

School Improvement Plan

Title I, Part A



School Year:	2025 - 2026
School Name:	Pearson Middle School
Principal Name:	
Date Submitted:	
Revision Date(s):	

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

In developing this plan, briefly describe how the school sought and included advice from individuals (teachers, staff, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, parents, community partners, and other stakeholders). <i>References: Schoolwide Checklist 3.b.[Sec. 2103(b)(2)]</i>	
School Response: The SIP was reviewed by all shareholders (families, teachers, staff and community members) with the expectation/understanding that all shareholders reviewing this document will have the power to make suggestions, additions, and edits in which they felt best represented the needs of our community.	

IDENTIFICATION of STAKEHOLDERS

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

Positions and Roles to consider when developing the SIP Committee.

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

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN COMMITTEE MEMBERS - SIGNATURE PAGE

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

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

Position/Role	Printed Name	Signature
Principal	Dean Yoder	
Assistant Principal	Kristi Lankford	
6-8 Reading/ELA Instructional Specialist	Rachel Benhart	
6-8 Math/science Instructional Specialist	Marshane Foreman	
6 th grade Team Lead	Jaclyn Davies	
7 th grade Team Lead	Jessica West	
8 th grade Team Lead	Mercedes Liriano	
School counselor	Rayniece Meadows	
Parent	Ricardo Munoz	
School Librarian	Tiffany Spriggs	

Comprehensive Needs Assessment Evaluation of Goal(s)

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

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

Previous Year's Goal #1	By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, the number of students reading below their grade-level band will decrease by 15% as measured ELA EOG Milestones Assessment. • 6th grade will decrease from <u>46%</u> to <u>31%</u> (15 students) ○ 6th grade Lexile band 925 – 1070 • 7th grade will decrease from <u>60%</u> to <u>45%</u> (23 students) ○ 7th grade Lexile band 970 – 1120 • 8th grade will decrease from <u>50%</u> to <u>35%</u> (21 students) ○ 8th grade Lexile band 1010 – 1185																																																																					
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially																																																																						
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="7">8th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Scale went up</td><td style="text-align: center;">Scale went down</td><td style="text-align: center;">Achievement up</td><td style="text-align: center;">Achievement down</td><td style="text-align: center;">Level 1 2024</td><td style="text-align: center;">Level I 2025</td><td style="text-align: center;">Hit Goal?</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">156</td><td style="text-align: center;">73</td><td style="text-align: center;">56</td><td style="text-align: center;">20</td><td style="text-align: center;">122</td><td style="text-align: center;">110</td><td style="text-align: center;">No</td></tr> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="7">7th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Scale went up</td><td style="text-align: center;">Scale went down</td><td style="text-align: center;">Achievement up</td><td style="text-align: center;">Achievement down</td><td style="text-align: center;">Level 1 2024</td><td style="text-align: center;">Level I 2025</td><td style="text-align: center;">Hit Goal?</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">163</td><td style="text-align: center;">85</td><td style="text-align: center;">53</td><td style="text-align: center;">26</td><td style="text-align: center;">113</td><td style="text-align: center;">109</td><td style="text-align: center;">No</td></tr> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td colspan="7">6th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Scale went up</td><td style="text-align: center;">Scale went down</td><td style="text-align: center;">Achievement up</td><td style="text-align: center;">Achievement down</td><td style="text-align: center;">Level 1 2024</td><td style="text-align: center;">Level I 2025</td><td style="text-align: center;">Hit Goal?</td></tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">60</td><td style="text-align: center;">113</td><td style="text-align: center;">11</td><td style="text-align: center;">42</td><td style="text-align: center;">69</td><td style="text-align: center;">86</td><td style="text-align: center;">No</td></tr> </table>							8th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students							Scale went up	Scale went down	Achievement up	Achievement down	Level 1 2024	Level I 2025	Hit Goal?	156	73	56	20	122	110	No	7th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students							Scale went up	Scale went down	Achievement up	Achievement down	Level 1 2024	Level I 2025	Hit Goal?	163	85	53	26	113	109	No	6th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students							Scale went up	Scale went down	Achievement up	Achievement down	Level 1 2024	Level I 2025	Hit Goal?	60	113	11	42	69	86	No
8th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students																																																																						
Scale went up	Scale went down	Achievement up	Achievement down	Level 1 2024	Level I 2025	Hit Goal?																																																																
156	73	56	20	122	110	No																																																																
7th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students																																																																						
Scale went up	Scale went down	Achievement up	Achievement down	Level 1 2024	Level I 2025	Hit Goal?																																																																
163	85	53	26	113	109	No																																																																
6th Grade: Comparing "Like" Students																																																																						
Scale went up	Scale went down	Achievement up	Achievement down	Level 1 2024	Level I 2025	Hit Goal?																																																																
60	113	11	42	69	86	No																																																																
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: • Small Group Instruction – Adjust from Tier 1 instruction to a focus on Tier 2 instruction or RTI interventions. Consider language that focuses on specific interventions based on student need. Action steps to keep or extend: • ELlevation strategies – keep and add collaborative presentations from ESOL/SPED teachers • PILOT block – Keep and adjust wording for implementation plan to include targeted focus for certain students to meet with ELA teachers 5x per week (like January adjustment in SY25).																																																																					

