

# School Improvement Plan

## Title I, Part A



<b>School Year:</b>	<b>2025 - 2026</b>
<b>School Name:</b>	<b>Mableton Elementary</b>
<b>Principal Name:</b>	<b>Michael Cappucci</b>
<b>Date Submitted:</b>	<b>June 2, 2025</b>
<b>Revision Date(s):</b>	<b>July 25, 2025</b>

<i>District Name</i>	Cobb County School District
<i>School Name</i>	Mableton Elementary School
<i>Team Lead</i>	Michael Cappucci
<i>Position</i>	Principal
<i>Email</i>	Michael.Cappucci@cobbk12.org
<i>Phone</i>	770.819.2513

**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 <b>ONLY</b>
	"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 <b>ONLY</b>
	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:** Mableton staff members participated in identifying academic strengths and challenges based on multiple data sources to determine a comprehensive needs assessment. Through a collaborative discussion on the overarching academic challenges, root causes, and contributing factors, goals for the academic 2025-2026 year were determined. The Guiding Coalition met to finalize goals and determine key actions.

## 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
<b>Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)</b>	Social Workers
<b>Student (Required for High Schools)</b>	Community Leaders
<b>Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)</b>	School Technology Specialists
<b>MRESA School Improvement Specialist (For Federally Identified Schools)</b>	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.



## TITLE I – SIP Planning Meeting – 3/24/25

Name	Position	Signature
Michelle Hanes	Coach	Michelle Hanes
Kelsea Townsend	AC Coach	Kelsea Townsend
Brock Sharp	Interventionist	Brock Sharp
Kristin Bosley	gifted teacher	K. Bosley
Mu Cabbell	EIP	Mu Cabbell
Joanna Connor	EIP	Joanna Connor
Nichole McDowell	Intervention	Nichole McDowell
Stephanie Schwan	3rd grade teacher	Stephanie Schwan
Chloe Watts	5th	Chloe Watts
Olivia Gungwe	4th	Olivia Gungwe
Amanda Elkenburg	2nd	Amanda Elkenburg
Ashley Brooks	A/C	Ashley Brooks
Lori Arends	AP	Lori Arends
Joelle Hitechew	1st	Joelle Hitechew
Fatima Torne	para	Fatima Torne
Rosalyn Vinson	K	Rosalyn Vinson



# TITLE I – SIP Planning Meeting – 4/25/25

Name	Position	Signature
Michele Harris	AC Coach	Michele Harris
Kelsea Townsend	AC Coach	Kelsea Townsend
Brock Sharp	Interventionist	Brock Sharp
Kristin Bosley	gifted teacher	Kristin Bosley
Mu Cabbell	EIP	Mu Cabbell
Joanna Gerner	EIP	Joanna Gerner
Nichole McDowell	Intervention	Nichole McDowell
Stephanie Schwan	3rd grade teacher	Stephanie Schwan
Chloe Watts	5th	Chloe Watts
Olivia Giangue	4th	Olivia Giangue
Amanda Ellenburg	2nd	Amanda Ellenburg
Ashley Brooks	A/C	Ashley Brooks
Lori Arends	AP	Lori Arends
Joelle Hitechew	1st	Joelle Hitechew
Fatima Tommy	para	Fatima Tommy
Rosalyn Vinson	KK	Rosalyn Vinson





# TITLE I – SIP Planning Meeting – 5/12/25

Name	Position	Signature
Michele Harris	AC Coach	Michele Harris
Kelsea Townsend	AC Coach	Kelsea Townsend
Brock Sharp	Interventionist	Brock Sharp
Kristin Bosley	gifted teacher	Kristin Bosley
Mu Cabbell	EIP	Mu Cabbell
Joanna Conner	EIP	Joanna Conner
Nichole McDowell	Intervention	Nichole McDowell
Stephanie Schwan	3rd grade teacher	Stephanie Schwan
Chloe Watts	5th	Chloe Watts
Olivia Giangue	4th	Olivia Giangue
Amanda Ellenburg	2nd	Amanda Ellenburg
Ashley Roberts	A/C	Ashley Roberts
Lori Brendt	AP	Lori Brendt
Joelle Hitechew	1st	Joelle Hitechew
Fatima Torres	para	Fatima Torres
Rosalyn Vinson	RR	Rosalyn Vinson



# TITLE I – SIP Planning Meeting – 5/12/2025

Name	Position	Signature
Kelsea Townsend	AC	Kelsea Townsend
Stephanie Schwan	3rd	Stephanie Schwan
Amanda Ellenburg	2nd	Amanda Ellenburg
Meghan Money	Specialist	Meghan Money
Fatima Torres	para	Fatima Torres
MEGHAN HINTON	AP	Meghan Hinton
Ashley Brooks	A/C	Ashley Brooks
Kristin Bosley	gifted	Kristin Bosley
Joanna Conner	EIP	Joanna Conner
Olivia Giangue	4th	Olivia Giangue
Chloe Watts	5th	Chloe Watts
Dannielle McClure	SSA	Dannielle McClure
Della Jones	Counselor	Della Jones
Joe Shavers	4th IRR	Joe Shavers
Brock Sharp	Interventionist	Brock Sharp
Jean Brady	Teacher K-2	Jean Brady
KYLIE HARDY	ESOL	Kylie Hardy
Joelle Hitechew	1st	Joelle Hitechew
Lori Brendt	AP	Lori Brendt
Camryn Carr		Camryn Carr



## 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).

<b>Previous Year's Goal #1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The percentage of K-2<sup>nd</sup> grade students demonstrating at or above grade level reading ability, will increase by at least 6% from 23% (99 students) to 29% (125 students) from August 2024 to May 2025, as measured by the Amira Assessment.</li> <li>The percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup>- 5<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring Proficient (Level 3) or higher will increase 7% from 21% (98 students) to 28% (129 students) as measured by the Georgia Milestone EOG Assessment administered in May 2025.</li> </ul>
<b>Was the goal met?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially	
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<p>-The percentage of K-2<sup>nd</sup> grade students demonstrating at or above grade level reading ability is 41% (183 students) as measured by the Amira Assessment.</p> <p>-The percentage of 3<sup>rd</sup>- 5<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring Proficient (Level 3) or higher is 22% (100 students) as measured by the Georgia Milestone EOG Assessment administered in May 2025.</p>
<b>Reflecting on Outcomes</b>	
If the goal was <b>not met</b> , what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?	<p>3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Identify the lowest-performing ELA domains by grade level and prioritize instructional planning around these standards.</li> <li>-Kindergarten-5th grade teachers will use Explicit Writing Instruction with a structured process to increase students' ability to accurately provide a written response.</li> <li>- The ESOL Team will provide ELLEvation Professional Learning to Kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers once a quarter to model ELLEvation strategies that teachers will implement during the EL Block.</li> <li>-The ESOL Team will provide ELLEvation Professional Learning to Kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers once a quarter to model ELLEvation strategies that can be used during ELA Instruction leading to students scoring proficient on grade level writing common assessments.</li> </ul>
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>K-2<sup>nd</sup>: 41%:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Teachers implemented consistent, systematic phonics instruction based on the specific needs of students.</li> <li>-Foundational Reading skills were taught and assessed using common formative assessments.</li> <li>-Daily systematic Phonological Awareness was implemented.</li> </ul>



