

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2025 - 2026
School Name:	Floyd Middle School
Principal Name:	Ashley B. Hosey
Date Submitted:	June 3, 2025
Revision Date(s):	8/18/25

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Floyd Middle School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Dr. Ashley B. Hosey
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Ashley.hosey@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	770-819-2453
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: Floyd Middle School's comprehensive school-wide improvement plan was developed based on multifaceted data results. Student information and data results from the Georgia Health Survey, Georgia Milestone Assessment, Cobb County School subject interims, Reading Inventory and Math Inventory assessments, and student discipline data were disaggregated and analyzed by the principal, administrators, academic coaches and shared with members of Floyd Middle Building Leadership Team. The BLT is comprised of grade level and subject content teacher leaders, PBIS and Academic Coaches, House System manager, Head School Counselor, principal, and assistant principal. d on the need teacher leaders that serve on the Building Leadership Team shared input on the goals, root causes, and action steps

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

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

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Ashley B. Hosey	
Assistant Principal	Darsha Brooks	
Assistant Principal	Andri Cooke	
Academic Coach	Velrastine Shaw	
Academic Coach	Shoneka ONeal	
Math Content Lead	Delunde Greene	
ELA Content Lead	Anissa Swoopes	
Science Content Lead	April Rouser	
Social Studies Content Lead	Tammy McKinney	

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	Students on each grade level scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG Assessment will increase by 7% from the May 2023 EOG Math Assessment to May 2025 EOG Math Assessment. 6th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 14.7% on May 2024 Math EOG Assessment to 21.7% on the May 2025 Math EOG Assessment. 7th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 24.7% on May 2024 Math EOG Assessment to 31.7% on the May 2025 Math EOG Assessment. 8th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 23.1% on May 2024 Math EOG Assessment to 30.1% on the May 2025 Math Assessment.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The 2024-2025 End of Grade Assessment results support the outcome of the Math 2024 EOG Goal <u>17%</u> of students scored proficient or distinguished on the 6th Grade Math Milestones (N/A) <u>26%</u> of students scored proficient or distinguished on the 7th Grade Math Milestones (N/A) <u>46%</u> of students scored proficient or distinguished on the 8th Grade Math Milestones
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	For the grade levels who did not reach their goal, a more in-depth breakdown of data for students' strengths and weaknesses needs to be conducted. The data from student performance on the Beacon exams through the year 24-25 also needs to be reviewed to determine correlations between beacon performance and Milestone performance. Also, a breakdown of the student performance data to see which students successfully raised their score levels and those who did not. Demographic performance data will also be important to reviewed to see if any pertinent information is revealed.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be	For 8th grade a breakdown of the student performance data to see which students successfully raised their score levels and those who did not. The data from student performance on the Beacon exams through the year 24-25 also needs to be reviewed to determine correlations between beacon performance and Milestone performance. Demographic performance data will also be important to reviewed to see if any pertinent information is revealed

implemented to sustain progress?	
----------------------------------	--

Previous Year's Goal #2	Students on each grade level scoring proficient or distinguished on the EOG ELA Assessment will increase by 5% from the May 2024 EOG ELA Assessment to May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment. 6th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from <u>37%</u> May 2024 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to <u>42%</u> on the May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment 7th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from <u>32.2%</u> on May 2024 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to <u>37.2%</u> on the May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment. 8th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from <u>32.3%</u> on May 2024 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to <u>37.3%</u> on the May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment.
	Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The 2024-2025 End of Grade Assessment results support the outcome of the ELA 2024 EOG Goal <u>27%</u> of students scored proficient or distinguished on the 6th Grade ELA Milestones (N/A) <u>36%</u> of students scored proficient or distinguished on the 7th Grade ELA Milestones (N/A) <u>37.3%</u> of students scored proficient or distinguished on the 8th Grade ELA Milestones
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	The 6th grade English Language Arts team did not meet the goal of scoring proficient or distinguished on the May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment to 42% from 37%. The following steps and actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need: Strengthening the reading comprehension with nonfiction texts, developing students' ability to cite evidence and explain reasoning, developing and implementing anchor chart walls with relevant standards and content information for reinforcement, developing and using text structure lessons using science and social studies content to build cross-disciplinary connections and developing and creating formative assessments with immediate feedback for teachers. The 7th grade English Language Arts team did not meet the goal of scoring proficient or distinguished on the May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment to 37% from 32%. The following steps and actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need: develop deeper inferencing skills and theme analysis, improve writing fluency in argument and explanatory text, align unit text with standards, chunk text evidence in writing and discussions, develop and implement station rotation that focus on inference skills, grammar, vocabulary and writing, and develop and implement data-driven target groups and formative assessment to reteach and assess specific standards.

