

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2025 - 2026
School Name:	LaBelle Elementary
Principal Name:	Dr. Sara Ostrander
Date Submitted:	
Revision Date(s):	

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

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>
School Response: Grade level CCCs reviewed current Beacon data and identified grade level strengths, weaknesses, and possible root causes in ELA and math. Our LaBelle Leadership Team (LLT) then looked for common trends among grade levels strengths, and weaknesses, and brainstormed possible root causes. The team collaboratively prioritized concerns and root causes to inform updates to the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Based on these insights, the LLT established new action steps aligned with end-of-year data. A comprehensive plan was then developed to address these action steps, drawing from the collaborative input of both grade-level CCCs and the LLT retreat.

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 Dr. Sara Ostrander, Melissa Barnhart	Parent Facilitators
Content or Grade Level Teachers Kelly Castleberry, Tracy White, Monica Shirinzadeh, Victoria Denker, Lauren Hamilton, Cossatta Burlock, Eric Harris	Media Specialists
Local School Lead Teacher Dr. Katie Baggott	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches Laura Franco	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)	Social Workers
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists
MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)	Community Health Care Providers
	Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

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

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	By May 2025, 50% of kindergarten students will reach on or above grade level bands as measured by the ARM score of Amira. By May 2025, first grade students will increase on or above grade level bands from 48% to 68% as measured by the March 2024 ARM score of Amira. By May 2025, second grade students will increase on or above grade level bands from 57% to 70% as measured by the March 2024 ARM score on Amira. By May 2025, 3rd grade students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 18% to 22% on the ELA Milestones. By May 2025 4th grade students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 21% to 25% on the ELA Milestones. By May 2025, 5th grade students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 33% to 37% on the ELA Milestones.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	For Kindergarten – 2nd grade, ARM scores from the Amira Assessment. For 3rd- 5th grade- The ELA Milestones K- 42% 1st: 45% 2nd: 36% 3rd: 21% 4th: 22% 5th: 31%
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented	Action steps to eliminate or change: Action steps to keep or extend: The data below shows no grade level met the ELA goal for SY 25-26. However, the goal was well within reach. Therefore, continuation of action steps are needed for the upcoming school year.

to address the area of need?	<table><tr><td colspan="3">K-2 Goal: % of students will reach on or above grade level bands as measured by the ARM score of Amira.</td></tr><tr><td>Grade Level</td><td>Goal</td><td>Actual Score</td></tr><tr><td>K</td><td>50%</td><td>42%</td></tr><tr><td>1st</td><td>68%</td><td>45%</td></tr><tr><td>2nd</td><td>70%</td><td>36%</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">3rd-5th Goal: % of students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from on the ELA Milestones.</td></tr><tr><td>Grade Level</td><td>Goal</td><td>Actual Score</td></tr><tr><td>3rd</td><td>22%</td><td>21%</td></tr><tr><td>4th</td><td>25%</td><td>22%</td></tr><tr><td>5th</td><td>37%</td><td>31%</td></tr></table> We will continue to use the LaBelle lesson plan template for planning for all components of the CCSD 120-minute literacy block. Additionally, we will continue to utilize the UFLI Foundations Manual in K-2nd grades as a part of the new ELA phonics adoption for daily instruction. Possible action step additions: We will extend the LaBelle lesson plan action step by providing teachers with an exemplar lesson plan so that there is a common expectation for what a LaBelle lesson plan should look like. Additionally, we will develop a LaBelle Top 10 of non-negotiables to plan daily instruction.	K-2 Goal: % of students will reach on or above grade level bands as measured by the ARM score of Amira.			Grade Level	Goal	Actual Score	K	50%	42%	1 st	68%	45%	2 nd	70%	36%	3 rd -5 th Goal: % of students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from on the ELA Milestones.			Grade Level	Goal	Actual Score	3 rd	22%	21%	4 th	25%	22%	5 th	37%	31%
K-2 Goal: % of students will reach on or above grade level bands as measured by the ARM score of Amira.																															
Grade Level	Goal	Actual Score																													
K	50%	42%																													
1 st	68%	45%																													
2 nd	70%	36%																													
3 rd -5 th Goal: % of students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from on the ELA Milestones.																															
Grade Level	Goal	Actual Score																													
3 rd	22%	21%																													
4 th	25%	22%																													
5 th	37%	31%																													
If the goal was met or exceeded, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?																															