<p><b>Previous Year's Goal #2</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% percentage of kindergarten students will demonstrate proficient or advanced ability on the CTLS End of Unit Math Assessment.</li> <li>• The percentage of 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> grade students demonstrating proficient or advanced ability, will increase by at least 6% from 48% (141 students) to 54% (156 students) as measured by the Beacon Assessment administered in Spring 2025.</li> <li>• The percentage of students in 3<sup>rd</sup>- 5<sup>th</sup> grade scoring Proficient (Level 3) or higher on the Georgia Milestones End of Grade Assessment will increase by at least 7% from 22% (101 students) to 29% (131 students) as measured by the Georgia Milestone Assessment administered in May 2025.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Was the goal met?</b>      <input type="checkbox"/> YES      <input type="checkbox"/> NO      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially</p>	
<p>What data supports the outcome of the goal?</p>	<p>-The percentage of kindergarten students who demonstrated proficient or advanced ability on the CTLS End of Unit math Assessments was 62% (81 students). This part of the math goal was met.</p> <p>-The percentage of 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> grade students scoring in the prepared range on the Math Spring Beacon was 10% (27 students).</p> <p>-The percentage of students in 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade scoring Proficient (Level 3) or higher on the Georgia Milestones End of Grade Assessment was 26% (114 students).</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Reflecting on Outcomes</b></p>	
<p>If the goal was <b>not met</b>, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?</p>	<p>-The categories established in the goal did not match the scoring categories of the Beacon that was administered during the 2024-2025 school year.</p> <p>-Purposeful implementation of daily fluency instruction.</p> <p>-Professional Development that supports rigorous tier one instruction.</p>
<p>If the goal was <b>met or exceeded</b>, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?</p>	

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

ELA DATA				
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	FY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	FY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	24%	17%	14%	27%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	29%	25%	17%	22%
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	27%	32%	31%	20%

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 <sup>st</sup> Grade	34%	39%	26%	34%	37%	30%	31%	42%	27%	39%	36%	24%	39%	35%	26%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	44%	29%	27%	42%	33%	26%	36%	35%	29%	38%	33%	29%	36%	41%	23%

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 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	10%	72%	17%	21%	66%	13%	19%	70%	11%	14%	75%	10%	18%	68%	14%	20%	68%	12%	41%	51%	8%	18%	70%	12%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	25%	63%	12%	23%	63%	14%	30%	63%	7%	22%	68%	10%	25%	64%	11%	23%	61%	15%	37%	52%	10%	25%	63%	12%
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	29%	57%	14%	29%	56%	14%	29%	57%	14%	31%	53%	16%	29%	60%	12%	33%	52%	15%	47%	43%	10%	29%	57%	14%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses																																								
<b>FY24 ELA Milestones</b> (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	<b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD</b>  <b>Grade Levels (all students):</b>  <b>EL:</b> No identified strengths at this time  <b>SWD:</b> No identified strengths at this time.	<b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD</b> <b>Grade Levels (all students):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>14.5 % of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students scored in the proficient or distinguished categories (23/159 students tested).</li><li>17.5% of 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scored in the proficient or distinguished categories (25/144 students tested).</li><li>31% of 5<sup>th</sup> grade students scored in the proficient or distinguished categories (50/161 students tested).</li></ul> <table><tr><th colspan="4">2024 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grade Writing</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>1-Below Target</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2- Approaching target</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3- Met target</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</td><td>113</td><td>26</td><td>20</td><td>159</td></tr><tr><td>4<sup>th</sup> Grade</td><td>103</td><td>26</td><td>15</td><td>144</td></tr><tr><td>5<sup>th</sup> Grade</td><td>87</td><td>33</td><td>42</td><td>162</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>303</td><td>85</td><td>77</td><td>464</td></tr></table> <b>EL:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>3<sup>rd</sup> grade ELA Milestones: 94% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELL Students (61/65 students tested) scored in levels 1 or 2.</li><li>4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA Milestones: 94% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELL Students scored in levels 1 or 2 (58 out of 62 students tested).</li><li>5<sup>th</sup> grade ELA Milestones: 100 % of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELL Students scored in levels 1 or 2 (46 out of 46 students tested).</li></ul> <b>SWD:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 100% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade SWD scored in levels 1 or 2 (1-20 students; 2- 2 students).</li><li>4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA Milestones: 96% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD scored in levels 1 or 2 (25 out of 26 students tested).</li><li>5<sup>th</sup> grade ELA Milestones: 100 % of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD scored in levels 1 or 2 (19 out of 19 students tested).</li></ul>	2024 3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Writing				Total	1-Below Target	1	2	3		2- Approaching target					3- Met target					3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	113	26	20	159	4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	103	26	15	144	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	87	33	42	162	Total	303	85	77	464
2024 3 <sup>rd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Writing				Total																																						
1-Below Target	1	2	3																																							
2- Approaching target																																										
3- Met target																																										
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	113	26	20	159																																						
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	103	26	15	144																																						
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	87	33	42	162																																						
Total	303	85	77	464																																						

<p><b>FY25 ELA Milestones</b> (Grade Levels &amp; Subgroups)</p>	<p><b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD:</b></p> <p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b> No Strengths Identified at this time</p> <p><b>EL:</b> No Strengths Identified at this time</p> <p><b>SWD:</b> No Strengths Identified at this time</p>	<p><b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD:</b></p> <p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 152 students tested- 50% (76 students) scored level 1; 24% (36 students) scored level 2; 18% (27 students) scored level 3; 7% (11 students) scored level 4</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 158 students tested- 50% (79 students) scored level 1; 28% (44 students) scored level 2; 15% (24 students) scored level 3; 6% (9 students) scored level 4</li> <li>• 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 137 students tested- 44% (60 students) scored level 1; 36% (49 students ) scored level 2; 16% (22 students) scored level 3; 4% (5 students) scored level 4</li> </ul> <p><b>EL:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 60 students tested- 63% (38 students) scored level 1; 22% (13 students) scored level 2; 12% (7 students) scored level 3; 3% (2 students) scored level 4</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 63 students tested- 60% (38 students) scored level 1; 29% (18 students ) scored level 2; 8% (5 students) scored level 3; 3% (2 students) scored level 4</li> <li>• 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 36 students tested- 78% (28 students) scored level 1; 22% ( 8 students ) scored level 2; 0% (0 students) scored level 3; 0% (0 Students) scored level 4</li> </ul> <p><b>SWD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 19 students tested- 79% (15 students) scored level 1; 11% (2 students) scored level 2; 11% (2 students) scored level 3; 0% (0 students) scored level 4</li> <li>• 4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 25 students tested- 96% (24 students) scored level 1; 4% (1 student ) scored level 2; 0% (0 students) scored level 3; 0% scored level 4</li> <li>• 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 21 students tested- 90% (19 students) scored level 1; 5% (1 student ) scored level 2; 5% (1 Student) scored level 3; 0% (0 students) scored level 4</li> </ul>
--	---	--