If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	The 8 th grade English Language Arts team met the goal of scoring proficient or distinguished on the May EOG ELA Assessment to 37.3% from 32.3%. Below are some of the processes and action steps that contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress: consistent in creating and implementing information prompts and text as a team, analyzing student assessment and grouping students by teacher and reteaching standards during daily Enrichment Block.
--	--

Previous Year's Goal #3	The percentage of students who “Met Target” on the 2024 End of Grade Assessment in the Writing Domain will increase from <u>25.2%</u> to <u>30.2%</u> on the 2025 EOG Writing Assessment for 6 th through 8 th grades combined.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	The 2024-2025 End of Grade ELA Writing domain result supports the outcome of the writing goal. • 20.4% of the 6th Grade students met the ELA Writing Domain goal. • 28.3% of the 7th Grade students met the ELA Writing Domain goal • 32.6% of the 8th Grade students met the ELA Writing Domain goal. % of students in 6th through 8th met target on the 2024 EOG English Language Arts Writing Domain.
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	For the grade levels who did not reach their goal, a more in-depth breakdown of data for students' strengths and weaknesses needs to be conducted. The data from student performance on the Beacon exams through the year 24-25 also needs to be reviewed to determine correlations between beacon performance and Milestone performance. Also, a breakdown of the student performance data to see which students successfully raised their score levels and those who did not. Demographic performance data will also be important to reviewed to see if any pertinent information is revealed.

If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	
--	--

Previous Year's Goal #4	The percentage of students reporting positive connectedness to Floyd Middle School will increase by <u>5%</u> on the Georgia Health Survey in the 4 domains under School Connectedness during the 2024-2025 school year. 1. Most days I look forward to going to school will increase from <u>59%-64%</u> 2. I feel like I fit in at my school. – <u>75%-80%</u> 3. I feel successful at school. – <u>71%-76%</u> 4. I feel connected to others at school. – <u>73%-78%</u>
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Unbeknownst to us the 2025 Georgia Health Survey Results changed the questions and format of the survey from previous versions. The current data does not match or align with the data used to craft the goal. Because data from the survey no longer matches the previous versions so we cannot compare data sets.
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 and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	
--	--

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

ELA DATA				
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	30.4%	35.2%	32.1%	27.6%
7 th Grade	28.4%	28.9%	36.2%	35.9%
8 th Grade	23.3%	30.5%	32.3%	38.2%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Reading									Reading Text Types						Writing								
	Key Ideas & Details			Craft & Structure/ Integration of Knowledge & Skills			Vocabulary Acquisition & Use			Literary			Informational			Text Types and Purposes			Conventions			Research		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
6 th Grade	28%	54%	19%	33%	47%	20%	32%	55%	13%	31%	53%	17%	31%	49%	21%	31%	50%	19%	46%	43%	11%	33%	48%	18%
7 th Grade	25%	40%	35%	22%	46%	32%	29%	46%	25%	20%	48%	32%	27%	42%	31%	22%	44%	33%	38%	41%	21%	24%	44%	32%
8 th Grade	19%	42%	39%	17%	49%	33%	22%	45%	33%	18%	48%	34%	15%	46%	39%	15%	41%	43%	32%	37%	31%	16%	46%	37%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): - The 6th grade cohort from SY 23 increased their proficient and distinguished percentage from 35.2% to 38.2% as 8TH graders in SY 25 on the ELA EOG. - The 7th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished increased from 32.1% as 6th graders to 35.9% as 7th graders on the 2025 ELA EOG 26.5% of 6th grade students were proficient or distinguished. - The 8th grade team met their 5% increase goal. EL: No data SWD: No data	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 6th grade: The team did not meet their 5% increase ELA EOG goal. 7th grade: The team did not meet their 5% increase ELA EOG goal. 8th grade: EL: No data SWD: No data
Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels (all students): - Based on the BEACON results in ELA our 6th grade students have demonstrated strengths above Near Target or Prepared in the following: - Key Ideas & Details - 73% - Literary – 70% - Based on the BEACON results in ELA our 7th grade students demonstrated strengths above Near Target or Prepared in the following: - Research - 76% - Literary – 80% - Key Ideas & Details – 75% - Text Types – 77% - Craft & Structure – 78% - Based on the BEACON results in ELA our 8th grade students have demonstrated strengths above Near Target or Prepared in the following: - Key Ideas & Details – 81% - Craft & Structure - 82% - Literary - 82% - Informational - 85%	Grade Levels (all students): - Based on the BEACON results in ELA our 6th grade students demonstrated weaknesses in Conventions with 46% at Support Needed - Based on the BEACON results in ELA our 7th grade students demonstrated weaknesses in Conventions with 38% at Support Needed - Based on the BEACON results in ELA our 8th grade students demonstrated weaknesses in Conventions with 32% at Support Needed Although each grade level showed growth from the Fall to the Spring BEACON, school wide by the Spring administration, most of our students still fell under the Near Target group, not the Prepared group. EL: 6th grade: - During the Spring administration of the BEACON, 56% of our ELL students fell under the Support Needed category.

- Text Types – 84%
- Research - 83%

Every grade level showed growth in the prepared category from the Fall to the Spring BEACON administration. The support needed and the near target category percentages decreased for all categories as well from the Fall to the Spring.