	Possible action step additions: - SWD PILOT block – What are these students doing and how are we monitoring it? Are they meeting goals and objectives and IEPs? How are students being grouped according to IEP goals and objectives? - CCC Functioning – Expectations for CCCs and monitoring plan for implementation. Possibly include PL and/or CCC support from local and district coaches.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

Previous Year's Goal #2	By the end of the 2024-2025 school year, the number of “like” students on a LEVEL I on the math Milestones will decrease by 15%. 200 as measured by the Math EOG Assessment.		
	6th Grade will decrease from 111 to 95 7th Grade will decrease from 132 to 112 8th Grade will decrease from 132 to 112		
Was the goal met? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ Partially			
What data supports the outcome of the goal?	2025 RESULTS 6th Grade - 108 Below Grade Level 7th Grade –118 Below Grade Level 8th Grade -116 Below Grade Level		
Reflecting on Outcomes			
If the goal was not met , what actionable strategies could be implemented	Action steps to eliminate or change: - Manipulatives – Consider rolling into ISOPs because it has become common practice. - Small Group Instruction – Adjust from Tier 1 instruction to a focus on Tier 2 instruction or RTI interventions. Consider language that focuses on specific interventions based on student need. Action steps to keep or extend:		

to address the area of need?	• PILOT block – Consider adjusting based on Beacon scores to more targeted support (like January in SY25). • ELLevation strategies – keep and add collaborative presentations from ESOL/SPED teachers Possible action step additions: • Prisms implementation expectations in Math and Science. Consider setting a schedule for when it should be used. • CCC Functioning – Expectations for CCCs and monitoring plan for implementation. Possibly include PL and/or CCC support from local and district coaches.
If the goal was met or exceeded , what processes, action steps, or interventions contributed to the success of the goal and continue to be implemented to sustain progress?	

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

ELA DATA

ELA Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	23%	21%	23.9%	20.4%
7 th Grade	22%	28.4%	18.1%	27%
8 th Grade	20%	24.1%	30%	24%

Beacon ELA Data – Spring Administration	Reading									Reading Text Types						Writing								
	Key Ideas & Details			Craft & Structure/ Integration of Knowledge & Skills			Vocabulary Acquisition & Use			Literary			Informational			Text Types and Purposes			Conventions			Research		
	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P	SN	NT	P
6 th Grade	47%	41%	13%	46%	42%	12%	53%	37%	10%	44%	45%	11%	49%	41%	10%	47%	43%	10%	59%	32%	9%	44%	45%	11%
7 th Grade	40%	41%	20%	37%	43%	20%	42%	43%	15%	41%	40%	20%	43%	38%	19%	37%	45%	18%	55%	32%	13%	43%	37%	21%
8 th Grade	36%	40%	23%	37%	42%	21%	40%	40%	20%	36%	41%	23%	34%	41%	24%	35%	42%	23%	56%	26%	17%	34%	43%	23%

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY25 ELA Milestones (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	For Grade Levels, ELs and SWD	Grade Levels (all students):

	Grew Within Same Level (10+ Points)	51 students
	Increased Achievement Level	52 students total: 26 Level I → II, 20 Level II → III, 4 Level III → IV
	Moved Up Two Achievement Levels	3 students
	7th Data Summary	
	Category	Details
	Dropped Achievement Level	13 students: 7 Level II → I, 5 Level III → II, 1 Level IV → III
	No Change in Achievement Level	58 students (22 of these students grew within the Level 1 band)
	Dropped Scale Score	33 students
	6th Data Summary	
	Category	Details
	Grew Within Same Level (10+ Points)	28 students
	Increased Achievement Level	21 students: 13 Level I → II, 6 Level II → III, 1 Level III → IV, 1 Level II → IV
	Moved Up Two Achievement Levels	1 student
	6th Data Summary	
	Category	Details
	Grew Within Same Level (10+ Points)	56 students
	Increased Achievement Level	15 students total: 3 Level I → II, 9 Level II → III, 3 Level III → IV
	Moved Up Two Achievement Levels	0 students
EL:		
SWD:		
7th Data Summary		
Category		
Dropped Achievement Level		
No Change in Achievement Level		
Dropped Scale Score		
6th Data Summary		
Category		
Dropped Achievement Level		
No Change in Achievement Level		
Dropped Scale Score		
EL:		
SWD:		