<p><b>Beacon Assessment – ELA</b> (Grade Levels &amp; Subgroups)</p>	<p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>1<sup>st</sup> Grade:</b> 69% scoring Near Target or Prepared Scale Score (105 out of 152 students)</li> <li>• <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Grade:</b> 64% scoring Near Target or Prepared Scale Score. (89 out of 137 students)</li> <li>• <b>3<sup>rd</sup>- 5<sup>th</sup> grade:</b> Students have demonstrated strengths in <b>Key ideas and Details:</b> The scores indicate that students are able to ask and answer questions, recount a story, determine the central message, and describe character traits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade:</b> 89% scoring Near Target or Prepared (138 out of 155 students).</li> <li>• <b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade:</b> 75% scoring Near Target or Prepared (122 out of 163 students).</li> <li>• <b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade:</b> 71% scoring Near Target or Prepared (99 out of 139 students).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>ELL Students : 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 45 % scored in the Near Target or Prepared (53 out of 117 students).</li> <li>• <b>3<sup>rd</sup>- 5<sup>th</sup> grade:</b> 71 % scored in the Near Target or Prepared (142 out of 199 students).</li> </ul> <p><b>SWD: 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 43% scored in the Near Target or prepared (12 out of 28 students).</li> <li>• <b>3<sup>rd</sup>- 5<sup>th</sup> grade:</b> 51% scored in the Near Target &amp; Prepared (36 out of 71 students).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b></p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup>(all students):</b> Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in ELA our students have demonstrated weaknesses in <b>Foundations:</b> The scores indicate that students are having difficulties with phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.  <b>1<sup>st</sup> Grade:</b> 34% scoring in the Support Needed area (52 out of 152 students).  <b>2<sup>nd</sup> Grade:</b> 44% scoring in the Support Needed area (60 out of 137 students).</p> <p><b>3-5 (all students):</b> Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> grade Beacon results in English language Arts (ELA), our students have demonstrated weaknesses in <b>Conventions:</b> The scores indicate that students are having difficulties with punctuation, capitalization, and spelling when writing in the English language.  <b>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade:</b> 41% scoring in the Support Needed area (64 out of 155 students).  <b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade:</b> 37% scoring in the Support Needed area (57 out of 163 students).  <b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade:</b> 47% scoring in the Support Needed area (65 out of 139 students).</p> <p><b>EL: 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade ELL Students:</b>  <b>Based on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade beacon Data:</b> 55% scored in the Support Needed- Scale Score (64 out of 117 students).  <b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELL Students:</b>  <b>Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Beacon Data:</b> 29% scored in the Support Needed-Scale Score (57 out of 199 students).  <b>SWD: 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade SWD</b>  <b>Based on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade beacon Data:</b> 46% scored in the Support Needed area Scale Score (13 out of 28 students).  <b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD:</b>  <b>Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Beacon Data:</b> 49% scored in the Support Needed area Scale Score (35 out of 71 students).</p>
<p><b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p>	<p><b>Root Cause Explanation:</b></p> <p>-Writing instruction was not streamlined to a single resource.  -Modeling of writing was inconsistent.</p>	

<div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</div></div>	<div>-Instruction in language conventions is delivered in isolation, without being embedded within the context of content-area learning.</div> <div>-Need for additional professional development focused on unpacking ELlevation strategies that can be utilized when delivering ELA Instruction.</div>																															
<div><div>ACCESS Scores</div><div>(Grade Level Reading &amp; Writing)</div></div>	<div>Grade Levels (all students):</div> <table><tr><td colspan="2">2024 Overall PL Average – 3.0</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">348 total ELs</td></tr><tr><td>Listening – 4.2</td><td>1 – Entering = 25.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Reading – 3.2</td><td>2 – Emerging = 23.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Speaking – 2.9</td><td>3 – Developing = 26.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Writing – 2.7</td><td>4 – Expanding = 19.8%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>5 – Bridging = 4.6%</td></tr></table>	2024 Overall PL Average – 3.0		348 total ELs		Listening – 4.2	1 – Entering = 25.9%	Reading – 3.2	2 – Emerging = 23.3%	Speaking – 2.9	3 – Developing = 26.4%	Writing – 2.7	4 – Expanding = 19.8%		5 – Bridging = 4.6%	<div>Grade Levels (all students):</div> <table><tr><td colspan="2">2025 Overall PL Average – 3.0</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">325 total ELs</td></tr><tr><td>Overall PL Average – 3.0</td><td>325 total ELs</td></tr><tr><td>Listening – 3.2</td><td>1 – Entering = 29.8%</td></tr><tr><td>Reading – 3.1</td><td>2 – Emerging = 19.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Speaking – 2.9</td><td>3 – Developing = 25.8%</td></tr><tr><td>Writing – 2.9</td><td>4 – Expanding = 16.9%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>5 – Bridging = 8%</td></tr></table>	2025 Overall PL Average – 3.0		325 total ELs		Overall PL Average – 3.0	325 total ELs	Listening – 3.2	1 – Entering = 29.8%	Reading – 3.1	2 – Emerging = 19.4%	Speaking – 2.9	3 – Developing = 25.8%	Writing – 2.9	4 – Expanding = 16.9%		5 – Bridging = 8%
	2024 Overall PL Average – 3.0																															
	348 total ELs																															
	Listening – 4.2	1 – Entering = 25.9%																														
	Reading – 3.2	2 – Emerging = 23.3%																														
Speaking – 2.9	3 – Developing = 26.4%																															
Writing – 2.7	4 – Expanding = 19.8%																															
	5 – Bridging = 4.6%																															
2025 Overall PL Average – 3.0																																
325 total ELs																																
Overall PL Average – 3.0	325 total ELs																															
Listening – 3.2	1 – Entering = 29.8%																															
Reading – 3.1	2 – Emerging = 19.4%																															
Speaking – 2.9	3 – Developing = 25.8%																															
Writing – 2.9	4 – Expanding = 16.9%																															
	5 – Bridging = 8%																															
<div>EL: Average Writing Proficiency Level (K-5):</div> <div>2024 = 2.7 of 6</div> <div>2025 = 2.9 of 6</div> <div>Average Writing proficiency level increased by 0.2 from 2024 to 2025.</div>	<div>EL: Average Listening Proficiency Level (K-5):</div> <div>2024 = 4.2 of 6</div> <div>2025 = 3.2 of 6</div> <div>Average Listening proficiency level decreased by 1.0 from 2024 to 2025.</div>																															
<div>Level 5 – Bridging Proficiency Level (K-5):</div> <div>2024 = 4.6%</div> <div>2025 = 8%</div> <div>-Increased percentage of students scoring at the Level 5 composite proficiency level by 3.4%.</div>	<div>Average Reading Proficiency Level (K-5):</div> <div>2024 = 3.2 of 6</div> <div>2025 = 3.1 of 6</div> <div>Average Reading proficiency level decreased by 0.1 from 2024 to 2025.</div>																															
<div>2025 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade</div> <table><tr><td>Overall PL Average – 2.9</td><td>58 total ELs –</td></tr><tr><td>Listening – 3.4</td><td>19 with ≤ 0 band growth</td></tr><tr><td>Reading – 3.5</td><td>9 with = 1 band growth</td></tr><tr><td>Speaking – 2.6</td><td>22 with &gt; 1 band growth</td></tr><tr><td>Writing – 2.8</td><td>6 with no historical data</td></tr></table>	Overall PL Average – 2.9	58 total ELs –	Listening – 3.4	19 with ≤ 0 band growth	Reading – 3.5	9 with = 1 band growth	Speaking – 2.6	22 with > 1 band growth	Writing – 2.8	6 with no historical data	<div>5<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD in Level 5 – Bridging Proficiency Level:</div> <div>2024 = 0 of 7 EL SWD</div> <div>2025 = 2 of 11 EL SWD</div> <div>-Increased number of SWD ELs scoring at Level 5 composite proficiency level from 0 to 2 from 2024 to 2025.</div>																					
Overall PL Average – 2.9	58 total ELs –																															
Listening – 3.4	19 with ≤ 0 band growth																															
Reading – 3.5	9 with = 1 band growth																															
Speaking – 2.6	22 with > 1 band growth																															
Writing – 2.8	6 with no historical data																															
	<div>2025 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</div> <table><tr><td>Overall PL Average – 3.3</td><td>60 total ELs –</td></tr><tr><td>Listening – 3.9</td><td>27 with ≤ 0 band growth</td></tr><tr><td>Reading – 3.4</td><td>13 with = 1 band growth</td></tr><tr><td>Speaking – 3.0</td><td>13 with &gt; 1 band growth</td></tr><tr><td>Writing – 3.2</td><td>7 with no historical data</td></tr></table>	Overall PL Average – 3.3	60 total ELs –	Listening – 3.9	27 with ≤ 0 band growth	Reading – 3.4	13 with = 1 band growth	Speaking – 3.0	13 with > 1 band growth	Writing – 3.2	7 with no historical data																					
Overall PL Average – 3.3	60 total ELs –																															
Listening – 3.9	27 with ≤ 0 band growth																															
Reading – 3.4	13 with = 1 band growth																															
Speaking – 3.0	13 with > 1 band growth																															
Writing – 3.2	7 with no historical data																															
	<div>2025 1<sup>st</sup> Grade</div>																															

