

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A and 1003a School Improvement Grant



School Year:	2025 - 2026
School Name:	City View Elementary School
Principal Name:	Dr. Barbara Swinney
Date Submitted:	June 9, 2025
Revision Date(s):	June 12, 2025

APPROVED

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	City View Elementary School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Barbara Swinney
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Barbara.Swinney@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	770-819-2553
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:

City View Elementary school sought and included advice from various stakeholders through a series of structured meetings and feedback sessions. Teachers and staff participated in departmental meetings, classroom observations, data presentations, and surveys to share their insights. School, state, and district leaders organized regular forums with teachers and other specialized instructional support personnel to gather their perspectives. Parents were engaged through surveys, parent-teacher association (PTA) meetings, and annual title 1 input meetings ensuring their voices were heard. Additionally, the school collaborated with community partners and other stakeholders to integrate diverse viewpoints into decision-making processes.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	4/30/25		
----------------	---------	--	--

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
TEACHER - K LEAD	SHARISSE WILSON	S. Wilson
MTSS/RTI Coordinator	Leah Benour	Leah Benour
Teacher 3rd Lead	Daphne Harp	Daphne Harp
Teacher 1st Lead	Courtney Davis	Courtney Davis
Teacher 2nd Lead	Camille Norris	Camille Norris
Special Ed.	Jennifer Lanno	Jennifer M. Lanno
Coach	Monica McElveen	Monica McElveen
Coach	Brandi Chastain	Brandi Chastain
5th Team Lead	Asia Alexander	Asia Alexander
Teacher - Specialist	Joseph Pitman	Joseph Pitman
ESOL Lead	Gaby Lopez	Gaby Lopez
Lead Paraprofessional	Demetrius Munn	Demetrius Munn
Specialist head	Shantae Crawford	Shantae Crawford
media specialist	Tanya Walker	Tanya Walker
Principal	Barbara Swinney	Barbara Swinney
Assistant Principal	James Groover	James Groover

City View Elementary

FY26 Title I School Improvement Plan

4

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).

<p>Previous Year's Goal #1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of K-2nd grade students at City View ES demonstrating at or above grade level reading ability will increase by at least 5% from August 2024 (Fall) to May 2025 (Spring) as measured by Lexile Scores on iReady. The percentage of students in 3rd-5th grade at City View ES, scoring Developing (Level 2) or higher in ELA on the Georgia Milestones End-of-Grade Assessment, will increase from 33% to 45% as measured by the 2024-2025 Georgia Milestone Assessment administered in May 2025. 																																
<p>Was the goal met? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Partially</p>																																	
<p>What data supports the outcome of the goal?</p>	<p>Grades 3-5 Georgia Milestones ELA Results for 2024-2025</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Beg</th> <th>Dev</th> <th>Prof</th> <th>Dist</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3rd Grade ELA</td> <td>59.59</td> <td>19.63</td> <td>12.25</td> <td>8.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4th Grade ELA</td> <td>50.14</td> <td>30</td> <td>13.43</td> <td>6.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 Grade ELA</td> <td>42.63</td> <td>37.13</td> <td>17.88</td> <td>2.88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>K-2 Lexile Data</p> <p><i>i-Ready EOY</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Category</th> <th>% of Students</th> <th>Number of Students</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mid or Above Grade Level</td> <td>37.88%</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 Grade Level Below</td> <td>32.58%</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Early On Grade Level</td> <td>29.55%</td> <td>39</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Beg	Dev	Prof	Dist	3rd Grade ELA	59.59	19.63	12.25	8.88	4th Grade ELA	50.14	30	13.43	6.43	5 Grade ELA	42.63	37.13	17.88	2.88	Category	% of Students	Number of Students	Mid or Above Grade Level	37.88%	50	1 Grade Level Below	32.58%	43	Early On Grade Level	29.55%	39
	Beg	Dev	Prof	Dist																													
3rd Grade ELA	59.59	19.63	12.25	8.88																													
4th Grade ELA	50.14	30	13.43	6.43																													
5 Grade ELA	42.63	37.13	17.88	2.88																													
Category	% of Students	Number of Students																															
Mid or Above Grade Level	37.88%	50																															
1 Grade Level Below	32.58%	43																															
Early On Grade Level	29.55%	39																															

Reflecting on Outcomes

<p>If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement daily small group instruction based on student performance in phonics and comprehension. • Weekly writing prompts aligned with Milestones expectations. • Teacher Collaboration to create targeted lessons to support areas of need after analyzing Common Formative Assessment • Teachers need additional professional learning on using data to inform instructional practices
<p>If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?</p>	

Previous Year's Goal #2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage of students in 3rd-5th grade at City View ES scoring Developing (Level 2) or higher in Math, on the Georgia Milestones End of Grade Assessment will increase from 40% to 44% as measured by the 2024-2025 Georgia Milestone Assessment administered in May 2025. 																							
Was the goal met? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Partially																								
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<p>Grades 3-5 Georgia Milestones Math Results for 2024-2025</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="453 383 1161 643"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Beg</th> <th>Dev</th> <th>Prof</th> <th>Dist</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3rd Grade Math</td> <td>36</td> <td>41.75</td> <td>16.88</td> <td>5.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4th Grade Math</td> <td>33.29</td> <td>34.29</td> <td>22.89</td> <td>9.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5th Grade Math</td> <td>44</td> <td>35.38</td> <td>15.75</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Beg	Dev	Prof	Dist	3rd Grade Math	36	41.75	16.88	5.5	4th Grade Math	33.29	34.29	22.89	9.29	5th Grade Math	44	35.38	15.75	5
	Beg	Dev	Prof	Dist																				
3rd Grade Math	36	41.75	16.88	5.5																				
4th Grade Math	33.29	34.29	22.89	9.29																				
5th Grade Math	44	35.38	15.75	5																				
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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of common formative and summative assessments for reteaching and enriching. Use of collaborative planning to analyze student performance data. 																							

Previous Year's Goal #3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By May 2025, increase the percentage of indicators from below operational at City View ES from 12% (3 areas) to 80% operational (in 16 areas), as indicated by the GADOE/GSCI Comprehensive Needs Assessment April 2024.
<p style="text-align: center;"> Was the goal met? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Partially </p>	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<p>From Fall '24 to Spring '25, the school showed improvement with 7 of 16 indicators now meeting or exceeding the 66% proficiency target.</p> <p>Key indicator improvements include mission alignment (+25%), vision implementation (+16.7%), organizational structures (+25%), tools utilization (+50%), needs assessment, standards analysis (from 0% to 66.7%), and metrics (+75%)</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Reflecting on Outcomes</p>	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and revise the collaborative planning protocol to ensure it supports teacher deepening their understanding of the prepared learning plans and lesson rehearsal Provide support for teachers in vetting assessments, student tasks, and lesson plans that fully address the DOK level of the 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?	

