School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	**2026 - 2027**
School Name:	**Elementary**
Principal Name:	**Sara Ostrander**
Date Submitted:	**6/1/2026**
Revision Date(s):	

District Name	Cobb County School District
School Name	LaBelle Elementary
Team Lead	
Position	
Email	
Phone	

	Federal Funding Options to Be Employed in This Plan (SWP Schools. Select all that apply.)
X	Traditional funding (all Federal funds budgeted separately)
	Consolidated funds (state/local and federal funds consolidated) - Pilot systems **ONLY**
	"Fund 400" - Consolidation of Federal funds only

	Factor(s) Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty (Select all that apply.)
	Free/Reduced meal applications
X	Community Eligibility Program (CEP) - Direct Certification **ONLY**
	Other (if selected, please describe below)

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders).
References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]

Our school intentionally sought input from a wide range of stakeholders to ensure our school improvement plan reflects the needs and priorities of our entire community. Staff members were invited to share feedback through a Microsoft Form, providing insight into current academic practices and offering suggestions for future growth. Additionally, we gathered valuable perspectives from families and community members during PTA meetings, as well as from both the Principal Advisory Council and Student Advisory Council. This collaborative approach ensured that multiple voices were heard and considered in the development of our plan.

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

Required Stakeholders	Suggested Stakeholders
Administrative Team Dr. Sara Ostrander, Melissa Barnhart	Parent Facilitators
Content or Grade Level Teachers Charon Kirkland, Quinn Carter, Asha Patel	Media Specialists
Local School Lead Teacher Dr. Katie Baggott	Public Safety Officers
District Academic Coaches Laura Franco	Business Partners
Parent (a Non-CCSD Employee)	Social Workers
Student (Required for High Schools)	Community Leaders
Structured Literacy Coach (For CSI/ TSI Schools)	School Technology Specialists
MRESA School Improvement Specialist **(For Federally Identified Schools)**	Community Health Care Providers
	Universities or Institutes of Higher Education

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

Meeting Dates:	March 27, 2026		

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Sara Ostrander	
Assistant Principal	Melissa Barnhart	
K-5 EIP teacher	Katie Baggott	
K-2 EIP teacher	Quinn Carter	
3-5 EIP teacher	Charon Kirkland	
ESOL teacher	Asha Patel	

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	**Kinder- GKIDS** : The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring Developing or higher on the Constructing Texts domain of the GKIDS assessment will increase from 62% in May 2025 to 65% in May 2026. **1st & 2nd – Beacon:** The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 486 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 44% in May 2025 to 47% in May 2026. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 510 on the language domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 40% in May 2025 to 43% in May 2026. **3rd – 5th – ELA Milestone**: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase from 21% in May 2025 to 24% in May 2026. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase from 22% in May 2025 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase from 31% in May 2025 to 34%% in May 2026.
Was the goal met?	☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☒ **Partially**

What data supports the outcome of the goal?

Kinder Goal: % of students will reach the achievement level of developing or higher in writing as measured by the Constructing Texts domain of the GKIDS assessment.			
Grade Level	**Goal**	**Actual Score**	**Met/ Unmet**
K	65%	69%	met
1st-2nd Goal: % of students will reach at or above the grade level cut score as measured by the Language Domain on the ELA Beacon Assessment.			
Grade Level	**Goal**	**Actual Score**	
1st	47%	50%	met
2nd	43%	51%	met
3rd-5th Goal: % of students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced on the ELA Milestones.			
Grade Level	**Goal**	**Actual Score**	
3rd	24%	TBD- Fall 2026	TBD
4th	25%	TBD- Fall 2026	TBD
5th	34%	TBD- Fall 2026	TBD

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?

Action steps to eliminate or change: N/A

Action steps to keep or extend: N/A

Possible action step additions: N/A

If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?

Action steps to eliminate or change:

- The data above shows that **Kindergarten** met its Constructing Texts goal of implementing weekly UFLI dictation lessons during the 2025–2026 school year, as measured by GKIDS and evidenced through walkthroughs and lesson plans. However, this specific goal will be eliminated for the 2026–2027 school year. Kindergarten will continue utilizing UFLI daily, but teachers will now enter weekly UFLI data into Project Read and use the data to analyze student performance and develop targeted small groups to address specific skill deficits or provide enrichment opportunities.
- **1st and 2nd grade** met their ELA goal for the SY 25-26. Their goal was directly tied to implementation of the vocabulary routine in the new ELA Tier 1 curriculum adoption. These teachers implemented the daily Wonders vocabulary routine, where the vocabulary was integrated in reading and writing lessons. Our teachers will continue with the daily vocabulary routines, but we will discontinue this action step from our SIP for the 26-27 SY.

	Action steps to keep or extend: Next year, we will extend our goal by adding the monitoring component to the UFLI implementation and will use Project Read to track our students' progress through the phonics skills. Teachers will use this data to develop targeted small groups. **Possible action step additions:** Due to a need to strengthen staff knowledge and skills in planning and implementing small group instruction focused on foundational skills and targeted skill deficits, K–5 teachers will administer a quarterly core phonics screener and use the results to plan and implement differentiated small groups. Evidence of implementation will be reflected in weekly small group plans that target students' lowest identified skill deficits.