	<b>2024 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade</b>		Overall PL Average – 2.4 Listening – 3.6 Reading – 2.8 Speaking – 2.5 Writing – 2.1	61 total ELs – 22 with ≤ 0 band growth 17 with = 1 band growth 13 with > 1 band growth 8 with no historical data
	Overall PL Average – 3.1 Listening – 4.1 Reading – 3.8 Speaking – 2.8 Writing – 2.8	66 total ELs – 1 with ≤ 0% growth 37 with ≤ 50% growth 16 with > 50% growth 12 with no historical data	<b>2024 1<sup>st</sup> Grade</b>	
	<b>2025 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</b>		Overall PL Average – 2.5 Listening – 4.2 Reading – 2.9 Speaking – 2.5 Writing – 2.0	60 total ELs – 4 with ≤ 0% growth 46 with ≤ 50% growth 2 with > 50% growth 8 with no historical data
	Overall PL Average – 3.3 Listening – 3.9 Reading – 3.4 Speaking – 3.0 Writing – 3.2	60 total ELs – 27 with ≤ 0 band growth 13 with = 1 band growth 13 with > 1 band growth 7 with no historical data	<b>SWD:</b>	
	<b>2024 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</b>		Total = 38 K = 2 1 <sup>st</sup> = 4 2 <sup>nd</sup> = 5 3 <sup>rd</sup> = 6 4 <sup>th</sup> = 12 5 <sup>th</sup> = 9	Composite Levels: 1 – Entering = 10 ELs, 26% 2 – Emerging = 12 ELs, 31.5% 3 – Developing = 12 ELs, 31.5% 4 – Expanding = 4 ELs, 11%
	Overall PL Average – 3.0 Listening – 3.6 Reading – 3.3 Speaking – 2.7 Writing – 2.9	66 total ELs – 2 with ≤ 0% growth 29 with ≤ 50% growth 21 with > 50% growth 14 with no historical data	<b>2025 4<sup>th</sup> Grade</b>	

	Overall PL Average – 3.8 Listening – 5.2 Reading – 3.8 Speaking – 3.4 Writing – 3.6	64 total ELs – 6 with $\leq 0$ band growth 14 with = 1 band growth 32 with > 1 band growth 12 with no historical data
	<b>2024 4<sup>th</sup> Grade</b>	
	Overall PL Average – 4.1 Listening – 5.6 Reading – 4.1 Speaking – 3.8 Writing – 3.8	64 total ELs – 0 with $\leq 0\%$ growth 41 with $\leq 50\%$ growth 14 with > 50% growth 9 with no historical data
	<b>2025 5<sup>th</sup> Grade</b>	
	Overall PL Average – 4.1 Listening – 5.1 Reading – 3.5 Speaking – 3.6 Writing – 4.2	37 total ELs – 8 with $\leq 0$ band growth 5 with = 1 band growth 18 with > 1 band growth 6 with no historical data
	<b>2024 5<sup>th</sup> Grade</b>	
	Overall PL Average – 3.6 Listening – 4.9	64 total ELs – 2 with $\leq 0\%$ growth



	<table><tr><td>Reading – 3.2 Speaking – 3.2 Writing – 3.5</td><td>33 with ≤ 50% growth 3 with &gt; 50% growth 11 with no historical data</td></tr></table> <div>SWD:</div> <table><tr><td colspan="2"></td></tr><tr><td>Total: 36 ELs K- 3 1st- 3 2nd- 5 3rd- 7 4th- 7 5th-11</td><td>Composite Levels: 1 – Entering = 12 ELs 2 – Emerging = 6 ELs 3 – Developing = 11 ELs 4 – Expanding = 5 ELs 5 – Bridging = 2 ELs</td></tr></table>	Reading – 3.2 Speaking – 3.2 Writing – 3.5	33 with ≤ 50% growth 3 with > 50% growth 11 with no historical data			Total: 36 ELs K- 3 1st- 3 2nd- 5 3rd- 7 4th- 7 5th-11	Composite Levels: 1 – Entering = 12 ELs 2 – Emerging = 6 ELs 3 – Developing = 11 ELs 4 – Expanding = 5 ELs 5 – Bridging = 2 ELs	
Reading – 3.2 Speaking – 3.2 Writing – 3.5	33 with ≤ 50% growth 3 with > 50% growth 11 with no historical data							
Total: 36 ELs K- 3 1st- 3 2nd- 5 3rd- 7 4th- 7 5th-11	Composite Levels: 1 – Entering = 12 ELs 2 – Emerging = 6 ELs 3 – Developing = 11 ELs 4 – Expanding = 5 ELs 5 – Bridging = 2 ELs							
<div>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</div> <div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</div><div><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</div><div><input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</div></div>	<div>Root Cause Explanation:</div> <div><div><div>Lack of consistency with embedding language acquisition strategies in content/standards-based instruction.</div></div></div>							
<div>ELA Common Assessments</div> <div>(Grade Level Reading &amp; Writing)</div>	<div>Grade Levels (all students):</div> <div>EL: 2<sup>nd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grade: The average for ELL students was 9% lower than non-ELL Students on the Q3 ELA Summative: ELL Students performed just below non-ELL students with respect to RL3-Describing characters and explaining how character actions contribute to the outcome of the story; RL9- Comparing and Contrasting themes, settings, and plots of stories. RI3- Identifying Key Ideas and Details: Describing the relationship between a series of historical Events, scientific ideas, or steps technical procedures; ELL Students also performed just below non-ELL students with respect to RI6- recognizing and analyzing point of view, and RI9- Comparing and Contrasting important points and key details in two texts.</div>	<div>Grade Levels (all students):</div> <div>-2<sup>nd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grade: The average score on the Q3 ELA Summative Assessments was 61%: Students are having difficulty with RL3-Describing characters and explaining how character actions contribute to the outcome of the story; RL9- Comparing and Contrasting themes, settings, and plots of stories; RI3- Identifying Key Ideas and Details: Describing the relationship between a series of historical Events, scientific ideas, or steps technical procedures; to RI6- recognizing and analyzing point of view, and RI9- Comparing and Contrasting important points and key details in two texts.  -3rd -5th grade students consistently score below 50% on constructed response test items, regardless of the associated standard.</div>						