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

ELA DATA

ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	15.7%	18.2%	21.2%
4 th Grade	16.8%	17.5%	19%
5 th Grade	12.4%	30%	21%

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	32%	37%	32%	43%	39%	18%	31%	47%	22%	35%	43%	21%	35%	42%	23%
2 nd Grade	45%	25%	30%	48%	25%	28%	41%	35%	25%	46%	28%	25%	28%	35%	27%

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
3 rd Grade	21%	72%	7%	22%	64%	14%	24%	65%	12%	17%	72%	12%	16%	72%	12%	29%	62%	10%	42%	45%	13%	26%	63%	11%
4 th Grade	27%	64%	12%	24%	64%	12%	26%	65%	9%	27%	63%	10%	23%	69%	8%	22%	63%	15%	45%	45%	10%	27%	62%	12%
5 th Grade	27%	59%	14%	32%	58%	10%	35%	51%	14%	28%	60%	12%	27%	62%	12%	31%	58%	11%	51%	43%	6%	37%	54%	9%

Overall Performance Analysis

K-2 i-Ready EOY

Category	% of Students	Number of Students
1 Grade Level Below	37.04%	150
Mid or Above Grade Level	32.35%	131
Early On Grade Level	18.52%	75
2 Grade Levels Below	12.10%	49

1st-2nd Beacon Spring

Category	% of Students	Number of Students
Support Needed	40.53%	107
Near Target	35.98%	95
Prepared	23.48%	62

K-2 Amira Grade Level

Category	% of Students	Number of Students
Below Grade Level	67.67%	270
On or Above Grade Level	32.33%	129

Grade-Level Performance Analysis

Grade: Kindergarten (KK)

KK i-Ready EOY

Category	% of Students	Number of Students
Mid or Above Grade Level	37.88%	50
1 Grade Level Below	32.58%	43
Early On Grade Level	29.55%	39

KK Amira Grade Level

Category	% of Students	Number of Students
Below Grade Level	74.81%	98
On or Above Grade Level	25.19%	33

Student Subgroup Performance Analysis

Amira- K-2

Grade Level	On or Above Levels Ranges (ARM Score)	Number of Students on or above	Percentage of Students on or above	Total Students
KK All	1.14 or higher	29	22.1%	131
KK SWD	1.14 or higher	5	3.8%	131
KK ELLs	1.14 or higher	7	5.3%	131
1 st All	2.12 or higher	30	22.6%	133
1 st SWD	2.12 or higher	1	0.7%	133
1 st ELLs	2.12 or higher	13	9.7%	133
2 nd All	3.57 or higher	24	17.6%	136
2 nd SWD	3.57 or higher	1	0.7%	136
2 nd ELLs	3.57 or higher	9	6.6%	136

I-Ready K-2

K-2 i-Ready All Students EOY

Category	% of Students	Number of Students
1 Grade Level Below	37.04%	150
Mid or Above Grade Level	32.35%	131
Early On Grade Level	18.52%	75
2 Grade Levels Below	12.10%	49

K-2nd i-Ready by Subgroups

Subgroups	Number of Students on or above	Percentage of Students on or above	Total Students
SWD	18	4.4%	405
ELLs	71	17.5%	405

Beacon by Subgroup (Percentages)					
Grade Level	Subgroup	Subject	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
1st	ELL	ELA	46	44	10
		Math	29	56	15
	SWD	ELA	25	75	0
		Math	25	50	25
2nd	ELL	ELA	61	23	16
		Math	29	63	8
	SWD	ELA	77	15	8
		Math	31	62	8
3rd	ELL	ELA	29	71	0
		Math	21	79	0
	SWD	ELA	25	63	13
		Math	38	50	13
4th	ELL	ELA	21	75	4
		Math	47	53	0
	SWD	ELA	40	50	10
		Math	64	36	0
5th	ELL	ELA	47	53	0
		Math	90	10	0
	SWD	ELA	29	71	0
		Math	57	43	0

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students scoring proficient or distinguish in 3rd and 4th grade both increased by 3% from the previous year EL: n/a SWD: n/a	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 79% of all students scored below proficient and distinguished on the GMAS in ELA. EL: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 4th grade only increased their percentage to proficient and distinguished by 0.7 on the EOG in ELA. 60% of ELLs in 5th grade scored level 1 (beginning) on GMAS in ELA SWD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grades 3 - 5 has 64.3% at level 1 (beginning) in ELA 71% in 3rd and 4th grade scored level 1 (beginning) on GMAS in ELA
SY24 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From SY 23 to SY 24, the 5th Grade proficient and distinguished percentage has increased from 12.4% to 30% on the ELA EOG EL: 2023: 28.06% 2024: 35.40% EL exceeded the goal with an increase in ELA of 7%. Readiness increased by 5%, exceeding the goal. SWD:	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): EL: SWD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-5 SWD 64.3% at level 1 (beginning)

Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st grade ELA- demonstrated strengths in Foundations, with 69% scoring Near Target or Prepared. 2nd grade ELA- demonstrated strengths in Constructing Text, with 62 % scoring Near Target or Prepared. Based on the 3rd grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated strengths in Reading Text type, with 84% scoring Near Target or Prepared in both Literary and informational text. Based on the 4th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated strengths in Writing Text Types and Purpose, with 78% scoring Near Target or Prepared. Based on the 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated strengths in Key Ideas & Details, with 73% scoring Near Target or Prepared. <p>EL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment scores indicate the 81% of EL students scored in the Near Target or Prepared range for ELA in the 3rd Grade. 3rd grade 63% "Near Target," with a small percentage proficient 13% <p>SWD:</p>	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the 1st grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated Weaknesses in Language, with 43% scoring Support Needed. Based on the 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in with Language, with 48% scoring Support Needed. Based on the 3rd grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in with Writing Conventions, with 42% scoring Support Needed. Based on the 4th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in with Writing Conventions, with 45% scoring Support Needed. Based on the 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in with Writing Conventions, with 51% scoring Support Needed. <p>EL:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment scores indicate the 50% of EL students scored in the Support Needed range for ELA in the 2nd Grade. 1st grade 46% "Support Needed" and only 10% proficient. <p>SWD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment scores indicate the 77% SWD scored in the Support Needed range for ELA in the 2nd grade 2nd grade 77% "Support Needed" – a significant concern.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The assessment scores indicate the 75% of SWD scored in the Near Target or Prepared range for ELA in the 1st,3rd and 5th grade.• 1st grade 75% of students are "Near Target," indicating progress toward proficiency.• 4th grade 75% "Near Target" with only 21% needing support.																																															
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Instruction inconsistently incorporates academic language and discourse practices.• Teachers may lack the training or resources to effectively scaffold academic language development• Possible lack of targeted grammar and conventions instruction integrated into writing, not taught in isolation.																																															
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): <table><tr><td></td><td>-2.0</td><td>2.0-2.9</td><td>3.0-3.9</td><td>4.0-4.4</td><td>4.5+</td></tr><tr><td>2023</td><td>23.2</td><td>23.5</td><td>37.2</td><td>8.5</td><td>7.6</td></tr><tr><td>2024</td><td>29.1</td><td>24.2</td><td>27.2</td><td>11.9</td><td>7.6</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="7">Table 1: 2024 ACCESS Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) Ranges</th></tr><tr><th>Data</th><th>Below 2.0</th><th>2.0-2.9</th><th>3.0-3.9</th><th>4.0-4.4</th><th>4.5+</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><th>Number of Students</th><td>95</td><td>79</td><td>89</td><td>39</td><td>25</td><td>327</td></tr><tr><th>Percentage</th><td>29.1%</td><td>24.2%</td><td>27.2%</td><td>11.9%</td><td>7.6%</td><td>100.0%</td></tr></table>			-2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.4	4.5+	2023	23.2	23.5	37.2	8.5	7.6	2024	29.1	24.2	27.2	11.9	7.6	Table 1: 2024 ACCESS Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) Ranges							Data	Below 2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.4	4.5+	Total	Number of Students	95	79	89	39	25	327	Percentage	29.1%	24.2%	27.2%	11.9%	7.6%	100.0%
	-2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.4	4.5+																																											
2023	23.2	23.5	37.2	8.5	7.6																																											
2024	29.1	24.2	27.2	11.9	7.6																																											
Table 1: 2024 ACCESS Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) Ranges																																																
Data	Below 2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.4	4.5+	Total																																										
Number of Students	95	79	89	39	25	327																																										
Percentage	29.1%	24.2%	27.2%	11.9%	7.6%	100.0%																																										