Fall BEACON Results:

Grade Level	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
6 th	39%	51%	10%
7 th	34%	49%	17%
8 th	30%	52%	18%

Spring BEACON Results:

Grade Level	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
6 th	29%	58%	13%
7 th	22%	49%	29%
8 th	14%	51%	35%

EL:

6th grade:

- During the Spring administration of the BEACON, 41% of our ELL students fell under the Near Target Category

7th grade:

- During the Spring administration of the BEACON, 60% of our ELL students fell under the Near Target Category

8th grade:

- During the Spring administration of the BEACON, 61% of our ELL students fell under the Near Target Category
- During the Spring administration of the BEACON, only 34% of our ELL students fell under the Support Needed category.

- Only 3% of our ELL students were prepared.

7th grade:

- During the Spring administration of the BEACON, 40% of our ELL students fell under the Support Needed category.
- 0% of our ELL students were prepared

8th grade:

- 5% of our ELL students were prepared

SWD:

6th grade:

- During the Spring administration of the BEACON, 56% of our SWD students fell under the Support Needed category.
- 0% of our SPED students were prepared

7th grade: n/a

8th grade: n/a

	SWD: 6th grade: During the Spring administration of the BEACON, 44% of our SWD students fell under the Near Target Category 7th grade: n/a 8th grade: n/a																																				
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - A clear focus on effective implementation of the instructional framework and Cobb Collaborative Community process, with an emphasis on the data team process, should be conducted with fidelity each week. - Students are deficient in foundational writing and grammar skills, such as sentence structure, ideas, descriptive writing. - GADOE checklists and rubrics should be consistently utilized in all content areas for instructional writing activities and assessments. - Instructional strategies are not consistent for teaching various ELA standards among teachers on each grade level. - Instructional assignments and assessment are developed and implemented on Depth of Knowledge Level 1 and 2																																				
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): EL: 34 EL students exited the program 49.1% of our EL students showed proficiency regarding listening. 2025 ACCESS Composite Score Data by Grade Note: ACCESS data include students with a 2025 ACCESS Test Score. <table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Student Count</th><th>1.0-1.9 (%)</th><th>2.0-2.9 (%)</th><th>3.0-3.9 (%)</th><th>4.0-4.9 (%)</th><th>5.0-6.0 (%)</th></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>46</td><td>6.5</td><td>17.4</td><td>37.0</td><td>37.0</td><td>2.2</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>58</td><td>10.3</td><td>15.5</td><td>50.0</td><td>20.7</td><td>3.4</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>59</td><td>8.5</td><td>16.9</td><td>33.9</td><td>40.7</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>ALL</td><td>163</td><td>8.6</td><td>16.6</td><td>40.5</td><td>32.5</td><td>1.8</td></tr></table>	Grade	Student Count	1.0-1.9 (%)	2.0-2.9 (%)	3.0-3.9 (%)	4.0-4.9 (%)	5.0-6.0 (%)	6	46	6.5	17.4	37.0	37.0	2.2	7	58	10.3	15.5	50.0	20.7	3.4	8	59	8.5	16.9	33.9	40.7	-	ALL	163	8.6	16.6	40.5	32.5	1.8	Grade Levels (all students): EL: Speaking category is an area of weakness for our students.
Grade	Student Count	1.0-1.9 (%)	2.0-2.9 (%)	3.0-3.9 (%)	4.0-4.9 (%)	5.0-6.0 (%)																															
6	46	6.5	17.4	37.0	37.0	2.2																															
7	58	10.3	15.5	50.0	20.7	3.4																															
8	59	8.5	16.9	33.9	40.7	-																															
ALL	163	8.6	16.6	40.5	32.5	1.8																															

