement from Near Target to Prepared and adjust Tier 1 instruction	
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal	

	to focus on moving students from Near Target to Prepared. • May: Artifacts to be Collected: • Student data notebooks • Assessment Prediction/reflection forms • Goal setting • Conferencing notes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	☒ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April: • May:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

4.	Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
----	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☒ 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: Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - August-September: - October-December: - January-February: - March-April: - May:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
4. (Insert action step here)	Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA/OTHER DATA		
Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
(Name of Assessment) (Data by grade & subgroup)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
(Name of assessment) (Grade Level Reading & Writing)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
(Name of assessment) (Grade Level Reading & Writing)		

Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system impacted: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

OTHER CONTENT AREA DATA / OTHER DATA IMPROVEMENT PLAN			
GOAL #3: OTHER			
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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: Implementation Plan: • Preplanning: • August-September: • October-December: • January-February: • March-April:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): • Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

1. (Insert action step here)	• May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
-------------------------------------	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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: Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - August-September: - October-December: - January-February: - March-April: - May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. (Insert action step here)			

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:			
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ 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: Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - August-September: - October-December: - January-February: - March-April: - May: Artifacts to be Collected: Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: Evaluation Tool(s): Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches ☐ CCC Leads	
Target Student Group			
☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
3. (Insert action step here)			

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement <i>(Required Components)</i>			
Family Engagement Activities <i>(*Must be listed in the school policy)</i>	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required: * Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026) Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	9/10/26		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required: * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026) Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	10/13/26-10/16/26		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required: * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027) Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	3/25/27		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required: Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy) Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)	9/1/26		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	2/2/26		
5. Required: * Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visiting the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. Briefly describe the transition activities here: 5th grade students visit Smitha Middle School - Milford students and parents will be invited to Smitha for an information session	Spring 2027		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide translated information related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	List documents translated for parents:		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

<u>Academic-Related</u> School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)							
Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	"Shall" Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Staff Responsible
STEAM Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Supplies for hands-on science, art, and math supplies	Title I	3/25/27	Parent Survey Sign-In Sheet	Parent Facilitator Teachers
Publix Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Copy supplies	Title I	4/15/27	Parent Survey Sign-In Sheet	Parent Facilitator Teachers
Family Game Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Instructional games Copy Supplies	Title I	11/12/26	Parent-Survey Sign-In Sheet	Parent Facilitator Teachers

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

1. Assist parents in understanding state academic standards, state and local assessments, and how to monitor their child's academic progress.
2. Provide materials and training to help parents work with their child to improve academic achievement. (Ex. Literacy training, technology training)

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

School Improvement Plan Required Questions	
Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)	
1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)	
2. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)	
3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)	
4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)	
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted	

support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. *SWP Checklist 5(e)* **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:

Milford Elementary School's Schoolwide Plan has been developed in coordination and integration with federal, state, district, and local resources to ensure a comprehensive approach to improving student achievement. The plan aligns with Title I requirements and supports district initiatives such as LETRS-informed literacy practices, and district mathematics initiatives designed to strengthen students' conceptual understanding, problem-solving, and fluency skills.

The schoolwide plan focuses on improving literacy and mathematics outcomes through high-quality Tier I instruction, targeted interventions, WIN (What I Need) Time, and ongoing professional learning for staff. Teachers collaborate regularly through CCC meetings to analyze student data, monitor progress, and make instructional adjustments based on student needs.

As part of the schoolwide program, students engage in data tracking and goal setting through student data notebooks and conferences with teachers. These practices promote student ownership of learning while helping teachers monitor progress and provide timely interventions. Through the integration of these programs and resources, Milford Elementary ensures that all students have access to the support needed to achieve academic success.

ESSA Requirements to Include in the Schoolwide Plan – Section 1116(B)(1)

6. Jointly develop with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parental and family engagement involvement policy, agreed on by such parents, that shall describe the means for carrying out the requirements of Subsections (c) through (f). Parents shall be notified of the policy in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language the parents can understand. Such policy shall be made available to the local community and updated periodically to meet the changing needs of parents and the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes Posting every Title I school's parent policy on the school's website in multiple languages where practicable, Fall and Spring input meeting agendas and sign in sheets providing parents the opportunity to assist in the development of the school's parent policy, compact and parent engagement budget.**