Previous Year's Goal #2	**K – 2nd – Beacon:** The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring at or above 455 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon assessment will increase from 44% in May 2025 to 47% in May 2026. The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 490 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 43% in May 2025 to 46% in May 2026. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 516 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 36% in May 2025 to 39% in May 2026. **3rd – 5th – Math Milestone**: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math Milestone will increase from 22% in May 2025 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math Milestone will increase from 37% in May 2025 to 40% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math Milestone will increase from 28% in May 2025 to 31% in May 2026.
Was the goal met? ☐ **YES** ☐ **NO** ☒ **Partially**	

What data supports the outcome of the goal?

K-2 Goal: % of students will reach at or above the grade level cut score as measured by the Numerical Reasoning Domain on the Math Beacon Assessment.			
Grade Level	**Goal**	**Actual Score**	**Met/Unmet**
K	47%	38%	Unmet
1st	46%	71%	Met
2nd	36%	41%	Met
3rd-5th Goal: % of students will increase their level of achievement to proficient or advanced on the Math Milestones.			
Grade Level	**Goal**	**Actual Score**	**Met/Unmet**
3rd	25%	33%	Met
4th	40%	32%	Unmet
5th	31%	34%	Met

Reflecting on Outcomes

If the goal was **not met**, what actionable strategies could be implemented to address the area of need?

Action steps to eliminate or change:

Action steps to keep or extend: Based on the above data, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, & 5th grade students met their math goal for the 25-26 SY. We believe this is due to the implementation of daily number talks. We will continue with this action step for next year, but we will extend the action step for the next school year by creating a grade level scope and sequence for each week that includes the pages from the Number Talks book. This will ensure consistency and a clear progression of Number Talks across grade levels at LaBelle.

Possible action step additions:

If the goal was **met or exceeded**, what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal?

Action steps to eliminate or change:

Action steps to keep or extend: Based on the data above. Kindergarten and 4th grade did not meet their math goal for the 25-26 SY. For the 26-27 SY we will add a grade level scope and sequence based on the Number Talks book.

Possible action step additions: While 4 of the 6 grade levels met their end of year math goals, we see a need school-wide for vertical planning and strategies for math problem solving. We will add an action step for next year that focuses on teacher fidelity and vertical planning of problem solving skills.

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

ELA DATA			
ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	**FY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY26** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3rd Grade	18%	21%	No data published as of 5/12/26
4th Grade	21.2%	22%	No data published as of 5/12/26
5th Grade	33.3%	31%	No data published as of 5/12/26

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
1st Grade	21%	29%	50%	27%	50%	23%	23%	50%	27%	17%	52%	31%	38%	37%	25%
2nd Grade	27%	33%	41%	32%	29%	39%	33%	43%	24%	24%	37%	39%	29%	53%	18%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Interpreting Texts												Constructing Texts								
	Texts: Context; Structure & Style			Texts: Techniques			Language: Vocabulary			Listening			Texts: Context; Structure & Style; Techniques			Texts: Research & Analysis			Language: Grammar Conventions		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
3rd Grade	25%	67%	8%	19%	73%	8%	14%	78%	8%	32%	67%	1%	24%	73%	3%	13%	83%	5%	22%	75%	3%
4th Grade	25%	56%	19%	23%	61%	16%	21%	67%	12%	44%	44%	12%	26%	60%	14%	23%	60%	17%	33%	60%	7%
5th Grade	17%	60%	22%	24%	50%	26%	16%	72%	12%	34%	57%	9%	28%	55%	17%	21%	72%	7%	28%	62%	10%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
FY26 ELA Milestones **(Grade Levels & Subgroups)** ****This data will be updated once we receive ELA EOG scores in Fall 2026**	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** **EL:** **SWD:**	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** **EL:** **SWD:**
Beacon Assessment – ELA **(Grade Levels & Subgroups)**	**1-2 (all students):** Based on the 1st and 2nd grade Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our students have demonstrated strengths in **Foundations** with 75% in 1st and 63% in 2nd scoring at or above the grade-level cut score. 1st grade and 2nd grade also demonstrated strengths in **Interpreting Text** with 65% in 1st and 57% of 2nd students meeting the grade level cut score. **1st Grade ELL (26 students**) Strength- **Foundations** 69% (18 out of 26 students) & **Interpreting Texts** 58% (15 out of 26 students) **2nd Grade ELL (26 students**) Strength- **Foundations** 54% (14 out of 26 students) **3-5 (all students):** Based on the 3rd , 4th, and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated strengths in **Language: Vocabulary** with 40% in 3rd grade, 37% in 4th grade, and 43% in 5th grade scoring at or above the grade-level cut score. 3rd grade also demonstrated strength in **Texts: Techniques** with 42% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score, and 4th grade demonstrated strength in **Texts: Context; Structure & Style** with 40% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score	**1-2 (all students):** Based on the Beacon results in English Language Arts (ELA) our 1st and 2nd grade students have demonstrated weakness in **Constructing Texts** with 52% (27 out of 52 students) of 1st graders and 63% (31 out of 49 students) of 2nd graders did not meet the grade-level cut score. **1st Grade ELL** (26 students) Weakness- **Language** 35% (9 out of 26 students) **2nd Grade ELL** (26 students) Weakness- **Constructing Texts** 27% (7 out of 26 students) **1st Grade SWD** (8 students) Weakness**- Constructing Texts** 13% (1 out of 8) **2nd Grade SWD** (5 students) Weakness- **Numerical Reasoning** 0% (0 out of 5 students) **3-5 (all students):** Based on the 3rd, 4th and 5th grade Beacon results in ELA, our students have demonstrated weaknesses in **Listening,** with 73% (38 out of 63 students) in 3rd, 75% (43 out of 57 students) in 4th, and 66% (27 out of 52 students) in 5th grade not meeting the grade-level cut score.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause:	Root Cause Explanation:	
☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Writing (Constructing Texts) deficits may be due to a lack of familiarity with the new Wonder's writing lessons. This was also a self-reported weakness from teachers on the CNA survey. Low Listening scores may be due to a change in the format of the standardized assessment and the addition of multi-media sources such as audio clips, podcasts, and video clips to the Beacon and Milestone Assessments.	
ACCESS Scores **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** ACCESS Reading Score Summary 2026 Level 1- Entering: 30 students Level 2- Emerging: 42 students Level 3- Developing: 16 students Level 4- Expanding: 14 students Level 5- Bridging: 28 students Level 6- Reaching: 16 students Total: 151 students.	**Grade Levels (all students):** ACCESS Writing Score Summary 2026 Level 1- Entering: 29 students Level 2- Emerging: 17 students Level 3- Developing: 68 students Level 4- Expanding: 32 students Total: 151 students.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:	**Root Cause Explanation:**	
☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	-Reading: Most students are in Level 1–2 (Entering–Emerging) → This is the lowest area; students have significant gaps in decoding, comprehension, and vocabulary. -Writing: Ranges from Level 1–3 (Entering–Developing) → Students struggle most with sentence structure, grammar, and organizing ideas in writing.	
ELA Common Assessments **(Grade Level Reading & Writing)**	**Grade Levels (all students):** **EL:** **SWD:**	**Grade Levels (all students):** **EL:** **SWD:**