Beacon Assessment SPRG25 – ELA (Grade Levels & Subgroups)	Grade Levels, ELs, and SWDs 6-8 (all students): - Based on the Beacon results in ELA, our 6th-grade students have demonstrated strengths in the Literary Texts and Research reporting categories, with 56% (114 students) at or above Near Target or Prepared. - Based on the Beacon results in ELA, our 7th-grade students have demonstrated strengths in the Craft Structure/Integration of Knowledge and Skills and the Text Types and Purposes reporting categories, with 63% (151 students) at or above Near Target or Prepared. - Based on the Beacon results in ELA, our 8th-grade students have demonstrated strengths in the Research reporting category, with 66% (160 students) at or above Near Target or Prepared. Additional areas of strength, where at least 60% (145 students) are at or above Near Target or Prepared, include: <i>Key Ideas and Details, Craft Structure/Integration of Knowledge and Skills, Literary Texts, Informational Texts, and Text Types and Purposes</i>. EL: - The assessment scores for our 6th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 24% (19 of 79 students) are scoring in the Near Target area overall. - The assessment scores for our 7th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 24% (24 of 99 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. - The assessment scores for our 8th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 38% (39 of 102 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. SWD: - The assessment scores for our 6th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 41% (9 of 22 students) are scoring in the Near Target area overall. - The assessment scores for our 7th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 37% (7 of 19 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. - The assessment scores for our 8th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 55% (16 of 29 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall.	Grade Levels, ELs, and SWDs 6-8 (all students): - Based on the Beacon results in ELA, our 6th-grade students have demonstrated weaknesses in the Vocabulary Acquisition and Use and Conventions reporting categories, 53% (108 students), and 59% (120 students) falling within Support Needed. - Overall, 6th grade students need increased support within the two Writing Skills reporting categories: Text Types & Purposes and Conventions. - Based on the Beacon results in ELA, our 7th-grade students have demonstrated weaknesses in two reporting categories (Vocabulary Acquisition and Use and Conventions), with 42% (101 students) and 55% (132 students) falling within Support Needed. - Based on the Beacon results in ELA, our 8th-grade students have demonstrated weaknesses in two reporting categories (Vocabulary Acquisition and Use and Conventions), with 40% (96 students) and 55% (133 students) falling within Support Needed. EL: - The assessment scores for our 6th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 76% (60 of 79 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. - The assessment scores for our 7th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 76% (75 of 99 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. - The assessment scores for our 8th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 62% (63 of 102 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. SWD: - The assessment scores for our 6th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 59% (13 of 22 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area. - The assessment scores for our 7th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 63% (12 of 19 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area. - The assessment scores for our 8th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 45% (13 of 29 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area.
--	---	--