Previous Year's Goal #2	By May 2025 1st grade students will increase their level of achievement to prepared from 0% to 23% on the Beacon Assessment. By May 2025 2nd grade students will increase their achievement to prepared from 0% to 18% on the Beacon Assessment
--------------------------------	---

	By May 2025, 3rd grade students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 25% to 29% on the Math Milestones. By May 2025, 4th grade students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 12% to 16% on the Math Milestones. By May 2025, 5th grade students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced from 33% to 37% on the Math Milestones.
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☒ Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	Kindergarten- .06% (3 students) 1st- 16% 2nd- 16% 3rd- 22% 4th- 37% 5th- 28%
Reflecting on Outcomes	
If the goal was not met, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	Action steps to eliminate or change: This year teachers focused on Common Assessments for Problem Solving. Next year, we will have the assessment department come lead our team through building common unit assessments in math. Action steps to keep or extend: We will continue to implement Number Talks as par of the daily Math instruction. Teachers will utilize the corresponding grade level strategies in the Number Talks book to use as warm activities on numerical reasoning. Possible action step additions: We will hold school-wide professional learning sessions from the district assessment department on common, formative assessments. Teachers will be required to administer common assessments at the end of each Math unit.
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	17.9	18.3	21%
4 th Grade	31.0	21.2	22%
5 th Grade	23.5	33.3	31%

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%	32%	36%	30%	48%	22%	34%	44%	22%	28%	50%	22%	32%	52%	16%
2 nd Grade	43.8%	18.5%	38.5%	49%	20%	31%	41%	43%	16%	49%	18%	33%	46%	33%	21%

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	16%	75%	9%	20%	69%	11%	24%	69%	7%	16%	76%	7%	18%	71%	11%	11%	84%	5%	34%	62%	4%	12%	80%	5%
4 th Grade	20%	73%	7%	22%	66%	12%	22%	71%	7%	22%	74%	4%	17%	74%	9%	17%	76%	7%	36%	57%	7%	17%	74%	9%
5 th Grade	24%	62%	13%	20%	64%	16%	22%	67%	11%	24%	58%	18%	27%	69%	4%	36%	53%	11%	56%	33%	11%	24%	62%	13%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3rd Grade- (Data linked) Vocabulary Acquisition and Use Domain Achievement- 26 students approaching and meeting target Craft and Structure/Integration of Knowledge and Ideas Domain Achievement- 25 students approaching and meeting target	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3rd Grade- (Data linked) Reading Literary Text Domain Achievement- 41 students scoring below target Reading and Vocabulary Domain Achievement- 39 students scoring below target

	• Reading Informational Text Domain Achievement- 25 students approaching and meeting target 4th Grade- (Data linked) • Vocabulary Acquisition and Use Domain Achievement- 26 students approaching and meeting target • Craft and Structure/Integration of Knowledge and Ideas Domain Achievement – 25 students approaching and meeting target 5th Grade- (Data linked) • Reading Literary Text Domain Achievement- 21 students approaching and meeting target • Vocabulary Acquisition and Use Domain Achievement- 20 students approaching and meeting target EL: (Data linked) • Vocabulary Acquisition and Use Domain Achievement- 33 students approaching and meeting target • Craft and Structure/Integration of Knowledge and Ideas Domain Achievement- 29 students approaching and meeting target SWD: (Data linked) • There are no strengths for SWD in ELA (see linked chart). Relative Strength- Vocabulary Acquisition and Use Domain Achievement- 6 out of 18 students approaching and meeting target	4th Grade- (Data linked) • Key Ideas and Details Domain Achievement – 45 students scoring below target • Reading Literary Text Domain Achievement – 43 students scoring below target 5th Grade- (Data linked) • Language Domain Achievement – 33 students scoring below target • Writing and Language Domain Achievement- 29 students scoring below target • Reading and Vocabulary Domain Achievement- 29 students scoring below target EL: (Data linked) • Key Ideas and Details Domain Achievement- 69 students scoring below target • Reading and vocabulary Domain Achievement- 68 students scoring below target SWD: (Data linked) • Craft and Structure/Integration of Knowledge and Ideas Domain Achievement- 18 out of 18 students below target • Key Ideas and Details Domain Achievement- 18 out of 18 students below target • Reading Informational Text Domain Achievement- 18 out of 18 students below target • Reading and Vocabulary Domain Achievement- 18 out of 18 students below target • Writing Domain Achievement- 18 out of 18 students below target • Writing and Language Domain Achievement- 18 out of 18 students below target
--	---	--