SWP Checklist 4

Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - 34 CFR § 200.26

7. Describe how the school regularly monitors and the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement. *SWP Checklist 3(a)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Milford Elementary regularly monitors the implementation and effectiveness of the schoolwide program through ongoing analysis of Georgia Milestones, ACCESS, Beacon, CFA, CSA, and other district assessment data. Teachers and administrators review data during CCC meetings to identify strengths, gaps, and instructional next steps, including reteaching, intervention, and enrichment opportunities.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Milford Elementary determines the effectiveness of the schoolwide program by analyzing student performance data from Georgia Milestones, ACCESS for ELLs, Beacon assessments, CFAs, CSAs, and other district assessments throughout the school year. Data are reviewed during CCC meetings to monitor student growth, identify trends, and determine whether students are progressing toward mastery of grade-level 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)*

The schoolwide plan will be revised as necessary based on regular review of implementation and student achievement data to ensure continuous improvement for all students. Assessment data from Georgia Milestones, ACCESS, Beacon, CFAs, CSAs, walkthrough observations, and student work will be analyzed during CCC meetings and leadership discussions to identify strengths, gaps, and areas needing additional support.

Based on the data, the school will adjust instructional strategies, intervention plans, professional learning, WIN groups, and schoolwide action steps to better meet student needs and improve student achievement outcomes.

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)*

Milford Elementary School will implement a schoolwide Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to prevent and address problem behavior and provide early intervening services for students. This tiered model is coordinated with services provided under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to ensure students receive appropriate academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support.

The school's CORE Team, consisting of the principal, assistant principal, school counselor, social worker, parent facilitator, and school psychologist, will meet regularly to review behavior, attendance, and academic data to identify students in need of additional support. The team will monitor student progress, recommend interventions, and coordinate services to address identified needs.

At the Tier I level, Milford will implement schoolwide expectations, social-emotional learning opportunities, positive behavior recognition programs, and consistent classroom management practices to promote a positive school climate. Students demonstrating appropriate behavior will be recognized through schoolwide incentives and celebrations.

Students requiring additional support will receive Tier II interventions, including counseling groups, check-in/check-out supports, behavior contracts, mentoring, social skills instruction, and targeted behavioral interventions. The school counselor, social worker, and other support staff will collaborate with teachers and families to monitor student progress and adjust interventions as needed.

For students with more intensive behavioral needs, Tier III supports will be provided through individualized behavior intervention plans, functional behavior assessments when appropriate, and coordinated services with Special Education staff. The MTSS process will ensure that interventions are data-driven and aligned with services provided under IDEA to support student success and reduce barriers to learning.

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:

Milford Elementary School will provide ongoing professional learning for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other staff to improve instruction and increase student achievement. Professional development will focus on data-driven instruction, literacy and mathematics best practices, differentiated instruction, intervention strategies, and student engagement.

Teachers will participate in CCC meetings, quarterly collaborative planning, and district professional learning to analyze assessment data, monitor student progress, and adjust instruction to meet student needs. Staff will use data from state, district, and classroom assessments to guide instructional decisions and interventions.

To recruit and retain effective teachers, Milford will provide mentoring for new teachers, job-embedded coaching, leadership opportunities, and ongoing support to foster professional growth. The school will work with district departments to recruit and retain highly qualified educators, particularly in high-need areas such as Special Education and ESOL.

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:

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?
Classroom Teacher(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The Class Size Reduction teacher will be assigned to fourth grade to lower the teacher-to-student ratio, allowing for more targeted and differentiated instruction. This additional support will enable teachers to provide additional support for the diverse learning needs of students, particularly as they develop foundational math skills. Fourth grade instruction often requires smaller group settings to effectively address multiple skill levels and ensure all students receive the individualized support necessary for academic growth.
Academic Coach(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	
Parent Facilitator(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Family Engagement and Communication: The Parent Facilitator will establish strong communication channels with families, ensuring they are informed about school goals, programs, and student progress, which fosters a collaborative school-home partnership. Workshops and Support for Parents: The facilitator will coordinate with teachers and staff, to organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies to support their children's academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. Increased Parental Involvement: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. Connecting Families with Resources: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based

			programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.
Instructional Paraprofessional(s)	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	

School Improvement Goals	
Include goals on the parent compacts and policy	
Goal #1	- By May 2027, students in 1st- 2nd grades will increase their level of achievement to prepared, by 10% from August 2026 to May 2027 on the Beacon Assessment. - The percentage of 3rd-5th grade students performing at proficient or higher on the Georgia ELA Milestones assessment increase by 10% from May 2026 to May 2027.
Goal #2	By May 2027, students in 1st and 2nd grade will increase their level of performance to prepared by 10% from August 2026 to may 2027 on the Beacon Assessment. By May 2027, students in 3rd—5th grades will increase their level of achievement to proficient and distinguished by 10% on the Math Milestones assessments.
Goal #3	
Goal #4	