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: The lack of consistent, explicit vocabulary instruction prevents Pearson students, especially ELL and SWD student groups, from fully accessing and engaging with academic content. In summary, over half of students in grades 6-8th need additional support in vocabulary acquisition and use, meaning they need help learning new words, understanding what those words mean, and using them correctly when they speak or write. The data tells us that our ELL and SWD populations need additional support to access, gain, and demonstrate grade-level literacy knowledge, especially our current 6th and 7th grade SWD and ELL cohorts. Low achievement for ELLs and SWDs is often linked to gaps in academic language development. Our instruction needs to consistently and systematically support vocabulary growth through research-based strategies so students can fully access content and demonstrate mastery. Research shows that gaps in academic vocabulary are one of the primary barriers preventing these student groups from accessing grade-level content and demonstrating their understanding. Pearson students are not consistently receiving explicit instruction in writing conventions across content areas, with ELLs and SWDs being disproportionately impacted. Over half of students in grades 6- 8 need additional support in writing conventions, meaning they need help with the basic rules of writing, like spelling words correctly, using proper punctuation (like periods and commas), writing complete sentences, and using correct grammar. Helping students master writing conventions strengthens their overall writing skills because it allows their ideas to be communicated clearly and effectively. When students don't have to struggle with the basics, they can focus more on expressing creative, thoughtful, and complex ideas — which leads to stronger, more confident writing across all subjects. Research emphasizes the need for systematic instruction in grammar and mechanics to build strong writers. Prioritizing conventions instruction will improve writing clarity, support mastery across disciplines, and close achievement gaps for diverse learners. ELLs and SWDs often require more targeted, repeated, and structured support to master writing conventions due to language development needs or processing differences. Strengthening explicit instruction in conventions ensures these learners can more effectively demonstrate knowledge, participate fully in academic tasks, and meet grade-level writing standards.														
ACCESS Scores (SY25) (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	1. Listening Comprehension Schoolwide listening scores were consistently above 5.0 from SY22–SY24, peaking at 5.7 in SY24. All grades in SY25 still performed strongest in listening, with 8th grade at 4.34, even during a year of decline. 2. Current 8th Grade Cohort Shows Cumulative Growth In writing and reading, 8th grade outperformed 6th and 7th, suggesting students benefit from sustained language development over time. Composite scores in Data Set 2 show 8th grade at 3.24 overall, the highest of all grade levels. 3. 6th Grade is on an Upward Trend Both writing and reading showed improvement in 6th grade from SY24 to SY25, signaling success in entry-level support or early intervention practices. 4. Based on ESOL exiting criteria, approximately 33 students achieved a composite score of 4.3 and above.		1. Speaking is the Lowest Performing Domain Grade-level speaking scores are the lowest across all grades. Schoolwide speaking also dropped from 3.7 in SY24 to 2.85 in SY25, a significant regression. 2. 7th Grade Underperformance Across the Board 7th grade scores declined in reading and writing from SY24 to SY25. In Data Set 2, 7th grade had the lowest averages in all domains except speaking, pointing to systemic instructional or support gaps at that grade level. 3. SY25 Schoolwide Scores Plummeted From SY24 to SY25, the school experienced a dramatic decline across all domains (Data Set #1) Data Set #1 <table><tr><td>School Average by Domain (Longitudinal)</td><td>Listening</td><td>Speaking</td><td>Reading</td><td>Writing</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>			School Average by Domain (Longitudinal)	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing					
School Average by Domain (Longitudinal)	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing											