	Historical CCPI Progress Towards English Language Proficiency Data Note. ELP data include students with two consecutive ACCESS test scores. <table><thead><tr><th rowspan="2">School Year</th><th rowspan="2">Student Count</th><th>No Positive Movement 0 points</th><th>Moved Less Than One Band 0.5 point</th><th>Moved One Band 1.0 point</th><th>Moved More Than One Band 1.5 points</th><th>Progress Toward English Language Proficiency</th></tr><tr><th>(%)</th><th>(%)</th><th>(%)</th><th>(%)</th><th></th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2019</td><td>69</td><td>29.0</td><td>12.0</td><td>18.8</td><td>39.1</td><td>83.95</td></tr><tr><td>2021</td><td>127</td><td>67.7</td><td>6.3</td><td>16.5</td><td>9.4</td><td>33.75</td></tr><tr><td>2022</td><td>155</td><td>42.6</td><td>9.7</td><td>21.9</td><td>25.8</td><td>65.45</td></tr><tr><td>2023</td><td>159</td><td>47.2</td><td>15.7</td><td>18.2</td><td>18.9</td><td>54.40</td></tr><tr><td>2024</td><td>162</td><td>35.8</td><td>9.9</td><td>22.2</td><td>32.1</td><td>75.30</td></tr></tbody></table>						School Year	Student Count	No Positive Movement 0 points	Moved Less Than One Band 0.5 point	Moved One Band 1.0 point	Moved More Than One Band 1.5 points	Progress Toward English Language Proficiency	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		2019	69	29.0	12.0	18.8	39.1	83.95	2021	127	67.7	6.3	16.5	9.4	33.75	2022	155	42.6	9.7	21.9	25.8	65.45	2023	159	47.2	15.7	18.2	18.9	54.40	2024	162	35.8	9.9	22.2	32.1	75.30	
School Year	Student Count	No Positive Movement 0 points	Moved Less Than One Band 0.5 point	Moved One Band 1.0 point	Moved More Than One Band 1.5 points	Progress Toward English Language Proficiency																																																
		(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)																																																	
2019	69	29.0	12.0	18.8	39.1	83.95																																																
2021	127	67.7	6.3	16.5	9.4	33.75																																																
2022	155	42.6	9.7	21.9	25.8	65.45																																																
2023	159	47.2	15.7	18.2	18.9	54.40																																																
2024	162	35.8	9.9	22.2	32.1	75.30																																																
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - ESOL teachers are not utilizing ELlevation with fidelity as well. - General Education teachers are not utilizing and incorporating ELlevation in their instruction. - ESOL push-in and sheltered teachers are not always incorporating various strategies within their classes to support ESOL students.																																																					
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): Utilizing the standard analysis report, the following standards have been mastered per grade level: 6th: - ELAGSE6RI5 – 78% - ELAGSE6RL1 (Priority Standard) – 78% 7th: - ELAGSE8W8 (Priority Standard) – 93% - ELAGSE7RL4 (Priority Standard) – 83% - ELAGSE7RL6 – 79% 8th: - ELAGSE8L1d – 72% - ELAGSE8L2a – 87% - ELAGSE8L4a – 76% - ELAGSE8L4a (Priority Standard) – 75% - ELAGSE8RL3 (Priority Standard) – 78%			Grade Levels (all students): Utilizing the standard analysis report, the following standards have not been mastered per grade level: 6th: - ELAGSE6RI2 (Priority Standard) – 39% - ELAGSE6W5 (Priority Standard) – 40% - ELAGSE6L1c – 41% - ELAGSE6RL9 (Priority Standard) – 49% - ELAGSE6L3a (Priority Standard) – 54% - ELAGSE6L3b – 59% - ELAGSE6L4b – 53% - ELAGSE6RI6 – 58% 7th: - ELAGSE7RL6 (Priority Standard) – 51% - ELAGSE7RL5 – 54% - ELAGSE7W2f (Priority Standard)– 35%																																																		

	○ ELAGSE8W8 – 81% EL: SWD:	○ ELAGSE7RI8 (Priority Standard) – 49% ○ ELAGSE7RI9 (Priority Standard) – 52% ○ ELAGSE7L1b – 60% 8th: ○ ELAGSE8L1a – 67% ○ ELAGSE8L1b – 60% ○ ELAGSE8L3a – 65% ○ ELAGSE8RL2 (Priority Standard) – 33% ○ ELAGSE8RL4 (Priority Standard)– 69% ○ ELAGSE8RL9 – 69% ○ ELAGSE8W4 – 69% EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Additional professional development is needed on the effective use of the Cobb Collaborative Community process. • Professional development is needed on creating assessments that align with the grade level standards • Professional development is needed on the use of the 6 Step Data Team Process with a focus on disaggregating data to inform and plan instruction • Vertical team alignment and data analysis is needed to address students' deficits and strengths. • Professional development is needed on aligning grade level standards to learning targets	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	• Instructional walks had specific focus: classroom management, instructional framework, student-led class instruction, etc. • Teachers are consistently using district provided resources (GADOE Checklist/rubrics) • Teachers are creating learning targets which are aligned to the standards consistently	• Data revealed that teachers do more lecture-based teaching versus student-led instruction. • An instructional walk calendar can be created at the beginning of each semester.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Clear expectations of shared vision and school-wide initiatives are not consistent across the school. • Clear expectations, goals, and vision for each grade/subject are not provided.
--	---

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	Students on each grade level scoring proficient or distinguished on the EOG ELA Assessment will increase by <u>3%-5%</u> from the May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment to May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment. 6th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 27.6% on May 2025 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to 32.6% on the May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment. 7th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 35.9% on May 2025 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to 40.9% on the May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment. 8th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 38.2% on May 2025 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to 43.2% on the May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Clear expectations, goals, and vision for each grade/subject are not provided. - Instructional strategies are not consistent for teaching various ELA standards among teachers on each grade level.		
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 align instruction with grade-level standards and good instructional practice. Implementation Plan: August: - CCC meeting schedule will be created for all subject areas. - All teachers will post learning targets and standards daily. - Admin team will perform compliance walks - Academic Coaches will attend CCC meetings.		
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>			
	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 75% or higher on common formative assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): ☒ Common Formative Assessments ☐ Beacon Assessment Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Weekly ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly		