Beacon Assessment – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels, Els, and SWD: K-2 (all students): Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in Foundations with 68% in 1st and 57% in 2nd grade scoring in the Near Target or Prepared area. 1st grade also demonstrated strengths in Interpreting Text with 72% of students scoring the Near Target or Prepared range. 3-5 (all students): Based on the 3rd and 4th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated strengths in Text Types and Purposes 89% in 3rd grade and 83% in 4th grade scoring in the Near Target or Prepared range, and in Writing Research with 85% in 3rd grade and 83% in 4th grade scoring in the Near Target or Prepared range.	Grade Levels, Els, and SWD: K-2 (all students): Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Language with 41% (49 out of 120 students) in Support Needed. 3-5 (all students): Based on the 3rd, 4th and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Conventions of Standard English, with 34% in 3rd, 36% in 4th, and 56% in 5th grade scoring in the Support Needed range.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Lack of resources, time to implement vocabulary lesson plan English Language Learners need tier 1 vocabulary as well Lack of a structured grammar program Language acquisition for ELs English language transfer at home Lack of time spent on explicit instruction on editing and revising for conventions	
ACCESS Scores (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	ACCESS Reading Scores Summary 2025 • Level 1 – Entering: 40 students • Level 2 – Emerging: 34 students • Level 3 – Developing: 36 students • Level 4 – Expanding: 20 students • Level 5 – Bridging: 42 students • Level 6 – Reaching: 13 students Strengths-	ACCESS Writing Scores Summary 2025 • Level 1 – Entering: 36 students • Level 2 – Emerging: 27 students • Level 3 – Developing: 72 students • Level 4 – Expanding: 47 students • Level 5 – Bridging: 19 students • Level 6 – Reaching: 1 student Weaknesses-

	Reading Strengths: • A significant number of students (42) scored at Level 5-Bridging, indicating strong progress and readiness to transition out of ESOL support for reading. • 13 students reached Level 6-Reaching, demonstrating near-native proficiency in reading and suggesting that current instructional supports are effective for some students. Writing Strengths: • Nearly 40% of students (67 total) scored at Levels 4–6, indicating they are approaching or demonstrating grade-level proficiency in writing. • The largest group, Level 3 – Developing (72 students), shows students have acquired basic writing skills and are progressing toward more complex written expression.	Reading Weaknesses: • A large portion of students (110 total) remain in the lower proficiency bands: ○ Level 1-Entering (40 students) ○ Level 2-Emerging (34 students) ○ Level 3-Developing (36 students) This indicates that over half of the ESOL population is still struggling with foundational reading skills in English. • Only 20 students reached Level 4-Expanding, suggesting a gap in support that helps students transition from intermediate to advanced reading proficiency. Writing Weaknesses: • A substantial number of students (63 students) remain in Levels 1–2, indicating limited ability to express ideas in written English. • Only 1 student reached Level 6 – Reaching, and only 19 reached Level 5 – Bridging, indicating that few students are meeting the highest standards of writing proficiency.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: High ELL population- English proficiency will effect reading and writing proficiency. Most families speak a language other than English in their home, therefore, these foundational reading and writing skills may not be supported outside of school.	