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:**	
School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	Based on the ELA Instructional Walk-Through Feedback, our teachers show strength in explicit instruction, use of county resources (UFLI, vocabulary cards, RWC, and Wonders leveled readers). It was also noted throughout that our classrooms have a high level of student engagement.	Based on the ELA Instructional Walk-Through Feedback, many comments indicated that there needed to be more time given for student discourse. Students need more time to talk in all ELA components.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Planning and Delivering- We rolled out the Collaborative Conversations in the Wonders, but teachers aren't applying these routines throughout the literacy block. Teachers need more PL on how to plan for and give time during ELA lessons.	
Other Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Based on the teacher survey given in March 2026, teachers shared that their personal strengths in ELA instruction were with the Wonders Reading Comprehension (Interpreting Texts) lessons. They all reported using the Cobb adopted resources (Wonders & UFLI).	Based on the teacher survey given in March 2026, a majority of the respondents reported writing as their weakest area of instruction in the ELA block. Phonics/Morphology instruction was rated lowest by 8 of the 18 respondents. Small group instruction consistently ranked in the middle for teacher self-efficacy.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Developing Staff: A need for developing staff knowledge and skills with the new Wonders writing lessons, 3rd-5th grade Morphology instruction and small group instruction that focuses on skill deficits and foundational skills. Planning for Quality Instruction: Writing, morphology lessons, and small group instruction.	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	**Kinder- GKIDS** : The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring Developing or higher on the Constructing Texts domain of the GKIDS assessment will increase from 62% in May 2026 to 65% in May 2027. **1st & 2nd – Beacon:** The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 486 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 62% in May 2026 to 65% in May 2027. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 510 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 55% in May 2026 to 58% in May 2026. **3rd – 5th – ELA Milestone**: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase by 3% from May 2026 to May 2027. (goal will be updated to reflect exact percentages in Fall 2026 after receiving ELA EOG data) The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase by 3% from May 2026 to May 2027. (goal will be updated to reflect exact percentages in Fall 2026 after receiving ELA EOG data) The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase by 3% from May 2026 to May 2027. (goal will be updated to reflect exact percentages in Fall 2026 after receiving ELA EOG data)
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Coherent Instruction: Refining the Instructional Systems Kindergarten-2nd Grade teachers began implementing the UFLI daily lessons during the 2025-2026 school year. We began using the Project Read platform to track student progress in phonics encoding. We would like teachers to begin using the data and suggested reteaching lessons for differentiated small groups.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of kindergarten-2nd grade teachers will use data collected weekly from Project Read to develop differentiated small groups for targeted phonics instruction.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** 51% of kindergarten students will score 80% or higher on their weekly progress monitoring assessments as indicated by their Project Read data.	
Target Student Group			

☒ All Students
☐ EL
☐ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
K-2 teachers will utilize weekly progress monitoring probes and data collected from Project Read to support phonics instruction.
	Implementation Plan:
	• August-September:
	  • UFLI Refresher to review common expectations for implementation.
	  • K-2 EIP teachers and/or Literacy coach to model lessons in all K-2 classrooms
	  • Teachers will reteach and/or instruct on student phonics deficits as indicated by progress monitoring data/Project Read.
	
	• October-May:
	  • Walkthroughs conducted monthly during Phonics lessons. Feedback will be provided to all K teachers based on collected walkthrough data.
	  • Teachers will reteach and/or instruct on student phonics deficits as indicated by progress monitoring data/Project Read.
	
	Artifacts to be Collected:
	Project Read Data
	Student Word Samples- UFLI dictation progress monitoring.
	
	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
	☒ Principal
	☒ Assistant Principals
	☒ EIP Teachers
	
	Frequency of Monitoring:
		43% of 1st grade students will score 80% or higher on their weekly progress monitoring assessments as indicated by their Project Read data.
		