	<p><b>SWD :</b> 2<sup>nd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grade: The average score on the Q3 ELA Summative for SWD was 6.25% lower than students w/out disabilities: SWD performed just below Non-SWD with respect to RL3-Describing characters and explaining how character actions contribute to the outcome of the story; RL9- Comparing and Contrasting themes, settings, and plots of stories; RI3- Identifying Key Ideas and Details: Describing the relationship between a series of historical Events, scientific ideas, or steps technical procedures; SWD also performed just below Non-SWD with respect to RI6- recognizing and analyzing point of view, and RI9- Comparing and Contrasting important points and key details in two texts.</p>	<p><b>EL: (See Left Column)</b></p> <p><b>SWD: (See Left Column)</b></p>
<p><b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction  <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity  <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership  <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p><b>Root Cause Explanation:</b></p> <p>- 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Students pulled out during reading/ writing instruction would benefit from more time to practice ELA Standards/independent practice as they are required to take the common formative assessments.  -Primary- Students perform well on phonics skills when taught in isolation, but the transfer of phonics knowledge is not evident in writing.</p>	
<p><b>School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)</b></p>	<p>-Phonics instruction is consistently found during instructional walks in 32 out of 32 classrooms.  -Vocabulary instruction has been intentionally planned and implemented.</p>	<p>-Students were not observed actively speaking: 14 out of 32 walks students were actively speaking 25-50 % of the time; 5 out of the 32 walks students were actively speaking 0-25% of the time.</p>
<p><b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity  <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership  <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p>	<p><b>Root Cause Explanation:</b></p> <p>-Inconsistent implementation of the 120-minute literacy block.</p>	
<p><b>Other Summary Data</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teacher Survey  <input type="checkbox"/> Parent Survey</p>	<p>-Teacher responses indicate that teachers in K-2 feel confident teaching phonics using district-provided resources.</p>	<p>-Teacher responses indicate that teachers in 3<sup>rd</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> grade do not feel confident assessing students' phonics skills or providing instruction to support students with phonics needs.</p>

<input type="checkbox"/> Professional Learning Survey <input type="checkbox"/> _____		-Teacher responses indicate that many of K-5 teachers do not feel confident teaching writing connected to text.
<b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	<b>Root Cause Explanation:</b> - Teachers require more training in structured reading and writing instruction. -Teachers need more support with balancing grade-level reading/writing expectations with instruction that addresses previously missed skills.	

## ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

<b>GOAL #1: ELA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By May 2026, the percentage of students in 1<sup>st</sup>- 2<sup>nd</sup> grade who scored at Level 1, will decrease from 37% of enrollment (108/289 students), to 17% of enrollment as measured by the Spring 2026 Beacon Assessment.</li> <li>By May 2026, the percentage of students in 3<sup>rd</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> grade scoring Proficient or higher will increase from 22 % of enrollment (98 out of 447 students tested), to 29 % of enrollment as measured by the 2025-2026 Georgia Milestone EOG Assessment.</li> </ul>		
<b>Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:</b>	-Writing instruction was not streamlined to a single resource. -Modeling of writing was inconsistent.		
<b>Funding Source(s)</b> <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
<b>Components</b>	<b>Implementation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Evaluation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Resources</b>
<b>Who?</b> <b>One Action (Verb)</b> <b>What?</b> <b>Frequency</b>	<b>Implementation Performance Target:</b> By October 2025, 100% of K-5 <sup>th</sup> teachers will use explicit writing instruction with a structured process a minimum of two times a week to increase students' ability to accurately provide a written response.	<b>Evaluation Performance Target:</b> By December 2025, at least 50% of students in each grade level (grades K-5) will score 3/4 on a grade level common assessment using rubrics from the Wonders Curriculum.  By May 2026, at least 65% of students in each grade level (grades K-5) will score 3/4 on a grade level common assessment using rubrics from the Wonders Curriculum.	-Wonders Strategy Resources  -Wonders Rubrics  -Structured writing process resources respective to each writing genre.
<b>Target Student Group</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All Students <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input type="checkbox"/> SWD			
<b>Action Step</b> <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
1. Kindergarten-5th grade teachers will use Explicit Writing Instruction with a structured process to increase students' ability to accurately provide a written response.	<b>Implementation Plan:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preplanning: Provide teachers with writing instruction requirements.</li> <li>August-September: PL will be provided for explicit writing instruction processes. Coaches will provide strategies for each component of the process as well as anchor charts and graphic organizers.</li> <li>October-December: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of the explicit writing processes. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> </ul> January-February: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of the explicit writing processes. Share instructional walk data with grade		
	<b>Evaluation Tool(s):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade Level Common Formative Assessments</li> </ul> <b>Evaluation Plan:</b> Students will be assessed: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>At the end of each unit.</u>		



	<p>level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• March-April: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of the explicit writing processes. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> <li>• May: Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Artifacts to be Collected:</b>          -Instructional walk forms          -PL sign -in sheets</p> <p><b>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p><b>Frequency of Monitoring:</b> Monthly Instructional Walks</p>	<p><b>Data Analysis Plan:</b>          CCCs: - Collaborative scoring of grade level common assessment using Wonders writing rubrics at the end of each unit during CCC meetings to determine progress towards goal, and address student needs and/or necessary changes in lessons.</p> <p><b>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Principal  <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists  <input type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads</p>	
<b>Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:</b>	<p>-55% (64 students out of 112 students tested) of ELL Students in grades 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> scored in the Support Needed performance level of the Spring 2025 ELA Beacon.</p> <p>-28% (59 students our of 202 students tested) of ELL Students in grades 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> scored in the Support Needed performance level of the spring 2025 ELA Beacon.</p> <p>-46% (13 students out of 28 students tested) of Students with Disabilities in grades 1<sup>st</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> scored in the Support Needed performance level of the Spring 2025 ELA Beacon.</p> <p>-49% (35 students our of 71 students tested) of Students with Disabilities in grades 3<sup>rd</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> scored in the Support Needed performance level of the spring 2025 ELA Beacon.</p>		
<b>Funding Source(s)</b> <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
<b>Components</b>	<b>Implementation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Evaluation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Resources</b>

<p><b>Who?</b> <b>One Action (Verb)</b> <b>What?</b> <b>Frequency</b></p>	<p><b>Implementation Performance Target:</b> By October 2025, 100% of K-5<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers will implement ELLevation strategies during the ELA Block as measured by monthly instructional walk forms.</p>	<p><b>Evaluation Performance Target:</b> <b>Kindergarten:</b> By December 2025, at least 50% of Kindergarten ELL students will score a three(3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric.</p>	
	<p><b>Implementation Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preplanning: Provide teachers with school-wide expectations for Utilizing ELLevation strategies during the ELA block.</li> </ul>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grade:</b> By December 2025, at least 70% of 1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade ELL students will score in the Near Target category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment.</p>	
<p><b>Target Student Group</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SWD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>August-September: PL will be provided for ELLevation Strategies. The ESOL team will provide guidance on how to effectively implement the strategies.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Kindergarten:</b> By May 2026, at least 70% of Kindergarten ELL students will score a three(3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric.</p>	
<p><b>Action Step</b> <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>October-December: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of ELLevation strategies. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> </ul>	<p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>:</b> By May 2026, at least 70% of 1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade ELL students will score in the Prepared category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment.</p>	
<p>2. The ESOL Team will provide ELLevation Professional Learning to Kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade teachers once a quarter to model ELLevation strategies that teachers will implement during the EL Block.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>January-February: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of ELLevation strategies. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> <li>March-April: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of ELLevation strategies. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> </ul> <p>May: Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation.</p> <p><b>Artifacts to be Collected:</b> -Instructional walk forms -PL sign -in sheets</p> <p><b>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</b></p>	<p><b>Kindergarten:</b> By December 2025, at least 50% of Kindergarten SWD will score a three(3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric.</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grade:</b> By December 2025, at least 70% of 1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade SWD will score in the Near Target category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment.</p> <p><b>Kindergarten:</b> By May 2026, at least 70% of Kindergarten SWD will score a three(3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric.</p> <p><b>1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>:</b> By May 2026, at least 70% of 1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> grade ELL SWD will score in the Prepared category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Tool(s):</b> Kindergarten: Scored Grade Level Common assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1st-5th: Beacon Data</li> </ul> <p><b>Evaluation Plan:</b> Students will be assessed: <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks</p>	