	<table><tr><th colspan="7">Table 2: 2025 ACCESS Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) Ranges</th></tr><tr><th>Data</th><th>Below 2.0</th><th>2.0-2.9</th><th>3.0-3.9</th><th>4.0-4.4</th><th>4.5+</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><th>Number of Students</th><td>105</td><td>91</td><td>108</td><td>30</td><td>44</td><td>378</td></tr><tr><th>Percentage</th><td>27.8%</td><td>24.1%</td><td>28.6%</td><td>7.9%</td><td>11.6%</td><td>100.0%</td></tr></table> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In Reading, our students remained the same. The majority of the EL population continued to score between 1.5-1.9 and 2.5-2.9.• Listening as well remained like the year before. However, this year many of our students still scored between 1.5-1.9. The increase was a 5% jump from 9.1%-14.6%.• In Writing 23.7% of our EL population scored between 1.5-1.9, which is a 6% increase compared to the previous year at 17.5%.• Although the majority of our EL students scored between 2.5-3.4 in Speaking, both years, there is still room for growth. Especially since the students in the 1.0-1.4 band jumped from 6.8% to 12.8%, which means we had double the students score in the lower band.	Table 2: 2025 ACCESS Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) Ranges							Data	Below 2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.4	4.5+	Total	Number of Students	105	91	108	30	44	378	Percentage	27.8%	24.1%	28.6%	7.9%	11.6%	100.0%
Table 2: 2025 ACCESS Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) Ranges																													
Data	Below 2.0	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.4	4.5+	Total																							
Number of Students	105	91	108	30	44	378																							
Percentage	27.8%	24.1%	28.6%	7.9%	11.6%	100.0%																							
<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p>Root Cause Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited opportunities for authentic language use across content areas to clarify words, academic words and words with multiple meanings.• Students need ongoing opportunities to apply learning through structured speaking practice and the exchange of ideas with others in a meaningful way• Curriculum implementation may not be targeting the specific language domains effectively (e.g., writing workshops).																												
<p>ELA Common Assessments</p> <p>(Grade Level Reading & Writing)</p>	<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p><u>Kindergarten:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Students demonstrated proficiency or higher (70% or above) on most of the standards assessed on the Common Formative Assessments.			<p>Grade Levels (all students):</p> <p><u>Kindergarten:</u></p> <p>Standards not mastered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ELAGSEKRI2: Students need additional practice identifying the main topic and retelling key details of a text.																									

	<p>Informational Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSEKRI1: 88% - Students effectively asked and answered questions about key details in a text. • ELAGSEKRI3: 76% - Students were able to identify the connection between two individuals, events, ideas, or pieces of information in a text. • ELAGSEKRI4: 77% - Students demonstrated the ability to ask and answer questions about unknown words in a text. • ELAGSEKRI5: 73% - Students showed proficiency in identifying the front cover, back cover, and title page of a book. • ELAGSEKRI6: 92% - Students excelled in naming the author and illustrator of a text and defining the role of each in presenting the ideas or information in a text. • ELAGSEKRI7: 77% - Students used illustrations and details in a text to describe its key ideas. • ELAGSEKRI9: 75% - Students compared and contrasted the adventures and experiences of characters in familiar stories. <p>Literary Standards</p> <p>Kindergarten students also performed well in literary standards, with the following scores:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSEKRL1: 70% - Students demonstrated the ability to ask and answer questions about key details in a text. • ELAGSEKRL2: 86% - Students were able to retell familiar stories, including key details. • ELAGSEKRL3: 85% - Students identified characters, settings, and major events in a story. • ELAGSEKRL4: 75% - Students asked and answered questions about unknown words in a text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSEKRI8: Students should work on identifying the reasons an author gives to support points in a text. • ELAGSEKRL5: Enhancing skills in recognizing common types of texts (e.g., storybooks, poems) and understanding their basic features is necessary. <p><u>1st Grade</u></p> <p>Students in first grade demonstrated a stronger performance on literary standards compared to informational standards on the common formative assessments. Specifically, the grade level averages for the five informational standards that were not mastered ranged from 31% to 69%.</p> <p>Lower scores in informational standards. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE1RI3: Describing connections between events, ideas, or pieces of information in a text. • ELAGSE1RI5: Understanding and utilizing text features (e.g., headings, tables of contents, glossaries) to locate key facts or information. • ELAGSE1RI7: Using illustrations and details in a text to describe its key ideas. • ELAGSE1RI8: Identifying the reasons an author gives to support points in a text. • ELAGSE1RI9: Identifying similarities and differences between two texts on the same topic. <p><u>2nd Grade</u></p> <p>Out of the 17 standards assessed, 11 standards were not mastered, with the majority being informational standards. The scores for these standards ranged from 38% to 68%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notably, two out of the eight classes did not achieve a proficiency score on any of the Common Formative Assessments taken.
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSEKRL6: 73% - Students named the author and illustrator of a story and defined the role of each in telling the story. • ELAGSEKRL7: 78% - Students described the relationship between illustrations and the story in which they appear. • ELAGSEKRL9: 88%- Students compared and contrasted adventures and experiences of characters in familiar stories. <p><u>1st Grade:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE1RI1: 75% - Students effectively asked and answered questions about key details in a text. • ELAGSE1RI2: 76% - Students were able to identify the main topic and retell key details of a text. • ELAGSE1RI4: 72% - Students demonstrated understanding of words and phrases in a text, including those that suggest feelings or appeal to the senses. • ELAGSE1RI6: 76% - Students could distinguish between information provided by pictures or other illustrations and information provided by the words in a text. <p>For <u>literary standards</u>, the students performed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE1RL1: 74% - Students asked and answered questions about key details in a story. • ELAGSE1RL3: 92% - Students described characters, settings, and major events in a story, using key details. • ELAGSE1RL4: 74% - Students identified words and phrases in stories or poems that suggest feelings or appeal to the senses. • ELAGSE1RL6: 76% - Students identified who is telling the story at various points in a text. 	<p>Standards not mastered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE2RI2: Students need to improve in identifying the main topic of a multi-paragraph text as well as the focus of specific paragraphs within the text. • ELAGSE2RI4: Enhancing vocabulary skills to determine the meaning of words and phrases in a text is necessary. • ELAGSE2RI5: Students should work on understanding and using text features (e.g., captions, bold print, subheadings) to locate key facts or information. • ELAGSE2RI6: Developing the ability to identify the main purpose of a text, including what the author wants to answer, explain, or describe, is essential. • ELAGSE2RI7: Students need to improve in explaining how specific images (e.g., a diagram showing how a machine works) contribute to and clarify a text. • <u>3rd Grade:</u> Average scores of 3rd grade Common Formative Assessments focused on literary reading standards (RL1-9) range from 61% to 74%. • Average scores of 3rd grade Common Formative Assessments focused on informational reading standards (RI1-9) range from 30% to 69%. <p><u>4th Grade:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average scores of 4th grade Common Formative Assessments focused on literary reading standards (RL1-9) range from 40% to 77%. • Average scores of 4th grade Common Formative Assessments focused on informational reading standards (RI1-9) range from 25% to 75%. <p><u>5th Grade:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average scores of 5th grade Common Formative Assessments focused on literary reading standards (RL1-9) range from 54% to 85%.
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE1RL7: 88% - Students used illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events. • ELAGSE1RL9: 83% - Students compared and contrasted the adventures and experiences of characters in stories. <p><u>2nd Grade:</u></p> <p>Students demonstrated proficiency or higher (70% or above) on six key standards on the Common Formative Assessments.</p> <p>Informational Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE2RI1: 79% - Students effectively asked and answered questions to demonstrate understanding of key details in a text. • ELAGSE2RI3: 73% - Students were able to describe the connection between a series of historical events, scientific ideas or concepts, or steps in technical procedures in a text. <p>Literary Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE2RL1: 81% - Students demonstrated the ability to ask and answer questions to show understanding of key details in a text. • ELAGSE2RL5: 79% - Students showed proficiency in describing the overall structure of a story, including how the beginning introduces the story, and the ending concludes the action. • ELAGSE2RL5: 79% - Students consistently identified and described the structure of stories, including the sequence of events. • ELAGSE2RL7: 79% - Students used information gained from illustrations and words in a print or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average scores of 5th grade Common Formative Assessments focused on informational reading standards (RI1-9) range from 35% to 84%.
--	---	---