		40% of 2nd grade students will score 80% or higher on their weekly progress monitoring assessments as indicated by their Project Read data.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• Common UFLI Dictation Assessment
		• UFLI Spelling Assessment
		• Project Read Platform
		• Beacon (1st-2nd only)
		• GKIDS (K only)
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☒ Every 2 weeks
		☐ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☐ _____
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		Analyze data during CCC meetings during grade level planning time
		
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
		☐ Principal
		☐ Assistant Principal
		☒ K-2 CCC Teams	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Developing Staff: A need for developing staff knowledge and skills in planning and implementing small group instruction that focuses on skill deficits and foundational skills. Planning for Quality Instruction: Small group instruction		
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
☒ Gen Ed
☒ EL
☒ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
K-5th grade teachers will plan and implement differentiated small groups based on the students' lowest skill deficit as indicated by weekly small group lesson plans.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of teachers serving K- 5th grade students will use data collected from the quarterly CORE Phonics Screener and/or Wonders Progress Monitoring Assessments (PMA) to develop and implement differentiated small groups for targeted instruction.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• Preplanning:
	  • Staff will participate in a CORE Phonics training on Friday
	
	• August-September:
	  • Staff Meeting PL on how to use data to form instructional groupings using CORE Phonics data and Wonders PMA data
	  • EIP teachers will lead CCC meetings to establish skills/small groups and the components of a small group lesson. EIP teachers will also model appropriate instructional strategies for small group intervention during the CCC meetings.
	
	• October-May:
	  • Walkthroughs conducted monthly during Reading Small Group lessons using district ELA walkthrough form. Feedback will be provided to all teachers based on collected walkthrough data.
	
	Artifacts to be Collected:
	CORE Phonics Data- Data Trackers
	Small group lesson plan/ form
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 486 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 62% in May 2026 to 65% in May 2027.
		
		The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 510 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 55% in May 2026 to 58% in May 2027.
		
		The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring above 412 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 32% in May 2026 to 35% in May 2027.
		
		The percentage of 4th grade students scoring above 446 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 28% in May 2026 to 31% in May 2027.
		
		The percentage of 5th grade students scoring above 471 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 36% in May 2026 to 39% in May 2027.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• CORE Phonics Screener
		• Beacon Assessment
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☐ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☐ 3 times per year
		☒ Quarterly	

	Small Group Peer observations **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ CCC teams ☒ EIP teachers **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly	**Data Analysis Plan:** Analyze data during CCC meetings during grade level planning time **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☒ CCC Teams	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	**WHOLE SCHOOL OPTION #1**		
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☒ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**

Who?
One Action (Verb)
What?
Frequency
 	
Target Student Group
☐ Gen Ed
☒ EL
☐ SWD
 	
Action Step
SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)
K-5 Speaking – K-5 teachers will implement daily opportunities for students to use academic language while speaking to peers.
	Implementation Performance Target:
	100% of LaBelle teachers will implement daily opportunities for collaborative conversations with students to use academic language while speaking to peers in all content areas by the end of May 2027.
	
	Implementation Plan:
	• July:
	  • ESOL team will model ELLevation speaking strategies during Quarter 1 collaboration day to enhance the collaborative conversation opportunities for ESOL students
	• August:
	  • Staff Meeting- team will roll out the SIP Action Step and review components of Collaborative Conversations posters
	• September, December, March:
	  • ESOL team will model ELLevation speaking strategies during quarterly collaboration days to enhance the collaborative conversation opportunities for ESOL students
	
	Artifacts to be Collected:
	Classroom walkthroughs
	Lesson plans with opportunities to talk
	Walkthrough form with # of opportunities
	
	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:
	☒ Principal
	☒ Assistant Principal
	☒ ESOL teachers
		Evaluation Performance Target:
		The percentage of ELL students scoring a level 4-Expanding on ACCESS speaking domain will increase from 17% in May 2026 to 20% in May 2027.
		
		Evaluation Tool(s):
		• ACCESS Assessment
		
		Evaluation Plan:
		Students will be assessed:
		☐ Every 2 weeks
		☐ Monthly
		☐ Every other month
		☒ 3 times per year
		☒ _____Annually_____
		
		Data Analysis Plan:
		ELL teacher will utilize ACCESS goal-setting sheet for student self-assessment (beginning, middle, end of year)
		
		ELL teachers will also utilize the WIDA speaking rubric to drive student discussions 3x per year
		
		Person(s) Collecting Evidence:
		☐ Principal
		☐ Assistant Principal
		☒ ESOL teachers	

	Frequency of Monitoring: Quarterly		

MATH DATA

MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	**FY24** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY25** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	**FY26** % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
3rd Grade	25%	22%	33%
4th Grade	11.8%	37%	31.5%
5th Grade	33.3%	28%	34.4%

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)	31%	45%	24%	48%	31%	21%	55%	31%	14%	55%	28%	17%
1st Grade	7%	54%	38%	33%	26%	41%	4%	25%	71%	21%	48%	31%
2nd Grade	37%	41%	22%	37%	34%	29%	32%	41%	27%	24%	22%	53%
3rd Grade	17%	81%	1%	11%	83%	6%	17%	81%	1%	27%	68%	5%
4th Grade	44%	51%	5%	46%	53%	1%	42%	56%	2%	42%	53%	5%
5th Grade	46%	49%	5%	56%	41%	3%	44%	46%	10%	53%	44%	3%