School Instructional Walks (3rd- 5th Grades)	Connection between vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing connected to text was evident during classroom observations.	56% of classrooms 0-25% of the time students were actively speak with peers. 38% of classroom observations- 25%-50% of the time students were actively speak with peers. Lots of worksheets were noted in observation with low level discussion questions and text dependent questions that lacked higher order thinking.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: High ELL population- language acquisition makes students less confident in speaking skills Structures for instructional delivery do not include time for students to talk to each other or collaborate.	
GKids (Kindergarten)	Students' performance on the Phonics portion of GKids showed 91% of students in the Developing- Exceeding categories. 87% in Phonemic Awareness, and 85% in High Frequency Words.	Students' performance on the Spelling and Writing Conventions portions of GKids showed only 62% of students were performing in the Developing to Exceeding categories.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: High ELL population- Students have had less exposure to academic English vocabulary, syntax, and discourse at home. ELL students may still be developing basic oral communication skills in English.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	Kinder- GKIDS : The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring Developing or higher on the Constructing Texts domain of the GKIDS assessment will increase from 62% in May 2025 to 65% in May 2026. 1st & 2nd – Beacon: The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 486 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 44% in May 2025 to 47% in May 2026. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 510 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 40% in May 2025 to 43% in May 2026. 3rd – 5th – ELA EOG: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA EOG will increase from 21% in May 2025 to 24% in May 2026. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA EOG will increase from 22% in May 2025 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA EOG will increase from 31% in May 2025 to 34%% in May 2026.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Coherent Instruction – Monitoring Student Progress Lack of a structured grammar program Language acquisition for ELs Lack of time spent on explicit instruction on editing and revising for conventions		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of Kindergarten teachers will implement the UFLI dictation by the end of semester 1 (December 2025) Implementation Plan:	Evaluation Performance Target: 65% of Kindergarten students will score Developing or Higher on the Spelling domain of the GKids Assessment by May 2026. Evaluation Tool(s):	
Target Student Group			

☒ All Students ☒ EL ☐ SWD	• Preplanning: Training during Learning Engagement Institute (LEI) • August-September: • UFLI Refresher to set common expectations for implementation. • K-5 EIP teacher to model lessons in all K classrooms • October-May: • Walkthroughs conducted monthly during Phonics lessons. Feedback will provided to all K teachers based on collected walkthrough data.		
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____		
K- Kindergarten teachers will implement the new Tier I ELA resources (i.e. UFLI dictation lessons) weekly as indicated by data collected with the district-wide ELA walkthrough form.	Data Analysis Plan: Analyze data during CCC meetings during grade level planning time Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Lead Teacher(s) ☒ K CCC team		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Coherent Instruction - Delivering Quality instruction Prior to the 2025-2026 school year, we have lacked a systematic and explicit vocabulary curriculum.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☒ Other: <u>None</u>		
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 1 st and 2nd-grade teachers will implement daily Wonders vocabulary lessons by end of semester 1 (December 2025)	Evaluation Performance Target: The percentage of 1 st grade students scoring above 500 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 39% in May 2025 to 42% in May 2026.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan:		

☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD	• Preplanning: • Training during Learning Engagement Institute (LEI) • September-May: • Continue training during weekly CCCs • Walkthroughs conducted monthly during ELA block, specifically during Vocabulary lessons. • Feedback will be provided to all 1st and 2nd grade teachers based on collected walkthrough data. Artifacts to be Collected: Weekly Lesson Plans Classroom observations and walkthrough data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ Lead Teacher(s) Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring above 520 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 37% in May 2025 to 40% in May 2026. Evaluation Tool(s): • Beacon Assessment (Language Domain) Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: -Teachers will record the percentage of students scoring proficient on the Wonders unit assessments on a common data sheet. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Lead Teacher(s) ☒ CCC teams	
Action Step SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)			
1-2 Vocabulary – First and Second grade teachers will implement the new Tier I ELA resources (i.e. Vocabulary lessons) daily as indicated by data collected with the district-wide ELA walkthrough form.			

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Coherent Instruction- Delivering Quality Instruction and Monitoring Student Progress. Prior to the 2025-2026 school year, we have lacked a systematic and explicit grammar curriculum.				
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____				
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources		
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 3 rd -5 th grade teachers will implement daily Wonders grammar lessons by end of semester 1 (December 2025).	Evaluation Performance Target: The percentage of 3 rd grade students scoring above 412 cut score on the conventions domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 25% in May 2025 to 28% in May 2026.			
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - Training during Learning Engagement Institute (LEI) - August-May: - Walkthroughs conducted monthly during ELA block, specifically during Grammar lessons. - Feedback will be provided to all 3rd-5th grade teachers during weekly CCCs based on collected walkthrough data. Artifacts to be Collected: Weekly Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs	The percentage of 4 th grade students scoring above 446 cut score on the conventions domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 27% in May 2025 to 30% in May 2026.			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD				The percentage of 5 th grade students scoring above 471 cut score on the conventions domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 24% in May 2025 to 27% in May 2026.	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>					Evaluation Tool(s): Beacon Assessment (Conventions domain)
3-5 Conventions- Third, Fourth, and Fifth grade teachers will implement the new Tier I ELA resources (i.e. Grammar lessons) daily as indicated by data collected with the district-wide ELA walkthrough form.					