	<p>digital text to demonstrate understanding of its characters, setting, or plot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELAGSE2RL9: 73% - Students compared and contrasted two or more versions of the same story by different authors or from different cultures. 	
<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p>Root Cause Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELA instruction may not fully align to the rigor of the standard and assessment • Limited small group instruction to target diverse learners • More instructional emphasis on Literary standards and Informational standards • Lack of data-driven instruction in whole group and small group settings • Limited understanding of standards and what students are expected to do to show mastery of the standard • Inconsistent use of evidence-based strategies 	

School Instructional Walks
(Grade Level)

School & District Walks

Grades K – 5 Reading Comprehension and Writing Connected to Text

	May 2025 - Final Walk (% of classrooms partially or fully implemented)
Question 2: The teacher engages in gradual release (Teacher models the strategy. The teacher and student apply the strategy together. The student applies the strategy individually or with a peer.	47% (+29)
Question 3: The teacher activates background knowledge and addresses tier I, II or III words to support students with accessing the text.	50% (+5)
Question 4: The teacher includes opportunities for student discussions to support reading comprehension.	61% (+16)
Question 5: The learning target and instructional activity students are engaged in align.	86% (+14)
Question 5: The learning target and instructional activity students are engaged in align.	90% (+4)

School & District Walks

Grades K – 5 Reading Comprehension and Writing Connected to Text

	May 2025 - Final Walk (% of classrooms partially or fully implemented)
Question 1: The teacher includes an interactive read-aloud and an evidence-based strategy (before, during or after) to support students with understanding what the text says, what the text means and how the text works.	57% (-16)
Question 1: The teacher asks text-centered questions.	68% (-11)
Question 2: Students have access to the text to help with responding to text-centered questions.	59% (-12)
Question 3: The teacher models writing or thinking aloud with students.	73% (-13)
Question 4: The teacher's instructional language supports connections to other parts of the uninterrupted literacy block (i.e. phonics/word study, vocabulary and reading comprehension).	55% (-2)

	<p>Spring 2025 Instructional Awareness Walkthrough (GaDOE IAW observation tool)</p> <table><tr><th>Indicators</th><th>Percent at Level 3+ (Operational to Exemplary)</th></tr><tr><td>Total Number of Observations</td><td>34</td></tr><tr><td>1. The instructor implements a clear, subject-area appropriate instructional framework with a sense of urgency about how time is used and incorporates smooth transitions.</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>8. The instructor implements strategies to meet specific learning needs of students during the course of the lesson.</td><td>53%</td></tr><tr><td>9. The instructor provides personalized, standards-based instructional feedback to support proficient or distinguished learning.</td><td>67%</td></tr><tr><td>10. Students function in a supportive learning environment created by the teacher, their peers, and other pro-social resources.</td><td>75%</td></tr></table>	Indicators	Percent at Level 3+ (Operational to Exemplary)	Total Number of Observations	34	1. The instructor implements a clear, subject-area appropriate instructional framework with a sense of urgency about how time is used and incorporates smooth transitions.	50%	8. The instructor implements strategies to meet specific learning needs of students during the course of the lesson.	53%	9. The instructor provides personalized, standards-based instructional feedback to support proficient or distinguished learning.	67%	10. Students function in a supportive learning environment created by the teacher, their peers, and other pro-social resources.	75%	<p>Spring 2025 Instructional Awareness Walkthrough (GaDOE IAW observation tool)</p> <table><tr><th>Indicators</th><th>Percent at Level 3+ (Operational to Exemplary)</th></tr><tr><td>Total Number of Observations</td><td>34</td></tr><tr><td>2. The instructor communicates clear learning targets aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.</td><td>39%</td></tr><tr><td>3. The instructor communicates success criteria aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.</td><td>31%</td></tr><tr><td>4. The instructor uses high-yield instructional practices explicitly aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.</td><td>19%</td></tr><tr><td>5. The instructor uses formative assessments (oral or written) to monitor learning and to inform instruction.</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td>6. The instructor establishes and implements rules, schedules, practices, and procedures within the classroom to maximize student learning.</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>7. The students are actively engaged.</td><td>33%</td></tr></table>	Indicators	Percent at Level 3+ (Operational to Exemplary)	Total Number of Observations	34	2. The instructor communicates clear learning targets aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.	39%	3. The instructor communicates success criteria aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.	31%	4. The instructor uses high-yield instructional practices explicitly aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.	19%	5. The instructor uses formative assessments (oral or written) to monitor learning and to inform instruction.	25%	6. The instructor establishes and implements rules, schedules, practices, and procedures within the classroom to maximize student learning.	33%	7. The students are actively engaged.	33%
Indicators	Percent at Level 3+ (Operational to Exemplary)																													
Total Number of Observations	34																													
1. The instructor implements a clear, subject-area appropriate instructional framework with a sense of urgency about how time is used and incorporates smooth transitions.	50%																													
8. The instructor implements strategies to meet specific learning needs of students during the course of the lesson.	53%																													
9. The instructor provides personalized, standards-based instructional feedback to support proficient or distinguished learning.	67%																													
10. Students function in a supportive learning environment created by the teacher, their peers, and other pro-social resources.	75%																													
Indicators	Percent at Level 3+ (Operational to Exemplary)																													
Total Number of Observations	34																													
2. The instructor communicates clear learning targets aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.	39%																													
3. The instructor communicates success criteria aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.	31%																													
4. The instructor uses high-yield instructional practices explicitly aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard addressed.	19%																													
5. The instructor uses formative assessments (oral or written) to monitor learning and to inform instruction.	25%																													
6. The instructor establishes and implements rules, schedules, practices, and procedures within the classroom to maximize student learning.	33%																													
7. The students are actively engaged.	33%																													
<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p>Root Cause Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning targets and success criteria aligned to the rigor of the standards, need to be explicitly and consistently implemented and communicated to students• Training to meet the academic and behavioral needs of SWD is needed• Explicit and organized instruction in teaching phonemic awareness is needed.• Small group instruction is not consistently implemented and monitored.• Student engagement strategies may need to be consistently implemented																													