Source	**Strengths**	**Weaknesses**
FY26 MATH Milestones **(Data by grade & subgroup)**	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** 3rd Grade-	**For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD** **Grade Levels (all students):** 3rd Grade-

	• **Numerical Reasoning Domain Achievement** - 28 students scoring approaching or met target. 4th Grade- • **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Number and Shape Patterns Domain Achievement** - 31 students scoring approaching or met target 5th Grade- • **Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Polygon Properties and Volume of Prisms Domain Achievement** - 40 students scoring approaching or met target **EL:** **3rd Place Value (relative strength)-** 17 of 35 students scoring approaching or met target **4th Angles (relative strength)-** 9 of 24 students scoring approaching or met target **5th Algebraic reasoning (relative strength)**- 7 of 15 students scoring approaching or met target **SWD:** **3rd- Place value (relative strength)** 6 of 12 scoring approaching or met target **4th- None** **5th- Multiplication and division, algebraic reasoning (relative strength)** 7 of 15 scoring approaching or met target	• **Geometric & Spatial Reasoning Domain Achievement**- 42 students scoring below target 4th Grade- • **Numerical Reasoning Domain Achievement**- 34 students scoring below target 5th Grade- • **Numerical Reasoning Domain Achievement** - 31 students scoring below target **EL:** **3rd Algebraic reasoning, geometric reasoning, area and perimeter-** 26 of 35 students scoring below target **4th Numeric reasoning and fractions-** 18 of 24 students scoring below target 5th **Numeric reasoning, place value, fractions, multiplication and division, measurement and data-** 12 of 15 students scoring below target **SWD:** **3rd Addition and subtraction-** 10 of 12 students scoring below target **4th Numeric reasoning, compare numbers, and algebraic reasoning-** 9 of 9 students scoring below target **5th Numeric reasoning and place value-** 7 of 8 students scoring below target

Beacon Assessment – Math **(Grade Level & Subgroups)**	**K (all students):** Based on the Kindergarten Beacon results in Math our students have demonstrated strengths in **Geometric & Spatial Reasoning** with 40% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score. In **Numerical Reasoning** and **Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning** our students scored 38% in both domains. **1-2 (all students):** Based on the Beacon results in Math our 1st grade students have demonstrated strengths in **Measurement & Data** with 88% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score, and 71% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score in **Numerical Reasoning**. 2nd grade students demonstrated a strength in **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning** with 75% of students scoring at or above the grade-level cut score. **3-5 (all students):** Based on the Beacon results in Math our 3rd grade students' demonstrated a relative strength in **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning** with 35% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score. 4th grade students' demonstrated a relative strength in **Numerical Reasoning** with 22% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score. 5th grade students' demonstrated a relative strength in **Numerical Reasoning** with 31% scoring at or above the grade-level cut score.	**K (all students):** Based on the kindergarten Beacon results in Math, our students have demonstrated a weakness in **Measurement & Data** with 66% of students scoring below the grade-level cut score. **1-2 (all students):** Based on the Beacon results in Math, our 1st grade students have demonstrated a weakness in **Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning** with 54% of students scoring below the grade-level cut score. 2nd grade students demonstrated a weakness in **Numerical Reasoning** with 59% of students scoring below the grade-level cut score. **3-5 (all students):** Based on the Beacon results in Math, 3rd and 4th grade students demonstrated a weakness in **Measurement & Data** with 81% of 3rd graders, and 89% of 4th grade students scoring below the grade-level cut score. 4th and 5th grade students demonstrated a weakness in **Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning** with 86% of 4th graders and 87% of 5th grade students scoring below the grade-level cut score.
	Root Cause Explanation:	

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Refining the Instructional System- There is a lack of explicit and small group, differentiated instruction on Math concepts. More time is needed with manipulatives to teach place value. The pace of instruction is too fast. Students' lack of reading ability hinders their comprehension of word problems. There are many strategies for students to learn and apply which can cause confusion, especially in word problems.	
School Instructional Walks **(Grade Level)**	Based on the Math Instructional Walk-Through feedback, our teachers demonstrate strengths in engagement during math lessons.	Based on the Math Instructional Walk-Through feedback, there is an inconsistency in the use of manipulatives in math instruction. Additionally, our 3-5 grade teachers demonstrate inconsistency in differentiated small group math instruction.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Planning for quality instruction- Teachers may not feel comfortable with planning differentiated math small groups or are not making time to plan small groups or gather manipulatives. Delivering quality instruction- Teachers are not consistent in instructional practices for teaching students how to problem solve. There isn't a consistency in manipulative use or strategies taught.	
Other Summary Data ☒ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____	Based on the teacher survey given in March 2026, teachers shared that their personal strength in math instruction was whole group mini lessons.	Based on the teacher survey given in March 2026, most of the respondents reported Number Talks and Problem Solving as their weakest areas of instruction in the math block. 11 of the 18 teachers selected Number Talks and Problem Solving as their bottom 2 areas.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	**Root Cause Explanation:** Refining the Instructional System- We have been using Number Talks, but it is inconsistent how it is being implemented and the scope and sequence being used. Developing Staff- Teachers aren't comfortable using the Number Talks book.	