	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists  <b>Frequency of Monitoring:</b> Monthly instructional Walks	<input type="checkbox"/> Monthly <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year <input type="checkbox"/> _____  <b>Data Analysis Plan:</b> CCCs: - Collaborative scoring of grade level common assessment using Wonders writing rubrics three times a year during CCC meetings to determine progress towards goal, and address student needs and/or necessary changes in lessons.  <b>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Principal <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists <input type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads  <b>Evaluation Performance Target:</b> <b>Kindergarten:</b> By December 2025, at least 50% of Kindergarten SWD will score a three (3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric.  <b>1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Grade:</b> By December 2025, at least 70% of 1 <sup>st</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> grade SWD will score in the Near Target category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment.  <b>Kindergarten:</b> By May 2026, at least 70% of Kindergarten SWD will score a three (3) or a four (4) on grade level writing common assessments as evidenced by the Wonders writing rubric.  <b>1<sup>st</sup>-5<sup>th</sup>:</b> By May 2026, at least 70% of 1 <sup>st</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> grade ELL SWD will score in the Prepared category in the Writing domain of the Beacon Assessment.  <b>Evaluation Tool(s):</b> Kindergarten: Scored Grade Level Common assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1st-5th: Beacon Data</li> </ul> <b>Evaluation Plan:</b>	
--	---	--	--

		<p>Students will be assessed:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Every other month</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> _____</p> <p><b>Data Analysis Plan:</b></p> <p>CCCs: - Collaborative scoring of grade level common assessment using Wonders writing rubrics three times a year during CCC meetings to determine progress towards goal, and address student needs and/or necessary changes in lessons.</p> <p><b>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Principal</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads</p>	

## MATH DATA

<b>MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data</b>	<b>FY22</b> % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	<b>FY23</b> % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	<b>FY24</b> % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	<b>FY25</b> % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	26%	21%	29%	28%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	28%	23%	21%	30%
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	20%	24%	13%	18%

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)	45%	47%	8%	60%	27%	13%	52%	40%	8%	45%	36%	19%
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	34%	53%	14%	26%	31%	43%	16%	30%	54%	33%	52%	15%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade	29%	53%	18%	27%	50%	23%	46%	30%	24%	31%	40%	29%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade	14%	85%	1%	21%	77%	2%	20%	78%	3%	33%	64%	3%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	48%	48%	4%	54%	45%	1%	47%	50%	2%	50%	49%	1%
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade	69%	29%	2%	67%	33%	0%	65%	32%	3%	60%	36%	4%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>FY25 MATH Milestones</b> (Data by grade & subgroup)	<p><b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD</b></p> <p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b> No strengths identified at this time.</p> <p><b>EL:</b> No strengths identified at this time.</p> <p><b>SWD:</b> No strengths identified at this time.</p>	<p><b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD</b></p> <p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Math Milestones: 151 students tested- 26% (39 students) scored level 1; 46% (69 students) scored level 2; 23% (35 students) scored level 3; 5% (8 students) scored level 4</li> <li>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Milestones: 158 students tested- 30% (47 students) scored level 1; 39% (62 students) scored level 2; 25% (40 students) scored level 3; 5% (8 students) scored level 4</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5<sup>th</sup> Grade Math Milestones: 137 students tested- 52% (71 students) scored level 1; 31% (42 students ) scored level 2; 14% (19 students) scored level 3; 4% (5 students) scored level 4</li> </ul> <p><b>EL:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 60 students tested- 38% (23 students) scored level 1; 42% (25 students) scored level 2; 15% (9 students) scored level 3; 5% (3 students) scored level 4</li> <li>4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 63 students tested- 27% (17 students) scored level 1; 48% (30 students) scored level 2; 24% (15 students) scored level 3; 2% (1 student) scored level 4</li> <li>5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 36 students tested- 81% (29 students) scored level 1; 14% ( 5 students ) scored level 2; 6% (2 students) scored level 3; 0% (0 students) scored level 4</li> </ul> <p><b>SWD:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 19 students tested- 63% (12 students) scored level 1; 37% (7 students) scored level 2; 0% scored level 3; 0% scored level 4</li> <li>4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 25 students tested- 68% (17 students) scored level 1; 24% (6 students ) scored level 2; 8% (2 students) scored level 3; 0% (0 students) scored level 4</li> <li>5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA Milestones: 21 students tested- 86% (18 students) scored level 1; 5% (1 student) scored level 2; 10% (2 Students) scored level 3; 0% (0 students) scored level 4</li> </ul>
<b>FY24 MATH Milestones</b> (Data by grade & subgroup)	<p><b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD</b></p> <p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b> No strengths identified at this time.</p> <p><b>EL:</b> No strengths identified at this time.</p> <p><b>SWD:</b> No strengths identified at this time.</p>	<p><b>For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD:</b></p> <p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b></p> <p>-Based on the 2024 Math Milestones Data:</p> <p>-29 % of 3rd grade students scored in the proficient or distinguished categories (46 out of 159 students tested).</p>



		<p>-21% of 4th grade students scored in the proficient or distinguished categories (30 out of 144 students tested).</p> <p>-13% of 5th grade students scored in the proficient or distinguished categories (21 out of 161 students tested).</p> <p><b>EL:</b></p> <p>-Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Math Milestones results, 83% of 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade ELL Students (54 out of 65 students tested) scored in levels 1 or 2.</p> <p>-Based on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade Math Milestones results, 87% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELL Students scored in levels 1 or 2 (54 out of 62 students tested).</p> <p>-Based on the 5<sup>th</sup> grade Math Milestones results, 100 % of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELL Students scored in levels 1 or 2 (46 out of 46 students tested).</p> <p><b>SWD:</b></p> <p>-Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Math Milestones results, 91% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade SWD scored in levels 1 or 2 (20 out of 22 students tested).</p> <p>-Based on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade Math Milestones results, 92% of 4<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD scored in levels 1 or 2 (24 out of 26 students tested).</p> <p>-Based on the 5<sup>th</sup> grade Math Milestones results, 100 % of 5<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD scored in levels 1 or 2 (19 out of 19 students tested).</p>
<b>Beacon Assessment – Math</b> (Grade Level & Subgroups)	<p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b></p> <p><b>K-2<sup>nd</sup> (all students):</b> Based on the Kindergarten, 1<sup>st</sup>, and 2nd grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated strengths in Numerical Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>Kindergarten:</u></b> 55% scoring Near Target or Prepared ( 66 out of 120 students).</p> <p><b><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grade:</u></b> 67% scoring Near Target or Prepared (99 out of 148 students).</p>	<p><b>Grade Levels (all students):</b></p> <p><b>K-2<sup>nd</sup>(all students):</b> Based on the Kindergarten, 1<sup>st</sup>, and 2nd grade Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in Measurement &amp; Data Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>Kindergarten:</u></b> 52% scoring in the Support Needed area (62 out of 120 students).</p> <p><b><u>1<sup>st</sup> Grade:</u></b> 16% scoring in the Support Needed area (24 out of 148 students).</p>