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By Spring 2026, the percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring Prepared across ELA domains on the Beacon ELA Spring Assessment will increase from 25% to 29%, as measured by the 2026 Beacon Spring Administration. By May 2026, the percentage of students in grades 3–5 scoring at or above the Developing Learner (Level 2) on the Georgia Milestones ELA Assessment will increase from an average of 49.24% to 53%, as measured by the Spring 2026 Georgia Milestones End-of-Grade Assessment. 		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated time for Writing Connected to Text is not evident in lesson plans. Limited small group instruction to target diverse learners Instruction inconsistently incorporates academic language and discourse practices. Additional training for inclusive practices that benefit all students (e.g., visual supports, scaffolding). Additional training in consistent, explicit and organized instruction in teaching phonemic awareness skills. 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By May 2026, 100% of K-5 ELA teachers will implement data-informed small group instruction, as evidenced by lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs. Implementation Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preplanning: Identify PD/CCC facilitators, ELA leads, support staff, and administrators. Create or adapt small group instructional planning templates and observation tools. Create schedules for PD sessions and collaborative planning time throughout the year. August-September: Provide PL for staff on Wonders resources. Model flexible grouping strategies. Weekly CCC focuses on developing and planning small group lessons based on 	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on Wonders CFA. Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student growth data (common formative assessments data) Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <input type="checkbox"/> _____ 	Wonders
Target Student Group			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Students <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input type="checkbox"/> SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

<p>1. Teachers will implement daily data-driven small group instruction (including writing connected to text, academic language and discourse practices, phonemic awareness skills, visual supports and scaffolding), as evidenced by lesson plans and instructional walks.</p>	<p>student data. Teachers begin implementing small groups in reading.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October-December: Teachers continue to use formative and Beacon assessment data to provide targeted instruction. CCCs analyze student work and data to create flexible groups every 4–6 weeks. Admin and support staff provide ongoing feedback. • January-February: Analyze midyear assessment data to adjust flexible groups • March-April: Teachers share student work samples from targeted instruction in CCCs. Admin/coach feedback provided through mini coaching cycles. • May: Staff reflect on implementation and its impact using a structured small group protocol. Review student growth data. <p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PD agendas, sign-ins, and handouts • Teacher lesson plans showing small group structure and differentiation • Student grouping charts • Walkthrough and coaching notes with feedback • Collaborative planning meeting agendas/minutes focused on small group planning <p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders</p> <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p> <p>Monthly</p>	<p>Data Analysis Plan:</p> <p>Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFA</p> <p>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads</p>	
---	---	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited small group instruction to target diverse learners. Teachers need guidance on aligning the rigor of the standard to the lesson/learning experience Teachers need guidance in determining what students are expected to do to show mastery of the standard 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, 100% of grade level teams will participate in collaborative planning resulting in teams scoring operational in 13/16 indicators on the High Impact Rubric.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on Wonders CFA.	Wonders GADOE High Impact Rubric for Collaboration
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August-May: Calibration walks. Unpack the high impact rubric. Admin and teacher leaders develop “look fors” for high impact rubric indicators. Teams use internalization protocols to review and develop standards-based lessons. Artifacts to be Collected: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Checklist of descriptors for the operational indicators on the high impact rubric indicators Collaborative planning meeting minutes Planning templates Observation Results from High Impact Rubric Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GADOE High Impact Rubric for Collaboration Common Formative Assessments Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <input type="checkbox"/> _____	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD		Data Analysis Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFA Evaluate the observation Results from High Impact Rubric Person(s) Collecting Evidence: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads	
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 participate weekly in structured collaborative planning and professional development; Ensure instruction aligns to the rigor of the standard through lesson internalization, as evidenced by meeting agendas, minutes, and observations.			

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited opportunities for authentic language use across content areas to clarify words, academic words and words with multiple meanings. Limited opportunities for students to apply learning through structured speaking practices 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teachers will implement Ellevation strategies daily as evidenced by lesson plans and walkthroughs Implementation Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August-September: Conduct kickoff PD session: Introduction to Ellevation and its Strategic Purpose. Highlight priority instructional strategies aligned with ACCESS data October-December: Begin to model short “strategy spotlight” segments in staff meetings. Conduct walkthroughs and gather data on implementation fidelity. Use staff surveys or focus groups to assess comfort, barriers, and next steps. Offer targeted coaching to identified teachers. January-February: Spotlight classrooms using Ellevation strategies effectively. Conduct walkthroughs and gather data on implementation fidelity. Provide peer observations opportunity and to share out in CCCs. March-April: Provide Pd on aligning Ellevation strategies to ACCESS testing to provide language-rich tasks. Analyze EL student progress (ACCESS growth, classroom assessments). May: Analyze EL student progress (ACCESS growth, classroom assessments). 	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of EL students will score 70% or higher on Wonders CFA.	Wonders Ellevation
Target Student Group		Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student growth data (common formative assessments data) 	
<input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EL <input type="checkbox"/> SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <input type="checkbox"/> _____ 	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results from the CFA Walkthrough data and usage reports 	
3. Teachers will implement instructional strategies from Ellevation in grades K-5 daily (to include structured speaking practices and use of academic language), as evidenced by usage reports and walkthrough data.		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Principal <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads 	

	<p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson plans • Usage reports • Walkthrough or notes with strategy evidence <p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders</p> <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p>		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional training of consistent, explicit and organized instruction in teaching phonemic awareness skills. • Additional training in effective management during the ELA block to include small group data driven instruction. 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By May 2026, 100% of K–3 teachers will implement the 7 phonemic awareness indicators daily, as measured by instructional walkthroughs.	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on Wonders CFA.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August-September: Literacy coach and admin conduct initial walkthroughs to collect baseline fidelity data. Collaborative planning begins weekly with a focus on aligning routines, pacing, and analyzing BOY data to identify student needs. • October-December: Conduct classroom modeling and coaching cycles for targeted support. CCCs use data and student work to refine instruction and grouping. Provide job-embedded PD on differentiating phonemic awareness instruction for Tier 2 students. Conduct fidelity checks using walkthrough tools and provide teacher feedback. • January-February: Review formative data. Continue collaborative planning and deepen PD on advanced phonemic tasks (e.g., phoneme manipulation). Host peer observation rounds to build internal capacity. • March-April: Target support for students not meeting benchmarks; plan for Tier 2 small group reinforcement. Share instructional strategies and artifacts from high-implementing classrooms. Continue progress monitoring and analyzing subgroup data (SWD, ELLs). Coach and ELA lead support differentiation and reteaching strategies. • May: Collect and analyze EOY data to assess impact. Conduct final fidelity walkthroughs. Teachers reflect on implementation in CCCs and share practices that worked well. 	Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student growth data (common formative assessments data) 	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFA 	
4. K- 3 teachers will implement structured literacy to include the 7 phonemic awareness indicators in daily lessons, as evidenced by lesson plans and instructional walkthroughs.		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders <input type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads	

	<p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom lesson plans including phonemic awareness routines • Walkthrough forms <p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> K-3 literacy coach and teacher leaders</p> <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p> <p>Weekly</p>		
--	---	--	--

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 rd Grade	20.1	18.2	22.38
4 th Grade	23.5	20.8	32.15
5 th Grade	12.4	23.5	20.75