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	**K – 2nd – Beacon:** The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring at or above 455 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon assessment will increase from 38% in May 2026 to 41% in May 2027. The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 490 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 71% in May 2026 to 74% in May 2027. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 516 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 41% in May 2026 to 43% in May 2027. **3rd – 5th – Math EOG**: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase from 33.2% in May 2026 to 36.2% in May 2027. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase from 31.5% in May 2026 to 34.5% in May 2027. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase from 34.4% in May 2026 to 37.4% in May 2027.
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	**Refining the Instructional System-** We have been using Number Talks but it is inconsistent how it is being implemented, and the scope and sequence being used. **Developing Staff**- Teachers aren't comfortable using the Number Talks book.
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____

Components	Implementation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	Evaluation Plan *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	Resources
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group**	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of teams will implement daily Number Talks lessons by May 2027. **Implementation Plan:** July/Preplanning:	**Evaluation Performance Target:** The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring at or above 455 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon assessment will increase from 38% in May 2026 to 41% in May 2027.	

☐ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* K-5 Teachers will implement daily number talks aligned to the *Number Talks* book grade-level expectations	• Staff refresher of Number Talks using Number Talks book. Develop a scope and sequence for each grade level. August: • Model Number Talk session during a staff meeting September-May: • Walkthroughs conducted monthly during Math block, specifically during Number Talks lesson. • Feedback will be provided to all K-5 teachers during weekly CCCs based on collected walkthrough data. • Teachers will collaboratively plan Number Talks content during release time on full-day quarterly planning days. **Artifacts to be Collected:** Lesson plans Grade Level Number Talks Scope and Sequence Classroom walkthroughs **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ EIP teachers **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly and quarterly	The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 490 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 71% in May 2026 to 74% in May 2027. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 516 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 41% in May 2026 to 44% in May 2027. The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring above 396 cut score on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 24% in May 2026 to 27% in May 2027. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring above 455 cut score on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 22% in May 2026 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring above 510 cut score on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 20% in May 2026 to 23% in May 2027. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Beacon Math Assessment **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____ **Data Analysis Plan:** **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principal ☒ CCC Teams	

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Delivering quality instruction- Teachers are not consistent in instructional practices for teaching students how to problem solve. There isn't a consistency in manipulative use, or strategies taught.		
Funding Source(s) *SWP Checklist 5.e*	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	**Implementation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Evaluation Plan** *SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26*	**Resources**
Who? **One Action (Verb)** **What?** **Frequency** **Target Student Group** ☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD **Action Step** *SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv),2.c(v)* K-5 Teachers will develop and implement differentiated small groups for targeted Math instruction.	**Implementation Performance Target:** 100% of K-5 teachers will use various assessment data to develop and implement differentiated Math small groups for targeted instruction. **Implementation Plan:** Preplanning: (July) • Grade-level collaborative planning time with CCSD Math Specialist, Danielle Lanigan, to plan and discuss specific grade level Math strategies to be used in Quarter 1. August • EIP teachers will lead CCC meetings to establish skills/small groups and the components of a small group lesson. EIP teachers will also model appropriate instructional strategies for small group intervention during the CCC meeting. September, December, March: • Grade-level collaborative planning time with CCSD Math Specialist, Danielle Lanigan, to discuss grade level math strategies for units in quarters 2-4. October-May: • Walkthroughs conducted monthly during Math small group lessons using district Math walkthrough form. Feedback will be provided to all teachers based on collected walkthrough data.	**Evaluation Performance Target:** The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring at or above 455 scale score on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 38% in May 2026 to 41% in May 2027. The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 490 scale score on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 71% in May 2026 to 74% in May 2027. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 516 scale Score on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 41% in May 2026 to 43% in May 2027. The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring at or above 396 scale score on the Math Beacon Assessment will increase from 24% in May 2026 to 27% in May 2027. The percentage of 4th grade students scoring at or above 455 scale score on the Beacon Assessment will increase from 22% in May 2026 to 25% in May 2026. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring at or above 510 scale score on the Beacon Assessment will increase from 20% in May 2026 to 23% in May 2027. **Evaluation Tool(s):** • Beacon Assessment **Evaluation Plan:** Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year	

	Artifacts to be Collected: Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs **Person(s) Monitoring Implementation:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principal ☒ EIP teachers **Frequency of Monitoring:** Monthly and quarterly	**Data Analysis Plan:** Review Beacon data after each assessment administration with grade-level CCC Team. **Person(s) Collecting Evidence:** ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ CCC Teams	

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement *(Required Components)*			
Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	**Date(s) Scheduled**	**Date Completed**	**"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed**
***1. Required:* * Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline (September 30, 2026)** Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	Sept. 10. 2026		☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
***2. Required:* * Fall Input Survey (secondary method) – Deadline (October 1 - November 3, 2026)** Parents will have the opportunity to provide input and suggestions on the school policy and compact, how to spend our family engagement funds, and how to build staff capacity for family engagement.	Oct. 13-16, 2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
***3. Required:* * Spring Input Meeting (primary method) – Deadline (April 30, 2027)** Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and participate in discussions about the family engagement funds.	March 11, 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
***4. Required:* Building Capacity for Engagement (Does not need to be listed in the Policy)** Teachers will continue to learn about the value and utility of contributions of parents including how to reach, communicate with, and work with parents to implement parent programs and build ties between the parents and school. **Deadline September 18, 2026 (Fall); Deadline February 12, 2027 (Spring)**	Sept. 2026 Feb. 2027		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
***5. Required:* * Transition Activities** for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visiting the school). Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. **Briefly describe the transition activities here:** • Kindergarten Parent Orientation – Parents will hear from the Principal and Assistant Principal about processes and procedures for Kindergarten. Parents will also receive a tour of the school and Kindergarten classrooms. • Middle School Orientation – Parents will hear from staff members at the local Middle Schools on procedures and routines for 6th grade	Kindergarten – July 16, 2026 Middle School – April 2027		☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