		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Lead Teacher(s) ☒ CCC Teams	
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	WHOLE SCHOOL OPTION #1		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of LaBelle teachers will implement daily opportunities for students to use academic language while speaking to peers by the end of May 2026.	Evaluation Performance Target: The percentage of ELL students scoring a level 4- Expanding on ACCESS speaking domain will increase from 20% in May 2025 to 23% in May 2026.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Present the goal to staff - September-April: ESOL teachers present ELlevation speaking strategy at monthly staff meetings	Evaluation Tool(s): ACCESS Assessment	
☐ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☐ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☒ _____ Annually _____	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(iii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	Artifacts to be Collected: Classroom walkthroughs	Data Analysis Plan: ELL teacher will utilize ACCESS goal-setting sheet for student self-assessment (beginning, middle, end of year) ELL teachers will also utilize the WIDA speaking rubric to drive student discussions 3x per year	
K-5 Speaking – K-5 teachers will implement daily opportunities for students to use academic language while speaking to peers.	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ Lead Teacher(s) Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Lead Teacher(s) ☒ ELL teachers	

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	17.9	25.0	22
4 th Grade	41.4	11.8	37
5 th Grade	29.4	33.3	28

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)	29%	52%	19%	46%	35%	19%	48%	44%	8%	52%	40%	8%
1st Grade	40%	53%	6%	24%	39%	37%	16%	31%	53%	29%	51%	20%
2nd Grade	38%	49%	13%	49%	41%	10%	43%	35%	22%	36%	32%	32%
3rd Grade	12%	84%	4%	9%	89%	2%	22%	76%	2%	20%	76%	4%
4th Grade	38%	59%	3%	48%	48%	3%	57%	41%	2%	58%	40%	2%
5th Grade	56%	42%	2%	60%	38%	2%	56%	42%	2%	51%	49%	0%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3rd Grade - (Data linked) Numerical Reasoning: Place Value and Rounding Domain Achievement- 29 students approaching or meeting target	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD Grade Levels (all students): 3rd Grade - (Data linked) Numerical Reasoning: Represent Fractions Domain Achievement- 38 students scoring below target 4th Grade - (Data linked)

	4th Grade- (Data linked) • Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Area, Perimeter, and Polygons Domain Achievement- 40 students scored approaching or meeting target • Geometric & Spatial Reasoning Domain Achievement- 39 students scored approaching or meeting target 5th Grade- (Data linked) • Multiplication, Division, and Numerical Expressions Domain Achievement- 24 students scored approaching or meeting target EL: • Geometric & Spatial Reasoning- 39 ESOL students in 3-5 scored approaching or meeting target SWD: • Geometric & Spatial Reasoning- 9 SPED students in 3-5 scored approaching or meeting target	• Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Number and Shape Patterns Domain Achievement- 34 students scoring below target • Numerical Reasoning: Compare and Round Numbers Domain Achievement- 33 students scoring below target 5th Grade- (Data linked) • Numerical Reasoning Domain Achievement- 30 students scored below target EL: • Numerical Reasoning Domains- 60 ESOL students in 3-5 scored below target • Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning Domains- 56 ESOL students in 3-5 scored below target SWD: • Numerical Reasoning Domains- 18 SPED students in 3-5 scored below target
Beacon Assessment – Math (Grade Level & Subgroups)	Grade Levels, Els, and SWD: K-2 (all students): Based on the kindergarten Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in Numerical Reasoning with 71% scoring in the Near Target or Prepared range. 1st grade Beacon results in Math indicate our students have demonstrated strengths in Measurement & Data with 84% scoring in the Near Target or Prepared area. Based on 2nd grade Beacon results, our students demonstrated strengths in Geometry & Spatial Reasoning with 64% of students scoring the Near Target or Prepared range. 3-5 (all students):	Grade Levels, Els, and SWD: K-2 (all students): Based on the kindergarten Beacon results in Math our students demonstrated weakness in Measurement & Data Reasoning with 48% in Support Needed. 1st grade Beacon results in Math indicate our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Numerical Reasoning with 40% in Support Needed. 2nd grade Beacon results in Math indicate our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning with 49% in Support Needed. 3-5 (all students): Based on the 3rd and 4th grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Measurement &