	<p><b><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grade:</u></b> 71% scoring Near Target or Prepared (99 out of 139 students).</p> <p><b>3-5 (all students):</b></p> <p>-Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Beacon results in Math, students have demonstrated strength in Numerical Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade:</u></b> 86 % scoring Near Target or Prepared (131 out of 152 students).</p> <p>-Based on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade Beacon results in Math, students have demonstrated strength in Measurement &amp; Data Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>4<sup>th</sup> Grade:</u></b> 52% scoring Near Target or Prepared (85 out of 163 students).</p> <p>-Based on the 5<sup>th</sup> grade Beacon results in Math, (as compared to other domains) students have demonstrated strength in Geometric &amp; Spatial Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>5<sup>th</sup> Grade:</u></b> 40 % scoring Near Target or Prepared (56 out of 140 students).</p> <p><b>EL: K, 1<sup>st</sup>, and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade ELL Students:</b></p> <p><b>Based on the K, 1<sup>st</sup>, and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Beacon Data:</b> 55% scored in the Near Target or Prepared (89 out of 161 students).</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELL Students:</b></p> <p><b>Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Beacon Data:</b> 54% scored in the Near Target or Prepared (107 out of 199 students).</p> <p><b>SWD: K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade SWD</b></p> <p><b>Based on the K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Beacon Data:</b> 55 % scored in the Near Target or prepared (18 out of 33 students).</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD:</b></p>	<p><b><u>2<sup>nd</sup> Grade:</u></b> 46% scoring in the Support Needed area (64out of 139 students).</p> <p><b>3-5 (all students):</b></p> <p>-Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Beacon results in Math, students have demonstrated weakness in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>3<sup>rd</sup> Grade:</u></b> 33 % scoring in the Support Needed area (50 out of 152 students).</p> <p>-Based on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade Beacon results in Math, students have demonstrated weakness in Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>4<sup>th</sup> Grade:</u></b> 54 % scoring in the Support Needed area (88 out of 163 students).</p> <p>-Based on the 5<sup>th</sup> grade Beacon results in Math, students have demonstrated weakness in Numerical Reasoning:</p> <p><b><u>5<sup>th</sup> Grade:</u></b> 69% scoring in the Support Needed area (97 out of 140 students).</p> <p><b>EL: K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade ELL Students:</b></p> <p><b>Based on the K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade beacon Data:</b> 45% scored in the Support Needed area (72 out of 161 students).</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade ELL Students:</b></p> <p><b>Based on the 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Beacon Data:</b> 46% scored in the Support Needed area (92 out of 199 students).</p> <p><b>SWD: K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade SWD</b></p> <p><b>Based on the K, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade beacon Data:</b> 45% scored in the Support Needed area (15 out of 33 students).</p> <p><b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> Grade SWD:</b></p>
--	--	---

	Based on the 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> , and 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Beacon Data: 28% scored in the Near Target & Prepared (20 out of 71 students). <b>*No student scored in the prepared category.</b>	Based on the 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> , and 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Beacon Data: 72% scored in the Support Needed (51 out of 71 students).
<b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	<b>Root Cause Explanation:</b> -Classroom instruction is not aligned with the rigor of standards or assessments - Inconsistent opportunities provided for students to engage in daily number sense routines to develop foundational skills needed for numerical reasoning.	
<b>MATH Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading &amp; Writing)</b>	<b>Grade Levels (all students):</b>  <b>EL:</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Grade: The average for ELL students was 4% lower than non-ELL Students on the Q3 Math Summative. ELL Students performed just below non-ELL students with respect to Geometric & spatial reasoning, Measurement & Data Reasoning, Numerical Reasoning, and Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning.  <b>SWD:</b> 2 <sup>nd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Grade: The average score for SWD was 9% lower than students w/out disabilities. SWD performed just below Non-SWD with respect to Geometric & spatial reasoning, Measurement & Data Reasoning, Numerical Reasoning, and Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning.	<b>Grade Levels (all students):</b>  -2 <sup>nd</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> Grade: The average score on the Q3 Math Summative Assessments was 62% <b>EL: (see left column)</b>  <b>SWD: (see left column)</b>
<b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	<b>Root Cause Explanation:</b> -Common assessment items are not aligned to the expectation of the standard. -Limited Push-In support for math. -A school-wide intervention block for math was not implemented.	

<b>School Instructional Walks</b> <b>(Grade Level)</b>	-Math is generally presented in context: Math problems are presented as realistic situations.	- Lack of consistency in implementing Daily Numerical Reasoning activities/lessons. -Lack of consistency in implementing Daily Fact Fluency Curriculum.
<b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	<b>Root Cause Explanation:</b> -Limited opportunities for students to engage in authentic application of mathematical standards/concepts.	
<b>Other Summary Data</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teacher Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Parent Survey <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Learning Survey <input type="checkbox"/> _____	-Teachers are comfortable with retrieving and using district provided resources in CTLS.	-More varied use of approved resources including district provided resources is needed. -Testing Stamina: Small group and instructional time is often consumed with testing.
<b>Check the system that contributes to the root cause:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership <input type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment	<b>Root Cause Explanation:</b> -Limited PL opportunities focused on using the GADOE learning plans.	

## MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

<b>GOAL #2: MATH</b>	<p>The percentage of students in grades K-5<sup>th</sup> scoring in the Prepared category of the Numerical Reasoning domain of the Spring 2025 Beacon will increase from 11% ( 95 students) to 30% on the Spring 2026 Beacon.</p> <p>By May 2026, the percentage of students in 3<sup>rd</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> grade scoring Proficient or higher will increase from 26% of enrollment (115 out of 446 students tested), to 33% of enrollment as measured by the 2025-2026 Georgia Milestone EOG Assessment.</p>		
<b>Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:</b>	Limited opportunities for students to engage in daily number sense routines to develop foundational skills needed for numerical reasoning.		
<b>Funding Source(s)</b> <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
<b>Components</b>	<b>Implementation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Evaluation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Resources</b>
<b>Who?</b> <b>One Action (Verb)</b> <b>What?</b> <b>Frequency</b>	<p><b>Implementation Performance Target:</b> By October 2025, 100% of K-5<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers will implement explicit daily fluency instruction as a part of their daily math routine.</p>		
<b>Target Student Group</b>	<p><b>Implementation Plan:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preplanning: Provide teachers with Fluency Instruction Expectations, to include Building Fact Fluency Login information.</li> <li>• August-September: PL will be provided for explicit fluency Instruction to build fact fluency. Coaches will provide strategies/ideas for implementation for each component.</li> <li>• October-December: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the structure and implementation of fluency routine. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> </ul>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input type="checkbox"/> SWD			
<b>Action Step</b> <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
1. Kindergarten-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teachers will implement daily explicit and structured fluency instruction which allows students to verbalize their thinking and reasoning.	<p><b>Evaluation Performance Target:</b> By December 2025, 30% of students in grades K-5<sup>th</sup> will score in the Near Target category of the Numerical Reasoning Domain of the Beacon Assessment.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Tool(s):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beacon Data</li> </ul> <p><b>Evaluation Plan:</b> Students will be assessed:</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks  <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly  <input type="checkbox"/> Every other month  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year  <input type="checkbox"/> _____         </p> <p><b>Data Analysis Plan:</b> Beacon Assessment Data Digs during CCC meetings to determine progress towards goal, and address student needs and/or necessary changes in instruction.</p>		
BFF Fluency Kits			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• January-February: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the structure and implementation of fluency routine. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> <li>• March-April: Conduct monthly instructional walks to monitor the structure and implementation of fluency routine. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> <li>• May: Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Artifacts to be Collected:</b>          -Instructional Walk Form          -Lesson Plans</p> <p><b>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Principal  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</p> <p><b>Frequency of Monitoring:</b> Monthly</p>	<p><b>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Principal  <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists  <input type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads</p>	
--	--	--	--