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)	41%	46%	13%	55%	27%	18%	39%	46%	16%	34%	44%	22%
1st Grade	35%	47%	18%	21%	37%	41%	19%	35%	47%	33%	49%	19%
2nd Grade	36%	49%	16%	35%	43%	22%	41%	38%	21%	22%	49%	29%
3rd Grade	20%	76%	4%	22%	72%	6%	29%	70%	2%	34%	62%	3%
4th Grade	47%	46%	7%	57%	41%	2%	59%	40%	1%	45%	52%	9%
5th Grade	59%	36%	4%	60%	34%	1%	59%	38%	4%	72%	28%	0%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4th grade has the lowest proportion of students (33.29%) in the Beginning category compared to 3rd and 5th. Relatively stronger performance in "Developing" across all grades Roughly 37% of students are developing toward proficiency, indicating that many students may only need targeted support to move up a level. 	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High percentage of students in the Beginning category schoolwide (37.76%). low percentage of students reaching Proficiency (18.49%) and Distinguished (6.60%) 5th grade has the highest rate of students in Beginning (44%) and the lowest in Proficient (15.75%) EL:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4th grade has the highest combined percentage of Proficient + Distinguished (32.15%0. <p>EL:</p> <p>SWD:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EL: 70%-90% (beginning and developing) in math based on the Milestone 2025 results <p>SWD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-5: 70%-90% of SWD 3-5 70%-85% of ELLs are underperforming (beginning and developing) in math based on the Milestone 2025 results
SY24 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From SY23 SY24 the 5th Grade Proficient and Distinguished percentage has increased from 12.4 to 23.5 On the Math EOG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From SY23 to SY24 the 3rd and 4th grade percentage of distinguished and proficient decreased.
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the Kindergarten Beacon results in Math, our students demonstrated strength in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning with 66% of students demonstrating near target or prepared. Based on the 1st grade Beacon results in Math, our students demonstrated strength in Pattern and Algebraic Reasoning 78% of students demonstrating Near Target or Prepared. Based on the 2nd Beacon results in Math, our students demonstrated strength in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning with 78% of students demonstrating Based on the 3rd grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated strengths in Numerical Reasoning with 80% of students demonstrating Near Target or Prepared. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the 5th grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weakness in Numerical Reasoning with 59% in Support Needed. Based on the 5th grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weakness in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning. Based on the 4th grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated weakness in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning with 59% of student scoring in Support Needed.

<p>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment 	<p>Root Cause Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient practice with number sense and computational fluency in earlier grades. • Overreliance on procedures rather than conceptual understanding of operations. • Limited exposure to hands-on, visual-spatial learning activities or manipulatives. • Lack of training for meeting the academic and behavioral needs of SWD. • Small group specialized instruction is not expected or monitored. 	
<p>MATH Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By the end of the school year, about 67% of grade levels (K-5) scored 75% or higher on common formative assessments focused on Measurement and Data Reasoning. • By the end of the school year, nearly 70% of the grade levels (K-5) scored 75% or higher on common formative assessments focused on Geometric and Spatial Reasoning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analysis of common assessment data shows students in grades K-2 scored lower on tests focused on Numerical Reasoning: addition and subtraction. • An end of the year analysis of common formative assessment data shows that students in grades 3-5 scored less than 70% on tests focused on Numerical Reasoning: fractions. <p>The common formative assessment data is listed below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K: 65% Represent addition and subtraction within 10 from a given authentic situation using a variety of strategies. • 1st grade: 67% Determining the unknown number in an addition and subtraction equation relating to 3 whole numbers. • 2nd grade: 61% Fluently add and subtract within 100. • 3rd grade: 52% Recognize and generate equivalent fractions. • 4th grade: 35% Compare two fractions with different numerators and/or different denominators by flexibly using a variety of tools and strategies and recognize that comparisons are valid only when the two fractions refer to the same whole. • 5th grade: 48% Model and solve problems involving multiplication of a fraction and a whole number.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment 	Root Cause Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited small group instruction. • Little evidence of differentiated instruction and strategies to support all learners. • Inconsistent use of effective research based instructional strategies during math instruction. • Limited training on new math standards before being rolled out. 	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive Learning Environment: 75% proficiency • Personalized Feedback: 66.7% Proficiency • Differentiated Instruction: 52% Proficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor uses high-yield instructional practices aligned to the rigor and intent of the standard: 19% proficiency.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment 	Root Cause Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of math content-specific instructional strategies professional development. • Inconsistent use of small group instruction. • Small group specialized instruction is not expected or monitored. • Lack of training for meeting the academic and behavioral needs of SWD. 	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	<p>By Spring 2026, the percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring Prepared across all math domains on the Beacon Math Spring Administration will increase from an average of 23% to 28%, as measured by the 2026 Beacon Spring Assessment.</p> <p>By May 2026, the percentage of students in grades 3 - 5 scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment will increase from an average of 17.6% to 25%, as measured by the 2025 Georgia Milestones End-of-Grade Assessment.</p>		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inconsistent use of small group instruction. Limited exposure to hands-on, visual-spatial learning activities or manipulatives. Lack of additional strategies to meet the academic and behavioral needs of SWD. 		
Funding Source(s) <small>SWP Checklist 5.e</small>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <small>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</small>	Evaluation Plan <small>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</small>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	<p>Implementation Performance Target:</p> <p>By May 2026, 100% of K-5 Math teachers will implement data-informed small group instruction, as evidenced by lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs.</p> <p>Implementation Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August-September: Provide PL for staff on using Math resources (manipulatives-concrete to abstract learning approach, appropriate use of relevant math games). Model flexible grouping strategies. Weekly CCC focus on developing and planning small group lessons based on student 	<p>Evaluation Performance Target:</p> <p>70% of students will score 70% or higher on Wonders CFA.</p> <p>Evaluation Tool(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student growth data (common formative assessments data) <p>Evaluation Plan:</p> <p>Students will be assessed:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks</p>	
Target Student Group			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD			
Action Step <small>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</small>			

<p>1. Teachers will implement daily, data-driven small group instruction (including the use of manipulatives-concrete to abstract learning approach, math reasoning, and scaffolding), as evidenced by lesson plans and instructional walks.</p>	<p>data. Teachers begin implementing small group in reading.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October-December: Teachers continue to use formative and Beacon assessment data to provide targeted instruction. CCCs analyze student work and data to create flexible groups every 4–6 weeks. Admin and support staff provide ongoing feedback. • January-February: Analyze midyear assessment data to adjust flexible groups • March-April: Teachers continue to review, analyze, and share student work samples from targeted instruction in CCCs. Admin/coach feedback provided through mini coaching cycles. • May: Staff reflect on implementation and its impact using a structured small group protocol. Review student growth data. <p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small group lesson plans targeting math standards • Student grouping documents based on assessment data • CCC agendas/minutes showing collaborative planning and progress discussions • Walkthrough forms showing implementation fidelity • Progress monitoring records • Student work samples from intervention tasks • Teacher reflection logs or surveys <p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly/Quarterly</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every other month</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p>Data Analysis Plan:</p> <p>Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFA</p> <p>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math Teacher Leaders</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads</p>	
--	---	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of math content-specific instructional strategies professional development. • Small group specialized instruction is not expected or monitored. • Insufficient practice with number sense and computational fluency in earlier grades. • Overreliance on procedures rather than conceptual understanding of operations. 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, 100% of grade level teams will participate in collaborative planning resulting in teams scoring operational in 13/16 indicators on the High Impact Rubric. Implementation Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August-May: Admin Team and Teacher Leaders will conduct calibration walks; observing teams during collaborative planning sessions, to gather baseline data. Admin Team and Teacher Leaders will develop “look fors” for high impact rubric indicators. Teams will use internalization protocol to review and develop standards-based lessons. Artifacts to be Collected: Collaborative planning agenda, lesson plans, sign in sheets from professional learning sessions, walkthrough data. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring:	Evaluation Performance Target: 70% of students will score 70% or higher on Wonders CFA. Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GADOE High Impact Rubric for Collaboration • Common Formative Assessments Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <input type="checkbox"/> _____ Data Analysis Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade level data teams will evaluate the student results for the CFA • Evaluate the observation Results from High Impact Rubric Person(s) Collecting Evidence: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math Teacher Leaders <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads	
Target Student Group			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. Teachers will participate weekly in structured collaborative planning and professional development; Ensure instruction aligns to the rigor of the standard through lesson internalization, as evidenced by meeting agendas, minutes, and observations.			