	Based on the 3rd grade Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in Patterns & Algebraic Reasoning with 91% scoring in the Near Target or Prepared range. 4th grade Beacon results in Math indicate our students have demonstrated strengths in Numerical Reasoning with 62% scoring in the Near Target or Prepared area. 5th grade Beacon Math results did not indicate a particular area of strength as all scores were below 50%.	Data, with 22% in 3rd and 57% in 4th grade scoring in the Support Needed range. 5th grade Beacon results in Math indicate our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning with 60% in Support Needed.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Alignment of common assessments to standards Making connections between concrete and abstract concepts More time with manipulatives for place value Pace of instruction is too fast Reading ability hinders student ability to comprehend word problems Too many strategies Independent practice in Cobb materials does not align to minilesson and guided practice.	
MATH Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	CCCs worked to develop quarterly word problem assessments to track students' problem-solving skills over the year. Teachers learned to enter these assessments into CTLS Assess and score them using the LaBelle Math Rubric.	CCCs still lack common assessment practices.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Teachers do not have a consistent process for monitoring student progress as a CCC. .	
Other Summary Data- CCC Reflection Survey ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	58% of teachers reported that their CCC 'consistently' evaluated their assessments to ensure they aligned with the standards. 42% indicated that they check for alignment "sometimes." 74% of teachers reported their CCC uses common formative assessment data to adjust instruction.	5% of teachers report their CCC consistently (every unit) <u>create</u> common summative assessments. 5% say they consistently (every unit) <u>use</u> common summative assessments. 21% report their CCC consistently (every unit) <u>create</u> common formative assessments. 26% report their CCC consistently (every unit) <u>use</u> common formative assessments.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: CCCs have not mastered the development or implementation of common summative or formative assessments to drive instruction. CCCs are lacking a structure to collaboratively monitor student progress. Teachers may benefit from explicit work in the development and use of common assessments.
---	--

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	K – 2nd – Beacon: The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring at or above 455 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon assessment will increase from 44% in May 2025 to 47% in May 2026. The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 490 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 43% in May 2025 to 46% in May 2026. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 516 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 36% in May 2025 to 39% in May 2026. 3rd – 5th – Math EOG: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 22% in May 2025 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 37% in May 2025 to 40% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 28% in May 2025 to 31% in May 2026.		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Coherent Instruction: Lack of consistent development and use of common formative and summative assessments. Professional Capacity: Lack of structure of the professional capacity of developing and using common formative and summative assessments.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☒ Other: _____ None _____		
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 teams will develop common summative assessments for each math unit by May 2026. Implementation Plan: Preplanning:	Evaluation Performance Target: 45% of K-2 students will score 60% or higher on common summative math assessments. 35% of 3-5 students will score 60% or higher on common summative math assessments.	
Target Student Group			

☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	• August-September: Sept 18th 1. Deconstructing the Standards & Identifying Learning Targets: ○ 4 Types of Learning Targets ○ The level of the Standards • October-December: 2. DOK Levels & Building Assessment Items- Oct. 23rd ○ How to align the assessment items to the rigor of the standard. 3. Item Analysis- Nov. 6th ○ Item development 4. Assessment Audit- Nov. 20th or Dec. 4th ○ Work Time with Next Steps ○ Bring the created summative assessment ○ Could bring in teacher created or vendor-created assessments • January-May: develop and administer common formative assessments as a grade level CCC to align with CCSD Math quarterly pacing guide Artifacts to be Collected: - Grade level common assessments Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ Lead Teacher(s)	Evaluation Tool(s): • Math common summative assessments by grade level Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Each Unit		
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: Review and analyze summative assessment data in CCC meetings Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Lead Teacher(s) ☒ CCC Teams
K-5 teams will develop common summative assessments for each math unit.				