Teachers will align instruction with grade-level standards and evidence-based practices.	September: • PL – Instructional Framework • PL – Tier 1 strategies • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) • Admin team will perform compliance walks. October: • Admin team will conduct walks to observe Tier 1 strategies. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) November-December: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) January: • Based on grade profiles, targeted intervention plans will be developed for students. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) February-April: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) Artifacts to be Collected: • Walk Data • CCC Monitoring Forms Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ _____ Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: • Teachers will analyze common formative assessments weekly during CCC meetings • Teachers use results to adjust instruction, and to plan enrichment and support. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed	• Instructional assignments and assessment are developed and implemented on Depth of Knowledge Level 1 and 2 • Professional development is needed on creating assessments that align with the grade level standards		
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 give weekly common formative, unit pre and post, and summative assessments and analyze assessment data following each assessment.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 75% or higher on common formative assessments.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: August: • 8/18 – CCCs submit first assessment plan; training on Beacon assessment; PL on Milestones data and breakdowns • Academic coach will conduct PL on how to disaggregate assessment data. • Teachers will review CFAs to monitor students' progress between pre and post assessments. • Beacon data will be reviewed for student achievement and Milestones predictors.	Evaluation Tool(s): ☒ Common Formative/Summative Assessments	
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Weekly (formative) ☒ Beginning and end of each unit	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	September - November: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches)	Data Analysis Plan: • Common formative assessment data will be analyzed by CCCs weekly • Unit assessment data will be analyzed at the beginning and end of each unit. • Beacon data will be analyzed in August and December	
Teachers will give weekly common formative, unit pre & post assessments, and summative assessments and analyze the data following each assessment.	December: • Beacon data will be reviewed for student achievement and Milestones predictors. • PL – Assessment audits January: • Based on grade profiles, targeted intervention plans will be developed for students. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches)	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

	February-April: Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) Artifacts to be Collected: CCC Agendas Usage reports from CTLS Assess Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed	- ESOL teachers are not utilizing ELlevation with fidelity as well. - General Education teachers are not utilizing and incorporating ELlevation in their instruction. - ESOL push-in and sheltered teachers are not always incorporating various strategies within their classes to support ESOL students. - Vertical team alignment and data analysis is needed to address students' deficits and strengths.		
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 use targeted interventions during the enrichment block for students based on data. Implementation Plan: August: - PL on RTI process and Tier 1 strategies. Teams will pick their RTI representative for the grade level. - PL on IXL usage and set-up - Review ELL students by ACCESS data to adjust schedules in Vista class. - Beacon data will be reviewed for students and student groups in need of targeted interventions September: - Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) - PL – Our ACCESS scores and what they mean - PL – ELlevation training. Grade levels will create their list of Tier 1 strategies for interventions October-November: - Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) - Enrichment block will begin after September break. Students will be assigned specific IXL lessons based on weekly formative assessments in ELA and Math. December:	Evaluation Performance Target: 65% of students will score on or above grade level on the IXL diagnostic assessment by Spring 2026. Evaluation Tool(s): IXL Diagnostic Data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ As assigned by IXL (approx. 1-2x per month) Data Analysis Plan: - Teachers will analyze IXL Levels at a glance report at least 3 times a year Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ 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>			
Teachers will use targeted interventions during the enrichment block for students based on IXL data.			

	• Beacon data will be reviewed for students in need of targeted interventions • PL – Assessment audits January: • Based on Beacon data, targeted intervention plans will be developed for students. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) February: • Review data from ACCESS testing • Monthly RTI meetings to monitor student progress March-April: • Monthly RTI meetings to monitor student progress. Artifacts to be Collected: • IXL Usage reports • Tutoring logs • CCC Agendas • RTI documents • Vista data (ELLs) Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed	Clear expectations of shared vision and school-wide initiatives are not consistent across the school.		
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 design content-specific activities focused on increasing reading comprehension schoolwide. Implementation Plan: August: - Review Lexile data by grade level. - Students will be provided their current Lexile level. - Every student will be on a rotation to check books out in the media center. - ELA/Reading teachers will create vocabulary words of the week. - Academic vocabulary for each content will be highlighted. - Social Studies and Science teachers will focus on text/articles for students to read in their content. - Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) September: - Beanstack minute competition from the Media Center monthly. - Media center will conduct a reading campaign to encourage student book check out and reading to increase checkout numbers. - Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) October: - Social Studies and Science teachers will focus on text/articles for students to read in their content. - PL – Pulling articles for multiple Lexile Levels	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will show an increase in Lexile score from fall 2025 to spring 2026 as measured by the Beacon assessment. Evaluation Tool(s): Beacon Lexile Data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: - Beacon Lexile Data will be analyzed after each administration. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ 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> Teachers will design content-specific activities focused on increasing reading comprehension schoolwide.			

	November: - Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) December: - Beacon data will be reviewed for Lexile growth. January: - Based on Beacon data, targeted intervention plans will be develop for students. - Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) February-April: - Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) Artifacts to be Collected: - CCC Agendas - Media Center checkout logs - Beanstack minutes recorded Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	--	--	--

Math DATA				
Math Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	24.9	25.5	21.5	17.8
7 th Grade	23.6	23.4	29.2	26.5
8 th Grade	22.3	31.8	35.8	47.2

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
6 th Grade	71%	26%	3%	50%	43%	6%	49%	43%	8%	57%	40%	3%
7 th Grade	63%	29%	7%	60%	34%	4%	60%	34%	4%	60%	32%	7%
8 th Grade	72%	20%	8%	67%	23%	9%	58%	33%	9%	65%	27%	8%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY24 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	Grade Levels (all students): - The 6th grade cohort from SY 23 increased their proficient and distinguished percentage from 25.5% to 46.8 % as 8th graders in SY 25 on the Math EOG. - The 7th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished increased from 21.5 % as 6th graders to 26.5 % as 7th graders on the 2025 Math EOG - The 6th grade students moved 21 students from level 1 beginning to level 2 developing or higher on the Math EOG Milestones. - EL: No current data - SWD: No current data	Grade Levels (all students): 25 6th grade students decreased in achievement levels on the 2025 Math EOG. EL: No current data SWD: No current data