	Monthly/Quarterly		
--	-------------------	--	--

ATTENDANCE DATA		
Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 Attendance (Data by grade & subgroup) *10%=18 days Overall Average Daily Attendance=93.7% Kindergarten ADA=93.7% 69% (96 of 140) K students had 7 or more absences in for the 2024-25sy 18% (25 of 14) K students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25 school year First grade ADA=92.9% 62% (88 of 140) 1st grade students had 7 or more absences in for the 2024-25sy	Grade Levels (all students): 3-5 grade had an average daily attendance over 95% Chronic absenteeism (missing 10%+ of school days) is below 17% in several grades: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd grade: 16% • 4th grade: 13% • 2nd grade: 16% 	Grade Levels (all students): Kindergarten ADA is 92.9% First Grade ADA is 93.7% 60% of all students missed 7+ days Kindergarten and 1st grade show the lowest attendance and highest absenteeism: K: 18% chronically absent 69% had 7+ absences 1st: 24% chronically absent (highest of all grades) EL:

<p>24% (34 of 140) 1st grade students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25 school year</p> <p>Second grade ADA=94.1% 51% (71 of 137) 2nd grade students had 7 or more absences in for the 2024-25sy 16% (22 of 137) 2nd grade students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25 school year</p> <p>Third grade ADA=95.3% 53% (69 of 126) 3rd grade students had 7 or more absences in for the 2024-25sy 16% (20 of 126) 3rd grade students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25 school year</p> <p>Fourth grade ADA=95.4% 58% (82 of 141) 4th grade students had 7 or more absences in for the 2024-25sy 13% (18 of 141) grade students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25 school year</p> <p>Fifth grade ADA=95.9 59% (87 of 147) 5th grade students had 7 or more absences in for the 2024-25sy 18% (26 of 147) 5th grade students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25 school year</p> <p>60% of all students had 7 or more absences in for the 2024-25sy 17% of all students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25sy.</p> <p>59% of ELL students had 7 or more absences for the 2024-25sy. 20% of EL students were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25 sy</p> <p>75% of SWD students had 7 or more absences for the 2024-25sy. 34% of SWD were absent 10% or more of the 2024-25sy</p>	<p>EL:</p> <p>ELL chronic absenteeism (20%) is roughly in line with the schoolwide average, showing no significant disparity in chronic absenteeism among ELs.</p> <p>SWD:</p>	<p>SWD:</p> <p>75% of SWD missed 7+ days, and 34% were chronically absent — double the school average.</p>
---	--	---

Check the system impacted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment 	Root Cause Explanation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for social belonging and academic success negatively affects motivation and ultimately contributes to low attendance Students live in hotels, or doubled-up housing, which makes consistent attendance challenging. Parents working multiple jobs and overnight shifts may struggle to support consistent routines. Neighborhoods distance from school and lack of transportation can impact ability to get to school if a student misses the bus
Check the system impacted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment 	Root Cause Explanation: <p>Improving attendance in a low-income, transient school requires addressing both structural barriers (housing and transportation) and school-based factors (climate, relationships, academic support).</p>

ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #3:	By Spring of 2026 school year reduce the percentage of students who are chronically absent (absent 10% or more of the school year) from 17% to 12% by June 2026.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students lack social belonging and academic success negatively affects motivation and ultimately contributes to low attendance 		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: PBIS implemented with at least 80% fidelity as measured by the fidelity inventory walk through data, with 100% of staff trained and participating in PBIS practices Implementation Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August-May: Provide PD on PBIS school-wide to communicate schoolwide expectations for attendance campaign Weekly class attendance challenge that will include awarding PBIS points for perfect attendance, weekly recognition of the class with the highest attendance	Evaluation Performance Target: 95% (790) of the students will attend school 90% (108 days) of the time. Evaluation Tool(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-assessment PBIS walk-through Attendance Data Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks	PBIS Rewards
Target Student Group			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

<p>1. Teachers will Implement a schoolwide PBIS framework with a focus on reinforcing positive academic behaviors and social-emotional competencies to improve student engagement and reduce behavioral referrals and positively impact motivation and absenteeism.</p>	<p>Monthly data review and analysis</p> <p>Artifacts to be Collected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PBIS walkthrough tool • Monthly PBIS team meeting agenda • Teacher self-assessment form • Weekly attendance challenge tracker • On-Track and Grad-Scop reports • Small group plans • Check in/check out documentation. <p>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p>Frequency of Monitoring:</p> <p>Monthly</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every other month</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p>Data Analysis Plan:</p> <p>Monthly attendance data analysis by counselors, social worker, and CIS Rep to be presented to the PBIS team.</p> <p>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads</p>	
---	--	---	--

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: September 30, 2025</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.	Sept. 18, 2025		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6
2. Required <u>Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline: November 3, 2025</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.	Oct. 2, 2025		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6
3. Required <u>Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline: April 30, 2026</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 16, 2024		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6
4. Required <u>TWO Building Staff Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy) – Deadlines: September 26, 2025 and February 16, 2026</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	Sept. 9, 2025		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6
	Feb. 3, 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> "Kindergarten Round-Up" Families and students visit Kindergarten classrooms to meet teachers, explore the learning environment, and experience sample activities. "Rising 6th Grader Orientation" Parents and students attend an information session led by middle school staff to learn about course offerings, schedules, expectations, and extracurricular opportunities.	March 15, 2026		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i> The school will request assistance and interpreters for school events such as Parent/Teacher conferences, RTI meetings, IEP meetings, and PTA meetings via the International Welcome Center and bilingual district staff availability.	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> School Policies (upon request) School Compact Academic Meetings Communication/Presentations PTA Meetings		<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)</i>							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities <u>(Must be listed in the school policy)</u>	“Shall” 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
Family Literacy Night	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	ELA resources, learning materials and office supplies	Title 1	TBD	Flyer/advertisement, sign-in sheet, handouts, and survey results	Brandi Chastain
Family Math Night	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	Math Manipulatives, learning materials, and office supplies	Title 1	TBD	Flyer/advertisement, sign-in sheet, handouts, and survey results	Monica Baxter
Science and Art Night	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	Science and Art learning materials, office supplies	Title 1	TDB	Flyer/advertisement, sign-in sheet, handouts, and survey results	Kinla Nelson

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

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

School Improvement Plan Required Questions

Schoolwide Plan Development – Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)

1. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)**
2. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)**
3. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school’s participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)**
4. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school’s website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)**
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. **SWP Checklist 5(e) Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)**

SCHOOL RESPONSE:

The City View Elementary Schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration of the following Federal, State, and local services, resources, and programs:

- City View Elementary receiving support from the GaDOE and the school district support personnel.
- City View Elementary has been selected for the FFVP (Fresh Fruit and Veggie Program) grant. This grant allows fresh fruit and vegetables (nutrition) to be provided separately from lunch and breakfast meals during the school day.
- City View Elementary works with the area social worker to provide information on local services and targeted support. The information is shared directly with parents through the CTLS (Cobb Teaching and Learn Support) parent messaging system. This targeted support is provided through a weekly email highlighting federal, state, and local agencies in the areas of housing, childcare, financial

assistance, and educational and career programs. Information and assistance are provided to obtain assistance from federal housing programs, Cobb Works training and job employment programs, federal food assistance programs, and childcare through ASP (after-school program) scholarships.