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Coherent Instruction: Refining and improving the structure for numerical reasoning instruction		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☒ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☒ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of teams will implement daily Number Talks lessons by May 2026.	Evaluation Performance Target: The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring 480 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon assessment will increase from 23% in May 2025 to 26% in May 2026.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Pre-planning: - Staff refresher of Number Talks using <u>Number Talks</u> book August: - Model Number Talk session during a staff meeting	The percentage of 1 st grade students scoring above 500 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 34% in May 2025 to 37% in May 2026.	
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD	September-May: - Walkthroughs conducted monthly during Math block, specifically during Number Talks lesson. - Feedback will be provided to all K-5 teachers during weekly CCCs based on collected walkthrough data. - Teachers will collaboratively plan Number Talks content during release time on full-day quarterly planning days.	The percentage of 2 nd grade students scoring above 520 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 36% in May 2025 to 39% in May 2026.	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson plans Classroom walkthroughs	The percentage of 3 rd grade students scoring above 396 cut score on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 31% in May 2025 to 34% in May 2026.	
K-5 Teachers will implement daily number talks aligned to the <i>Number Talks</i> book grade-level expectations.	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ Lead Teacher(s)	The percentage of 4 th grade students scoring above 455 cut score on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 12% in May 2025 to 15% in May 2026.	
		The percentage of 5 th grade students scoring above 510 cut score on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 15% in May 2025 to 18% in May 2026.	
		Evaluation Tool(s): Beacon Math Assessment	

	Frequency of Monitoring: Monthly	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Review Beacon data after each assessment administration with grade-level CCC Team. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☐ Lead Teacher(s) ☒ CCC Teams	
--	--	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required <u>Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline</u> Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	Aug. 14, 2025		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required <u>Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline</u> Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	Oct. 14-17, 2025		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required <u>Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline</u> Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	March 5, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required <u>FOUR Building Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy)</u> Teacher 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.	Aug. 12-14 Parent Orientation		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	Dec. 4- PTA Night-Winter Arts Showcase		
	Feb. 5- Math Night		
	Mar. 5-STEAM Night		
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. Briefly describe the transition activities here: Kindergarten orientation, Middle Orientation Nights	Kindergarten Camp- Jul 24, 2025 Middle School Orientation- Apr. 2026		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u> - Orientation night flyers - Literacy Night flyers & resources - Math Night flyers & parent resources - STEAM Night flyers & parent resources - Conference materials - All CTLS Parent newsletters		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

	- Parent letters & notifications related to testing	
--	---	--

School Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)</i>							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities <u>(Must be listed in the school policy)</u>	“Shall” Addresse d	Goal(s) Addresse d	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Team Lead
Title 1 Annual Meeting and Parent Open House	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Compacts Printed Presentations and Flyers for parents	Title 1	4 th -5 th Grade- Aug. 12 th , 2025 2 nd -3 rd Grade- Aug 13 th K-1 & PTA Meeting- Aug. 14 th	Sign in sheets Grade level presentations Parent Compacts School Policy	Sara Ostrander & Melissa Barnhart
Winter Arts Showcase	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Fine Arts Standards	Local School	Dec. 5, 2025	Sign in sheets	Jerilyn Price, Al Liason
STEAM Night	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	STEAM Materials, batteries for microphones, music soundtracks, paper, dice, books, etc.	Title 1	March 5, 2025	Sign in sheets Grade level presentations STEAM Night “Passport” Take home math games and activities	Kriste Millington & Admin

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) <u>Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)</u>	

SCHOOL RESPONSE: LaBelle Elementary School will integrate state and local funds and community support in several ways. Title II will provide professional development support including staff and PL opportunities. Title III will provide language proficiency support. LaBelle will utilize 20 Day Funds for tutoring support of our students struggling to meet state standards. The local county will provide support for the school's implementation of Arts Integration to continue our support of authentic instruction and student engagement. Community Partners (Cobb EMC, St. Ann's Church, North Metro Martial Arts, etc.) will provide volunteers and support for our family engagement events, Career Day for students, and other student events. These programs will work together to meet the needs of the students and families identified in the CNA and through our parent and family surveys.