Beacon Assessment – MATH
(Grade Level & Subgroups)

For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD
6-8 (all students):

- Based on the Beacon results in Math, our 6th- to 8th-grade students have demonstrated strengths in **Measurement and Data Reasoning**, with 42 % of students scoring **Near Target or Prepared**.
 - Based on the 6th grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning**, with 41% of students scoring in the **Near Target and Prepared** areas.
- Every grade level showed growth in the prepared category from the Fall to the Spring BEACON administration. The support needed and the near target category percentages decreased for all categories as well from the Fall to the Spring.

6th Grade	Fall Beacon	Spring Beacon
Support Needed	73%	
Near Target	2%	
Prepared	1%	

7th Grade	Fall Beacon	Spring Beacon
Support Needed	65%	
Near Target	33%	
Prepared	2%	

8th Grade	Fall Beacon	Spring Beacon
Support Needed	72%	
Near Target	23%	
Prepared	5%	

EL:

- The beacon assessment scores indicate that 32% of 7th grade EL students are scoring in the **Near Target or Prepared** on the overall assessments

For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD
6-8 (all students):

- Based on the Beacon results in Math, 6th grade students demonstrated weaknesses in **Numerical Reasoning** with 71% at the **Support Needed** level.
- Based on the Beacon results in Math, 8th grade students demonstrated weaknesses in **Numerical Reasoning** with 72% at the **Support Needed** level.

EL:

-

SWD:

-

	• There are currently no strengths for 7th or 8th EL students on the Beacon assessment SWD: • There are currently no strengths for SWD on the Beacon assessment.	
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: • Instruction may not have been clearly aligned with state standards or the rigor of the EOG Milestones. • Teachers might have focused on procedural skills rather than conceptual understanding and application, which resulted in lower test scores. • Professional development is needed on the use of the 6 Step Data Team Process with a focus on disaggregating data to inform and plan instruction. Without data-driven practices, instruction might not have been responsive to student needs. • Vertical team alignment and data analysis is needed to address students' deficits and strengths. • Ineffective or inconsistent use of instructional strategies • Gaps in foundational skills	
☐ Math Common Assessments	Grade Levels (all students): • 6th grade students scored 75% or higher on Unit 3 common assessment Rates, Ratios and Proportions. • 8th grade students average a score of 70% or greater on common assessments focused on patterns functions and algebra. EL: SWD:	Grade Levels (all students): • There is currently a lack of consistent and aligned common assessment data for 6th & 7th grade math, making it difficult to accurately identify students' strengths and areas of need. EL: SWD:
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction	Root Cause Explanation: • Professional development is needed on creating assessments that align with the grade level standards.	

☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	- Professional development is needed on the use of the 6 Step Data Team Process with a focus on disaggregating data to inform and plan instruction - Limited Use of Data to Drive Instruction - Inconsistent and lack of common assessments - Assessments may not be aligned to the depth of knowledge (DOK) levels expected on each standard	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	- Instructional walks were completed using a forms document (created by Ms. Franco) as well as written and electronic feedback (created by myself and Dr. Shaw) was given to teachers immediately after walks were completes. - Instructional walks had specific focus: classroom management, instructional framework, student-led class instruction, etc. - Teachers are creating learning targets which are aligned to the standards consistently	- Data reveled that students consistently completed DOK 1 level questions and their lack of conceptual learning. There was a lack of productive struggle. - There was no instructional walk calendar created. This could be done at the beginning of each semester. - We didn't get an opportunity to walk using the form as often as we would like to, so increase usage and feedback to teachers is recommended.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☒ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Clear expectations of shared vision and school-wide initiatives are not consistent across the school. - Clear expectations, goals, and vision for each grade/subject are not provided.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	Students on each grade level scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG Assessment will increase 3-5% from the May 2025 EOG Math Assessment to May 2026 EOG Math Assessment. • 6th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 17.7% on May 2025 Math EOG Assessment to 22.7% on May 2026 Math EOG Assessment. • 7th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 26.5% on May 2025 Math EOG Assessment to 30.5% on May 2026 Math EOG Assessment. • 8th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 47.2% on May 2025 Math EOG Assessment to 51.2% on May 2026 Math Assessment.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Instruction may not have been clearly aligned with state standards or the rigor of the EOG Milestones. • Teachers might have focused on procedural skills rather than conceptual understanding and application, which resulted in lower test scores. • Professional development is needed on how to incorporate hands on activities to build conceptual understanding.		
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 align instruction with grade-level standards and good instructional practice. Implementation Plan: August: • CCC meeting schedule will be created for all subject areas. • All teachers will post learning targets and standards daily. • Admin team will perform compliance walks • Academic Coaches will attend CCC meetings.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 75% or higher on common formative assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): ☒ Common Formative Assessments ☐ Beacon Assessment Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Weekly ☐ Every 2 weeks	Math Teachers, Administration, Academic Coaches
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>			