- City View Elementary partners with local agencies that provide targeted assistance on an as-needed basis, such as Sweetwater Mission, Must Ministries, and Family Life Restorations.

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:

By implementing Collaborative Communities, City View Elementary can regularly monitor the implementation of strategies and student achievement. The school will collect data from various sources including the State's annual assessments, such as standardized tests administered to students across various grade levels and subjects. This data provides a benchmark against state academic standards.

- Collaborative communities will meet weekly to create unit plans based on grade-level priority standards and learning targets. The scheduled meetings include analyzing data from State annual assessments, district-provided assessments, and common formative assessments. The results help determine the next steps and individualized needs of both teachers and students.
- The Building Leadership Team establishes the systematic process for the PLC responding to data results ascertained from State annual assessments, district-required assessments, and local school assessments.
- ESOL lead teachers use the WIDA data results to determine growth and create a strategic plan to serve multilingual students.

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:

As City View Elementary School implements a school-wide improvement plan, the plan will be monitored regularly to ensure continuous improvement. Regularly collect data on student performance, behavior, attendance, and other relevant metrics will be collected. This data should be disaggregated to identify trends among different student groups (e.g., by grade level, demographic background). The plan includes specific strategies to address school-wide goals for improving student performance in ELA and Math. Analyze the data to identify areas of strength and weakness within the schoolwide program. This

will involve looking at specific subjects, grade levels, or student subgroups monitor for expected outcomes. Strategies implemented include small group instruction, an innovative ESOL instructional model, and a reduced class size EIP instructional model in grades k-5. To support the vast needs of the students and their families, City View offers comprehensive educational services that include a social worker, counselors, psychological services, literacy specialists, instructional coaches, and interventionists. This plan will be continually revised and edited as the effectiveness of programs and the needs of students become evident. Monitoring meetings will be scheduled to make revisions as necessary. By gathering input from teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and students themselves we will gain diverse perspectives on what aspects of the schoolwide program are working well and what needs improvement.

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:

As City View Elementary School implements a school-wide improvement plan, the plan will be monitored regularly to ensure continuous improvement. Regularly collect data on student performance, behavior, attendance, and other relevant metrics will be collected. This data should be disaggregated to identify trends among different student groups (e.g., by grade level, demographic background). The plan includes specific strategies to address school-wide goals for improving student performance in ELA and Math. Analyze the data to identify areas of strength and weakness within the schoolwide program. This will involve looking at specific subjects, grade levels, or student subgroups monitor for expected outcomes. Strategies implemented include small group instruction, an innovative ESOL instructional model, and a reduced class size EIP instructional model in grades k-5. To support the vast needs of the students and their families, City View offers comprehensive educational services that include a social worker, counselors, psychological services, literacy specialists, instructional coaches, and interventionists. This plan will be continually revised and edited as the effectiveness of programs and the needs of students become evident. Monitoring meetings will be scheduled to make revisions as necessary. By gathering input from teachers, administrators, support staff, parents, and students themselves we will gain diverse perspectives on what aspects of the schoolwide program are working well and what needs

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:

City View Elementary School has worked to establish PBIS. PBIS includes preventative and responsive approaches that may be effectively implemented with all students in a classroom and intensified to support small groups or a few individual students. Classroom and school-wide PBIS strategies have been identified to decrease disruptions, increase instructional time, and improve student social behavior and academic outcomes. The PBIS Professional Learning Community/Team uses a data-driven process to determine the needs of students, assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the approach, and provide alternative solutions to problematic behavior. This team includes general and special education teachers, counselors, psychologists, administrators, and the school nurse. Students who do not respond to Tier 1 PBIS Strategies will utilize Tier 2 and Tier 3 PBIS Strategies, such as check-in/check-out and check and connect. The PBIS team will continually review the data to monitor the program's effectiveness and adjust as needed. Students struggling with behavior will be referred to RTI tiers 2 and 3. Interventionist will work to provide intervention for students that have behavior concerns that require additional Tier interventions to be successful. The PBIS team collaborated with the classroom teachers to implement specific strategies for those students.

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:

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) or Cobb Collaborative Communities (CCC)– This is a focused professional development based on high standards of teaching and learning. It is essential to improve teaching and to increase student achievement. It must be focused on student learning and help teachers determine the next step for their students. Ultimately, professional development builds collaborative communities committed to analyzing data to inform student learning. Continuous learning opportunities that are focused, reflective, and coherent are essential. The following are research-based practices in professional development that support career-long development of teaching and student learning:

- Target student outcomes and goals of schools and districts
- New Teacher mentor program
- Professional development for small group and scaffolding techniques.
- Professional learning for paraprofessional to target skills.
- Scheduled time aside to allow teachers to implement new techniques and to plan collaboratively
- Establish Teacher Teams and Guiding Coalitions (leadership team)
- Involve all teachers in a collaborative process, including Special Education, ESOL, paraprofessionals, and specialists (music, art, science, math, and physical education)

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:

Administrators, teachers, the parent facilitator, counselors, and the PBIS CCC team will meet to schedule, plan, and promote opportunities for preschool students to participate in transition activities. Local preschool programs will be contacted to promote the transition meetings. Teachers, counselors, and the PBIS CCC will plan and facilitate activities to transition children from early childhood preschool to local elementary school programs. Additionally, administrators, teachers, the parent facilitator, counselors, and the PBIS CCC team will meet to schedule, promote, and plan transition activities for fifth-grade students transitioning from City View Elementary school to the middle school program.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: N/A

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

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

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?
Paraprofessionals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment <input type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist the teacher during lessons by working with small groups or individual students Help reinforce learning objectives through guided practice Prepare and organize instructional material
Parent Facilitator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foster positive relationships between families and school staff Serve as a bridge between home and school, especially for families who may feel disconnected Promote open, respectful, and culturally sensitive communication

City View Elementary School Improvement Goals

Include goals on the parent compacts and policy

Goal #1	<p>By Spring 2026, the percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring Prepared across ELA domains on the Beacon ELA Spring Assessment will increase from 25% to 29%, as measured by the 2026 Beacon Spring Administration.</p> <p>By May 2026, the percentage of students in grades 3–5 scoring at or above the Developing Learner (Level 2) on the Georgia Milestones ELA Assessment will increase from an average of 49.24% to 53%, as measured by the Spring 2026 Georgia Milestones End-of-Grade Assessment.</p>
Goal #2	<p>By Spring 2026, the percentage of 1st and 2nd grade students scoring Prepared across all math domains on the Beacon Math Spring Administration will increase from an average of 23% to 28%, as measured by the 2026 Beacon Spring Assessment.</p> <p>By May 2026, the percentage of students in grades 3 - 5 scoring Proficient or Distinguished on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment will increase from an average of 17.6% to 25%, as measured by the 2025 Georgia Milestones End-of-Grade Assessment.</p>
Goal #3	<p>By Spring of 2026 school year reduce the percentage of students who are chronically absent (absent 10% or more of the school year) from 17% to 12% by June 2026.</p>
Goal #4	<p>By May 2026, the percentage of English Learner (EL) students scoring at or above a Composite Proficiency Level (CPL) of 4.5 or higher on the ACCESS assessment will increase from 11.6% to at least 14.6%, and the percentage of students scoring below 3.0 will decrease from 51.9% to 48.1%, as a result of targeted language instruction, data-driven small group interventions, and scaffolding strategies for content mastery.</p>