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: Grade-level teams engage in weekly Cobb Collaborative Community meetings (CCCs) to review, analyze, and discuss multiple forms of data to inform instructional planning and decision-making. These data discussions are aligned with the grade-level standards as outlined in the CCSD pacing guide. Assessment tools utilized include, but are not limited to, GKIDS, End-of-Grade (EOG) assessments, Beacon Assessments, writing samples, and ongoing formative assessments.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The school leadership team and grade-level CCC teams regularly analyze the School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals in conjunction with various data sources to assess progress toward targeted outcomes. At the conclusion of the academic year, parent survey results and school-wide performance data are reviewed and compared against SIP goals to evaluate the effectiveness of implemented action steps and inform future planning.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is a dynamic, continuously reviewed document monitored by school administration and lead teachers. A variety of progress monitoring tools are utilized to support and enhance student achievement across academic areas. These tools include lesson plan reviews, classroom walkthroughs, and the implementation of model lessons.

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: At LaBelle Elementary, we prioritize proactive approaches to student behavior, with a primary focus on prevention. Our goal is to deliver engaging, high-quality instruction that captures students’ attention and minimizes opportunities for misbehavior. Weekly classroom meetings are held to foster positive peer relationships. We will utilize the counties anti-bullying procedures of Stop, Walk, Talk. We encourage students to report incidents of bullying to a trusted staff member and to serve as active, responsible bystanders. When behavioral concerns require administrative intervention, the leadership team is committed to identifying the underlying causes, supporting the student in regaining focus, and facilitating a smooth return to the learning environment.

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: At LaBelle Elementary, we are committed to fostering collaborative instructional planning. Dedicated time is set aside each week for classroom and support teachers to engage in joint planning sessions. These meetings provide an opportunity to design differentiated instruction, coordinate intervention blocks, and develop comprehensive weekly lesson plans. This collaborative approach promotes ongoing dialogue around student data, individual learning needs, and strategies for personalized instruction. Our EIP team actively support this process by providing educators with the necessary resources, materials, and professional development to enhance instructional effectiveness.

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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(v)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: To support our fifth-grade students as they prepare for middle school, we coordinate a half-day visit to their designated feeder middle school, where they are introduced to the campus, routines, and expectations. Furthermore, with the guidance of professional school counselors, targeted lessons are delivered to our fifth-grade classes to help them understand key procedures and prepare for a successful transition to middle school.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(ii)</i> 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. <i>SWP Checklist 1</i>

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals

SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)

Position	Supports Goal(s)	Supports which system(s)	How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?
Parent Facilitator	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	The parent facilitator plays a crucial role in supporting the implementation of our SIP. Our parent facilitator will help organize family literacy/math nights tied to our ELA and math goals. She will provide take-home strategies aligned with classroom instruction. She helps families navigated school systems (CTLs, ParentVue), encourages volunteerism and parent leadership roles, and builds parent confidence to advocate for their child's learning needs.
0.5 Teacher	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	This 0.5 teacher position directly supports the implementation of the School Improvement Plan by helping to close academic gaps in a high-needs school like LaBelle. By reducing the student-teacher ratio, classroom teachers are better able to differentiate instruction, provide more frequent and targeted feedback, and offer increased support and scaffolding—particularly for struggling students and English Language Learners.
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	

School Improvement Goals
Include goals on the parent compacts and policy

Goal #1	Kinder- GKids : The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring Developing or higher on the Spelling domain of the GKIDS assessment will increase from 62% in May 2025 to 65% in May 2026. 1st & 2nd – Beacon: The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 500 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 39% in May 2025 to 42% in May 2026. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 520 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 37% in May 2025 to 40% in May 2026. 3rd – 5th – ELA EOG: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA EOG will increase from 21% in May 2025 to 24% in May 2026. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA EOG will increase from 22% in May 2025 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA EOG will increase from 31% in May 2025 to 34% in May 2026.
Goal #2	K – 2nd – Beacon: The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring at or above 480 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon assessment will increase from 23% in May 2025 to 26% in May 2026. The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 500 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 34% in May 2025 to 37% in May 2026. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 520 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 36% in May 2025 to 39% in May 2026.

	3rd – 5th – Math EOG: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 22% in May 2025 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 37% in May 2025 to 40% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 28% in May 2025 to 31% in May 2026.
Goal #3	
Goal #4	