Teachers will align instruction with grade-level standards and evidence-based practices.	September: • PL – Instructional Framework • PL – Tier 1 strategies • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) • Admin team will perform compliance walks. October: • Admin team will conduct walks to observe Tier 1 strategies. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) November-December: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) January: • Based on grade profiles, targeted intervention plans will be developed for students. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) February-April: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) Artifacts to be Collected: • Walk Data • CCC Monitoring Forms Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ _____ Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: • Teachers will analyze common formative assessments weekly during CCC meetings • Teachers use results to adjust instruction, and to plan enrichment and support. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
---	---	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed	• Instructional assignments and assessment are developed and implemented on Depth of Knowledge Level 1 and 2 • Professional development is needed on creating assessments that align with the grade level standards		
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 give weekly common formative, unit pre and post, and summative assessments and analyze assessment data.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 75% or higher on common formative assessments.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: August: • 8/18 – CCCs submit first assessment plan; training on Beacon assessment; PL on Milestones data and breakdowns • Academic coach will conduct PL on how to disaggregate assessment data. • Teachers will review CFAs to monitor students' progress between pre and post assessments. • Beacon data will be reviewed for student achievement and Milestones predictors.	Evaluation Tool(s): ☒ Common Formative/Summative Assessments	
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Weekly (formative) ☒ Beginning and end of each unit	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	September - November: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches)	Data Analysis Plan: • Common formative assessment data will be analyzed by CCCs weekly • Unit assessment data will be analyzed at the beginning and end of each unit. • Beacon data will be analyzed in August and December	
Teachers will give weekly common formative, unit pre & post assessments, and summative assessments and analyze the data.	December: • Beacon data will be reviewed for student achievement and Milestones predictors. • PL – Assessment audits January: • Based on grade profiles, targeted intervention plans will be developed for students. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) February-April:	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	

	Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) Artifacts to be Collected: CCC Agendas Usage reports from CTLS Assess Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☐ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed	• ESOL teachers are not utilizing ELlevation with fidelity as well. • General Education teachers are not utilizing and incorporating ELlevation in their instruction. • ESOL push-in and sheltered teachers are not always incorporating various strategies within their classes to support ESOL students. • Vertical team alignment and data analysis is needed to address students' deficits and strengths.		
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 use targeted interventions during the enrichment block for students based on data. Implementation Plan: August: • PL on RTI process and Tier 1 strategies. Teams will pick their RTI representative for the grade level. • PL on IXL usage and set-up • Review ELL students by ACCESS data to adjust schedules in Vista class. • Beacon data will be reviewed for students and student groups in need of targeted interventions September: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) • PL – Our ACCESS scores and what they mean • PL – ELlevation training. Grade levels will create their list of Tier 1 strategies for interventions October-November: • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on action steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) • Enrichment block will begin after September break. Students will be assigned specific IXL lessons based on weekly formative assessments in ELA and Math. December:	Evaluation Performance Target: 65% of students will score on or above grade level on the IXL diagnostic assessment by Spring 2026. Evaluation Tool(s): IXL Diagnostic Data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ As assigned by IXL (approx. 1-2x per month) Data Analysis Plan: • Teachers will analyze IXL Levels at a glance report at least 3 times a year Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ 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>			
Teachers will use targeted interventions during the enrichment block for students based on IXL data.			

	• Beacon data will be reviewed for students in need of targeted interventions • PL – Assessment audits January: • Based on Beacon data, targeted intervention plans will be developed for students. • Monthly academic meetings to review progress on Action Steps (admin, leadership team, coaches) February: • Review data from ACCESS testing • Monthly RTI meetings to monitor student progress March-April: • Monthly RTI meetings to monitor student progress. Artifacts to be Collected: • IXL Usage reports • Tutoring logs • CCC Agendas • RTI documents • Vista data (ELLs) Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly		
--	---	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required <u>Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline</u> 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.	August 28, 2025		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required <u>Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline</u> 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 1- November 3, 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required <u>Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline</u> 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 30, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required <u>FOUR Building Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy)</u> 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	October 2, 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	February 5, 2026		
5. Required <u>Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school)</u> Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. <u>Briefly describe the transition activities here:</u>	Rising 6 th Grade March 25, 2026		☐ 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. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u>		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities (<i>Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6</i>)							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	“Shall” 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.	Team Lead
Fall Festival	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			October 18, 2025	Parents will sign in upon arrival. Parents will complete a survey upon completion of the event to give feedback about the event	
Literacy & Math Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			November 6, 2025	Parents will sign in upon arrival. Parents will complete a survey upon completion of the event to give feedback about the event	
Stem Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4			March 12, 2026	Parents will sign in upon arrival. Parents will complete a survey upon completion of the event to give feedback about the event	

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. <u>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.)</u>	
SCHOOL RESPONSE: Floyd’s school-wide Improvement Plan was developed based on a triangulation of data results that related to students’, teachers’ and staff academics, behavior, and social needs. Various teacher-leaders and administrators who serve on the Building Leadership Team reviewed and disaggregated local, school and State standardized test results. A collection of school-wide data was assessed by BLT members to determine how to best allocate financial and human resources to meet the needs of students, teachers, and staff.	
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 school regularly monitors the implementation of the School Improvement Plan through various formats. Weekly and monthly Cobb Collaborative Community meetings are conducted with administrators, teachers, and staff to share information related to students', teachers', and staff academic, behavior, and social needs, progress, and performance. The focus of discussion is centered on the 4 CCC Questions and students' learning results. The information is communicated and shared in the following: faculty meetings, grade level meetings, grade level content meetings, vertical content meetings.