6. Required: **<u>Provide translated information</u>** related to school and parent programs/meetings in a format and language that parents can understand. *SWP Checklist 5.d*	***<u>List documents translated for parents:</u>*** • Annual Title I meeting and Curriculum in Action flyers & resources • Conference materials • STEAM Night flyers & parent resources • All CTLS Parent newsletters	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

Academic-Related **School-Developed Family Engagement Activities *(Required for "Shall's" 2 and 6)***							
Academic-Related and School-Developed Family Engagement Activities (*Must be listed in the school policy)	**"Shall" Addressed**	**Goal(s) Addressed**	**Resources**	**Funding Source(s)** *SWP Checklist 5.e*	**Date**	**How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.**	**Staff Responsible**
Annual Title I meeting and Curriculum in Action Night	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☒ 3 ☒ 4 ☒ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	• Compacts • Printed Presentations and Flyers for parents	Title I	Sept. 10, 2026	• Sign in sheets • Grade level presentations • Parent Compacts • School Policy	Sara Ostrander Beatriz Alvarado Classroom teachers
Winter Arts showcase	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☒ 6	☒ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	Fine Arts standards	Local school	Dec. 3, 2026	• Sign in sheets	Erin Whigham Monica Shirinzadeh Natasha Tidmore
STEAM Night	☒ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☒ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	STEAM materials for grade-level stations		March 11, 2027	• Sign in sheets • Grade level presentations • STEAM Night "Passport" • Take home math games and activities	Kriste Millington Classroom teachers

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

1. Assist parents in understanding state academic standards, state and local assessments, and how to monitor their child's academic progress.
2. Provide materials and training to help parents work with their child to improve academic achievement. (Ex. Literacy training, technology training)
3. Educate school staff in the value and utility of the contributions of parents, and how to reach, communicate with, and partner with parents to implement parent programs to build ties between parents and the school.
4. Coordinate and integrate parent programs and activities with other Federal, State, and local programs (Preschool to Kindergarten, transitions, parent resource centers, etc.) to support parents in more fully participating in their child's education.
5. Ensure information related to school and parent programs/meetings are sent in a format and language parents can understand.

6. Provide other reasonable support for parental involvement activities as parents may request. These are school-developed activities based upon parent's input. (#14 in list of "shalls" and "mays")

School Improvement Plan Required Questions
Schoolwide Plan Development – *Section 1114(2)(B) (i-iv)*
1. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed during a 1-year period; unless – the school is operating a schoolwide program on the day before the date of the enactment of Every Student Succeeds Act, in which case such school may continue to operate such program but shall develop amendments to its existing plan during the first year of assistance after that date to reflect the provisions of the section. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages.** *SWP Checklist 5(a)*
2. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings**. *Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)*
3. Cobb County's schoolwide plans remain in effect for the duration of the school's participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page.** *SWP Checklist 5(c)*
4. Cobb County's schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school's website and in multiple languages.** *SWP Checklist 5(d)*
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. *SWP Checklist 5(e)* **Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)** **SCHOOL RESPONSE**: LaBelle Elementary School will integrate state and local funds and community support in several ways. Title II will provide professional development support including staff and PL opportunities. Title III will provide language proficiency support. LaBelle will utilize 20-Day Funds for tutoring support for our students struggling to meet state standards. The local county will provide support for the school's implementation of Arts Integration to continue our support of authentic instruction and student engagement. Community Partners (St. Ann's Church, North Metro Martial Arts, AYTEF Tennis, etc.) will provide volunteers and support for our family engagement events, Career Day for students, and other student events. These programs will work together to meet the needs of the students and families identified in the CNA and through our parent and family surveys.

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

6. Jointly develop with, and distribute to, parents and family members of participating children a written parental and family engagement involvement policy, agreed on by such parents, that shall describe the means for carrying out the requirements of Subsections (c) through (f). Parents shall be notified of the policy in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language the parents can understand. Such policy shall be made available to the local community and updated periodically to meet the changing needs of parents and the school. **Evidence to support this statement includes Posting every Title I school's parent policy on the school's website in multiple languages where practicable, Fall and Spring input meeting agendas and sign in sheets providing parents the opportunity to assist in the development of the school's parent policy, compact and parent engagement budget.**
SWP Checklist 4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Schoolwide Plan Reform Strategies – *Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)*

10. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: Provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111 (c)(2), to meet the State's challenging academic standards. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps and the schoolwide plan student groups page specifically identifying supports to assist various student groups in meeting the State's challenging academic standards, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(a)*

11. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: use methods and instructional strategies that strengthen an academic program in the school, will increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum, which may include programs, activities, and courses necessary to provide a well-rounded education. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(b)*

12. Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how such strategies will: address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly the needs of those at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards through activities which may include - counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. **Evidence to support this statement includes: Specific schoolwide plan action steps, the method for monitoring and evaluating those action steps, where applicable.** *SWP Checklist 2(c)(i)*

13. Describe the implementation of your schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.). *SWP Checklist 2.c(iii)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: At LaBelle Elementary, we prioritize proactive approaches to student behavior, with a primary focus on prevention. Our goal is to deliver engaging, high-quality instruction that captures students' attention and minimize opportunities for misbehavior. This year, a high focus will be placed on teaching our new mission: Leading with PRIDE (Prepared, Respectful, In Control, Do What's Right, Engaged). Monthly incentives and recognitions are provided to students who demonstrate LaBelle PRIDE. Weekly classroom meetings are held to foster positive, peer relationships. We also utilize CCSD's anti-bullying procedures of Stop, Walk, Talk. We encourage students to report incidents of bullying to a trusted staff member and to serve as active, responsible bystanders. When behavioral concerns require administrative intervention, the leadership team is committed to identifying the underlying causes, supporting the student in regaining focus, and facilitating a smooth return to the learning environment.