<b>Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:</b>	-Classroom instruction is not aligned with the rigor of standards or assessments.		
<b>Funding Source(s)</b> <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Title I Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Local School Funds <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____		
<b>Components</b>	<b>Implementation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Evaluation Plan</b> <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	<b>Resources</b>
<b>Who?</b> <b>One Action (Verb)</b> <b>What?</b> <b>Frequency</b>	<b>Implementation Performance Target:</b> By October 2025, 100% of K-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade teachers will implement State Learning Plans into their math instruction.  <b>Implementation Plan:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preplanning: Provide teachers with expectations and guidance on how/where to access state learning Plans.</li> <li>August-September: PL will be provided for State Learning Tasks. Coaches will provide strategies for implementation of State Learning Plans.</li> <li>October-December: Conduct BI-monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of State Learning Plans. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> <li>January-February: Conduct BI-monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of State Learning Plans. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</li> <li>March-April: Conduct BI-monthly instructional walks to monitor the implementation of State Learning Plans. Share instructional walk data with grade level teams during CCCs. Use data to</li> </ul>	<b>Evaluation Performance Target:</b> By December 2025 50% of K-5 <sup>th</sup> students will score at least 70% on end of unit summative assessments.  <b>Evaluation Tool(s):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of unit summative assessment scores.</li> </ul> <b>Evaluation Plan:</b> Students will be assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Every 2 weeks</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Monthly</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Every other month</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 3 times per year</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At the end of each unit</li> </ul> <b>Data Analysis Plan:</b> Summative Assessment Data Digs during CCC meetings to determine progress towards goal, and address student needs and/or necessary changes in instruction.  <b>Person(s) Collecting Evidence:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Principal</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principals</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CCC Leads</li> </ul>	
<b>Target Student Group</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gen Ed <input type="checkbox"/> EL <input type="checkbox"/> SWD			
<b>Action Step</b> <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
2. Kindergarten-5 <sup>th</sup> Grade teachers will use GA DOE State Learning Plans once a week as indicated by weekly lesson plans.			

	<p>determine next steps for whole group or individualized professional learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May: Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Artifacts to be Collected:</b></p> <p>-Weekly Lesson Plans</p> <p>-Bi-Monthly Instructional Walk Data</p> <p><b>Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:</b></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><b>Frequency of Monitoring:</b></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
<b>1. Required</b> <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.	August 28, 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
<b>2. Required</b> <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.	October 14 <sup>th</sup> -17th, 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
<b>3. Required</b> <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.	March 2026		<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
<b>4. Required</b> <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.	September 8, 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
	February 5, 2026		
<b>5. Required</b> <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. <b><u>Briefly describe the transition activities here:</u></b>	May 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
<b>6. Required:</b> Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<b><u>List documents translated for parents:</u></b> -School/Parent Compacts -Family Engagement Policy -All documents/communication presented to families		<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
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					
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					
Family STEAM 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					

**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. <b>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)</b>	
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. <b>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)</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. <b>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)</b>	
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. <b>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)</b>	
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. <b>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></b> <b>SCHOOL RESPONSE:</b> Mableton Elementary school will integrate state and local funds and community support in several ways. Title III will provide language proficiency support. Mableton will utilize Twenty- day funds for tutoring support of our students struggling to meet state standards.	
ESSA Requirements to Include in the Schoolwide Plan – Section 1116(B)(1)	

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

*SWP Checklist 4*

#### **Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan - 34 CFR § 200.26**

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

##### **SCHOOL RESPONSE:**

The Guiding Coalition leadership team meets monthly to monitor, analyze, and address the SIP goals.

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 Guiding Coalition leadership team meets monthly to monitor, analyze, and address the SIP goals and student achievement progress

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 Guiding Coalition leadership team meets monthly to monitor, analyze, and address the SIP goals and student achievement progress

#### **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. <b>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)</b>
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.). <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)</i> <b>SCHOOL RESPONSE:</b> Mableton elementary follows the district’s MTSS guidelines. Teacher teams meet every 6 weeks to discuss and plan interventions and collect data on Tier 2 students. The RTI coordinator manages the Tier 3 process as well as collaborates with the school psychologist for Tier 4 meetings. The SSA monitors SWD requirements, laws, policies, and procedures.
14. <u>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,</u> particularly in high need subjects. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)</i> <b>SCHOOL RESPONSE:</b> Professional development is embedded in the CCC (PLC) process.
15. <b>ONLY MIDDLE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED</b> Describe the transition activities provided for preschool children to kindergarten, 5 <sup>th</sup> grade students to 6 <sup>th</sup> grade and 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students to 9 <sup>th</sup> grade. <i>SWP Checklist 2.c(v)</i> <b>SCHOOL RESPONSE:</b> Rising Kindergarten parents will have the opportunity to meet all kindergarten teachers, tour the building, and watch a presentation about Kindergarten at Mableton in May 2026.  Rising Kindergarten students will have the opportunity to meet kindergarten teachers and paras during a 4-day camp in July. Students will tour the building and participate in learning activities in the kindergarten classrooms.
16. <b>ONLY HIGH SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED</b> 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> <b>SCHOOL RESPONSE:</b> N/A
<b>Comprehensive Needs Assessment – Section 1114(b)(1)(A)</b>
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. <b>Evidence to support this statement includes: The comprehensive needs assessment section of the schoolwide plan. SWP Checklist 1</b>



## 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?
<p>Academic Coach (0.5) Kindergarten – 1<sup>st</sup> Grade</p> <p>Academic Coach (0.5) 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade – 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade</p> <p>Academic Coach (0.5) 4<sup>th</sup> Grade – 5<sup>th</sup> Grade</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coherent Instruction</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Capacity</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effective Leadership</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supportive Learning Environment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides professional development and instructional support to teachers in the implementation of the Georgia Standards of Excellence.</li> <li>presents and models a variety of curriculum-based trainings and lessons for classroom teachers</li> <li>routinely conducts observations to ensure that the level of rigor for standards-based instruction is aligned to the state curriculum standards and assessments</li> <li>meets with teachers on an individual basis providing strategies and coaching as needed.</li> <li>provides job-embedded professional development through the coaching cycle which includes modeling and feedback.</li> <li>collaborates with teams of teachers regarding planning, assessment, and data analysis</li> </ul>
Parent Facilitator	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 1</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Goal 2</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal 3</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Goal 4</p>	<p><input 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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Family Engagement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The parent facilitator provides support to teachers, parents and families to ensure there is effective communication between home and school regarding the instructional program and assessments. Since she communicates in English and in Spanish, she is a great resource to our English Learners and their families. Additionally, the parent facilitator performs all Title I duties as assigned.</li> </ul>

<b>Mableton Elementary School Improvement Goals</b> <i>Include goals on the parent compacts and policy</i>	
<b>Goal #1: ELA/Reading</b>	<p>-By May 2026, the percentage of students in 1<sup>st</sup>- 2<sup>nd</sup> grade who scored at Level 1, will decrease from 37% of enrollment (108/289 students), to 17% of enrollment as measured by the Spring 2026 Beacon Assessment.</p> <p>-By May 2026, the percentage of students in 3<sup>rd</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> grade scoring Proficient or higher will increase from 22 % of enrollment (98 out of 447 students tested), to 29 % of enrollment as measured by the 2025-2026 Georgia Milestone EOG Assessment.</p>
<b>Goal #2: Math</b>	<p>-The percentage of students in grades K-5<sup>th</sup> scoring in the Prepared category of the Numerical Reasoning domain of the Spring 2025 Beacon will increase from 11% ( 95 students) to 30% on the Spring 2026 Beacon.</p> <p>-By May 2026, the percentage of students in 3<sup>rd</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> grade scoring Proficient or higher will increase from 26% of enrollment (115 out of 446 students tested), to 33% of enrollment as measured by the 2025-2026 Georgia Milestone EOG Assessment.</p>
<b>Goal #3</b>	