Floyd administrative team conducts weekly meetings with Academic Coaches and the Professional Counseling Team, social worker and Community In Schools Liaison to review and obtain updates from the weekly formal and informal teacher observations, Cobb Collaborative Community grade level and content meetings, and students' assessment results. Based on feedback and updates from the above stakeholders, celebrations, adjustments, and support are provided based on students' and staff needs.

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:

School-wide academic, social, behavior, and health surveys, software usage reports, and Title I Logic Model are reviewed, developed, and administered by administrators, Academic Coaches, teachers, and Professional School Counselors to monitor and determine the usage and effective of school-wide programs, particularly for students who are not meeting and achieving grade level state standards.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

Teachers will frequently monitor the academic performance of students by giving pre- and post-unit tests and weekly common assessments. Data will be analyzed to identify strengths and areas of improvement. Grade level content teachers will conduct weekly CCC meetings to address lesson plans, the

impact of interventions, and discuss necessary adjustments. The academic coaches and administration team will provide professional development as needed. The schoolwide plan is regularly reviewed, revised, and refined based on the latest data to ensure continuous improvement.

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:

Floyd Middle School has implemented a school-wide behavior tiered process that includes students, parents, teachers, staff, and administrators. Utilizing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) framework and best practices, students are taught the school-wide behavior expectations for the classroom, hallways, cafeteria, restrooms, and bus during on-going Advisement lessons and grade level class meetings and rewarding students for demonstrating the appropriate behavior.

Teachers also utilize progressive discipline processes when redirecting students’ inappropriate behavior, which includes teaching and redirecting students, conferencing with students; contacting parents to partner with the school, providing silent lunch; providing detention; conducting a parent, student, teacher conference; providing a referral for In-school or Out-of-school suspension.

Students who need a more progressive behavior plan are placed on an individual behavior success plan that supports specific behavior needs. Professional school counselors provide “check and connect” one-on-one support for students daily. Students who need additional support are placed on Tier 2 RTI process.

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:

Various professional development sessions are developed and implemented to school personnel to improve instruction, use of data, and to recruit and retain effective teachers on the following topics: New Teacher Orientation (local school level), Mentors for New Teachers, Cobb Collaborative Community training with CCC leaders on-going professional development; Developing Teacher Leaders Building Leadership Team), Constructing Effective Learning Targets, Developing Effective Assessments, School-wide Grading, Family and Parent Engagement, Conducting Student-led Conferences, Using Technology for Student Engagement, ESOL Support Strategies, and On-going monthly Special Education Professional Development sessions are conducted.

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:

Floyd Middle School staff will partner with the feeder high schools to implement activities that will support 8th grade students transitioning to 9th grade. The 8th Grade Professional School Counselor will provide lessons on student's individual graduation plans, which include dual-enrollment, Advance Placement, and selection of Elective courses. Classroom lessons will be provided in the magnet school application process. Students will also visit Cobb Innovation and Technology Academy to tour the campus and attend specialized program sessions, such as: Computer Science, healthcare, construction, cybersecurity, and networking.

High school magnet coordinators and leaders visit Floyd Middle School to provide an overview of the 6 Cobb County Schools magnet programs.

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	The Parent Facilitator will support the overall instructional program at Floyd Middle School by creating community and family partnerships, conducting professional learning sessions to parents, teachers, and staff, and providing frequent communications to parents on the academic programs, events, and student information.
Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Develop, implement, and facilitate standards-based instruction that supports students in understanding and mastering English Language Arts Reading and Writing Performance Standards.
Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Develop, implement, and facilitate standards-based instruction that supports students in understanding and mastering English Language Arts Reading and Writing Performance Standards.
	☐ 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	Students on each grade level scoring proficient or distinguished on the EOG ELA Assessment will increase by <u>3%-5%</u> from the May 2025 EOG ELA Assessment to May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment. • 6th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 27.6% on May 2025 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to 32.6% on the May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment. • 7th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 35.9% on May 2025 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to 40.9% on the May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment. • 8th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 38.2% on May 2025 EOG ELA (English Language Arts) Assessment to 43.2% on the May 2026 EOG ELA Assessment.
Goal #2	Students on each grade level scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG Assessment will increase 3-5% from the May 2025 EOG Math Assessment to May 2026 EOG Math Assessment. • 6th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 17.7% on May 2025 Math EOG Assessment to 22.7% on the May 2026 Math EOG Assessment. • 7th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 26.5% on May 2025 Math EOG Assessment to 30.5% on the May 2026 Math EOG Assessment. • 8th Grade students scoring proficient or distinguished will increase from 46.8% on May 2025 Math EOG Assessment to 50.8% on the May 2026 Math Assessment.