14. Describe professional development and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: At LaBelle Elementary, we are committed to fostering collaborative instructional planning. Dedicated time is set aside each week for classroom and support teachers to engage in joint planning sessions. These meetings provide an opportunity to design explicit instruction, analyze assessment data to plan for differentiated instruction, and develop engaging lessons for all students. Teachers are also provided with a full day of collaborative planning each quarter to map out grade level standards and assessments, receive professional learning from local and district staff, and conduct peer observations in other grade level classrooms. This collaborative approach promotes ongoing dialogue around student data, individual learning needs, and strategies for personalized instruction. Our EIP and ESOL teams actively support this process by providing educators with the necessary resources, materials, and professional development to enhance instructional effectiveness.

15. **ONLY MIDDLE AND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RESPONSE REQUIRED** Describe the transition activities provided for preschool children to kindergarten, 5th grade students to 6th grade and 8th grade students to 9th grade. *SWP Checklist 2.c(v)*

SCHOOL RESPONSE: We offer a four-day Kindergarten camp in mid-July for rising Kindergarten students to participate in learning activities. These activities are centered around Kindergarten curriculum standards and social-emotional learning. Students also learn basic routines and procedures of LaBelle so they are ready for the start of school in August. To support our fifth-grade students as they prepare for middle school, we coordinate a half-day visit to their designated feeder middle school, where they are introduced to the campus, routines, and expectations. Furthermore, with the guidance of professional school counselors, targeted lessons are delivered to our fifth-grade classes to help them understand key procedures and prepare for a successful transition to middle school.

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

SCHOOL RESPONSE: N/A

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

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

Title I Personnel/Positions Hired to Support the School Improvement Goals *SWP Checklist 2.c(iv) - Section 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)(I-V)*			
Position	**Supports Goal(s)**	**Supports which system(s)**	**How will the primary actions of this position support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan?**
Parent Facilitator(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☒ Family Engagement	• **Family Engagement and Communication**: The Parent Facilitator will establish strong communication channels with families, ensuring they are informed about school goals, programs, and student progress, which fosters a collaborative school-home partnership. • **Workshops and Support for Parents**: The facilitator will coordinate with teachers and staff, to organize workshops and events that empower parents with tools and strategies to support their children's academic success, particularly in areas such as literacy, math, and social-emotional learning. • **Increased Parental Involvement**: The facilitator will encourage and coordinate volunteer opportunities, parent involvement in decision-making, and active participation in school events, contributing to a positive school culture and community. • **Connecting Families with Resources**: The Parent Facilitator will link families to community resources, support services, and school-based programs that help address barriers to student success, ensuring all students have the necessary support to thrive academically and socially.
Instructional Paraprofessional(s)	☒ Goal 1 ☒ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☒ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	• The paraprofessional will serve as instructional support in a Kindergarten classroom by assisting the certified Kindergarten teacher with ELA and Math small groups and data collection. • The paraprofessional will facilitate ELA and Math stations during those academic subjects while the certified Kindergarten teacher is providing differentiated instruction in small groups to target specific learning skills.

School Improvement Goals *Include goals on the parent compacts and policy*	
Goal #1	**<u>ELA</u>** **Kinder- GKIDS** : The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring Developing or higher on the Constructing Texts domain of the GKIDS assessment will increase from 62% in May 2026 to 65% in May 2027. **1st & 2nd – Beacon:** The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 486 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 62% in May 2026 to 65% in May 2027. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 510 on the ELA Beacon Assessment will increase from 55% in May 2026 to 58% in May 2026. **3rd – 5th – ELA Milestone**: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase by 3% from May 2026 to May 2027. (goal will be updated to reflect exact percentages in Fall 2026 after receiving ELA EOG data) The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase by 3% from May 2026 to May 2027. (goal will be updated to reflect exact percentages in Fall 2026 after receiving ELA EOG data) The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the ELA Milestone will increase by 3% from May 2026 to May 2027. (goal will be updated to reflect exact percentages in Fall 2026 after receiving ELA EOG data)
Goal #2	**<u>Math</u>** **K – 2nd – Beacon:** The percentage of Kindergarten students scoring at or above 455 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon assessment will increase from 38% in May 2026 to 41% in May 2027. The percentage of 1st grade students scoring at or above 490 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 71% in May 2026 to 74% in May 2027. The percentage of 2nd grade students scoring at or above 516 on the numerical reasoning domain of the Beacon Assessment will increase from 41% in May 2026 to 43% in May 2027. **3rd – 5th – Math EOG**: The percentage of 3rd grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 33% in May 2026 to 36% in May 2027.

	The percentage of 4th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 32% in May 2026 to 35% in May 2027. The percentage of 5th grade students scoring proficient or distinguished on the Math EOG will increase from 34% in May 2026 to 37% in May 2027.