		<table><tr><td>SY22</td><td>5.2</td><td>3.4</td><td>3.9</td><td>3.7</td></tr><tr><td>SY23</td><td>5.2</td><td>3.3</td><td>3.2</td><td>3.4</td></tr><tr><td>SY24</td><td>5.7</td><td>3.7</td><td>4.2</td><td>4.2</td></tr><tr><td>SY25</td><td>4.3</td><td>2.85</td><td>2.67</td><td>3.12</td></tr></table> Data Set #2 <table><tr><th colspan="6">Grade Level Averages by Domain</th></tr><tr><th>Grade Level</th><th>Listening</th><th>Speaking</th><th>Reading</th><th>Writing</th><th>Composite (Overall)</th></tr><tr><td>6th</td><td>4.29</td><td>2.61</td><td>2.93</td><td>3.12</td><td>3.05</td></tr><tr><td>7th</td><td>4.25</td><td>2.64</td><td>2.41</td><td>2.98</td><td>2.86</td></tr><tr><td>8th</td><td>4.34</td><td>2.94</td><td>2.97</td><td>3.26</td><td>3.24</td></tr></table> Data Set #3 <table><tr><th colspan="3">ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Reading Grade Level Average Scores)</th></tr><tr><th>Grade Level</th><th>SY24</th><th>SY25</th></tr><tr><td>6th</td><td>1.89</td><td>2.02</td></tr><tr><td>7th</td><td>2.03</td><td>1.85</td></tr><tr><td>8th</td><td>2.44</td><td>2.45</td></tr></table> Data Set #4 <table><tr><th colspan="3">ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Writing Grade Level Average Scores)</th></tr><tr><th>Grade Level</th><th>SY24</th><th>SY25</th></tr><tr><td>6th</td><td>2.37</td><td>2.69</td></tr><tr><td>7th</td><td>2.50</td><td>2.45</td></tr><tr><td>8th</td><td>2.63</td><td>2.81</td></tr></table>	SY22	5.2	3.4	3.9	3.7	SY23	5.2	3.3	3.2	3.4	SY24	5.7	3.7	4.2	4.2	SY25	4.3	2.85	2.67	3.12	Grade Level Averages by Domain						Grade Level	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Composite (Overall)	6 th	4.29	2.61	2.93	3.12	3.05	7 th	4.25	2.64	2.41	2.98	2.86	8 th	4.34	2.94	2.97	3.26	3.24	ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Reading Grade Level Average Scores)			Grade Level	SY24	SY25	6 th	1.89	2.02	7 th	2.03	1.85	8 th	2.44	2.45	ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Writing Grade Level Average Scores)			Grade Level	SY24	SY25	6 th	2.37	2.69	7 th	2.50	2.45	8 th	2.63	2.81
SY22	5.2	3.4	3.9	3.7																																																																														
SY23	5.2	3.3	3.2	3.4																																																																														
SY24	5.7	3.7	4.2	4.2																																																																														
SY25	4.3	2.85	2.67	3.12																																																																														
Grade Level Averages by Domain																																																																																		
Grade Level	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Composite (Overall)																																																																													
6 th	4.29	2.61	2.93	3.12	3.05																																																																													
7 th	4.25	2.64	2.41	2.98	2.86																																																																													
8 th	4.34	2.94	2.97	3.26	3.24																																																																													
ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Reading Grade Level Average Scores)																																																																																		
Grade Level	SY24	SY25																																																																																
6 th	1.89	2.02																																																																																
7 th	2.03	1.85																																																																																
8 th	2.44	2.45																																																																																
ACCESS Longitudinal Data (Writing Grade Level Average Scores)																																																																																		
Grade Level	SY24	SY25																																																																																
6 th	2.37	2.69																																																																																
7 th	2.50	2.45																																																																																
8 th	2.63	2.81																																																																																
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Lack of language-rich Tier 1 instruction. In SY25, significant drops in reading and writing suggest that general education classrooms were not consistently embedding language objectives into content-area teaching. - Minimal integration of listening/speaking into content learning. Few authentic speaking opportunities in the classroom. While listening remained strong, the low speaking scores across the board reveal a gap in oral language instruction, which should be a daily practice across subjects, not just ESOL. - ESOL teachers may be stretched too thin (caseloads, scheduling conflicts, content areas, etc.), limiting their ability to co-plan or co-teach effectively. - Limited progress monitoring by domain or subgroup. Leaders may not track domain data to drive decisions. - Lower averages could also be attributed to a higher enrollment of ELL students throughout August to April.																																																																																	
Reading Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): Literary and informational text reading assessments indicate that at least 60% of students are performing proficiently on the following standards in each grade level: 6th Grade: RL. 5 (text structure/development of theme/setting/plot)– 65% RL.7 (compare/contrast texts)- 70% RL.1-9 (Literary standards overall) – 67% RI.1 (cite evidence/draw inferences/informational) – 61%	Grade Levels (all students): Standards analysis of common assessment items aligned to literary and informational (6th – 8th grades) reading standards indicates that the following standards are not mastered, with at least 60% of students scoring proficiently. The percentages of students scoring at least 75% proficiency are listed below: <table><tr><td>Lit.</td><td>RL.1</td><td>RL.2</td><td>RL.3</td><td>RL.4</td><td>RL.5</td><td>RL.6</td><td>RL.7</td><td>RL.8</td><td>RL.9</td></tr></table>	Lit.	RL.1	RL.2	RL.3	RL.4	RL.5	RL.6	RL.7	RL.8	RL.9																																																																						
Lit.	RL.1	RL.2	RL.3	RL.4	RL.5	RL.6	RL.7	RL.8	RL.9																																																																									

7th Grade:

RL.1 (cite evidence/draw inferences/literary) – 77%

RL.1 & RL.2 (constructed response writing) – 77%

RI.1 (cite evidence/draw inferences/informational) – 79%

RI.2 (determine central idea) – 72%

8th Grade:

RL.1-9 (literary standards overall) – 62%

RL.6 (analyze points of view, literary) - 65%

RI.1 (cite evidence/draw inferences/informational) - 81%

RI.6 (determine author's POV/purpose) - 75%

EL:

The assessment scores for our EL students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages similar to those of their non-EL peers.

SWD:

The assessment scores for our SWD students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages similar to those of their non-SWD peers.

6 th	51%	45%	30%	n/a		n/a			
7 th	55%		40%	47%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
8 th									

Inf.	RI.1	RI.2	RI.3	RI.4	RI.5	RI.6	RI.7	RI.8	RI.9
6 th		49%	29%	n/a	45%	26%	n/a	n/a	33%
7 th			28%	53%	n/a	45%	n/a	n/a	n/a
8 th		47%	41%	55%	27%		n/a	17%	n/a

EL:

While the assessment scores for our EL students indicate that they are exhibiting similar growth percentages as their non-EL peers, their proficiency averages are about 10-15% lower on reading grade-level standards.

- Common assessments reveal that ELs continue to struggle with understanding figurative or connotative language, text structures (e.g. cause/effect, problem/solution), and transitions that indicate shifts. Additionally, assessments reveal that limited background knowledge and schema impact their understanding of U.S.-based topics, literary and informational texts, or figures of speech (e.g. idioms).

SWD:

While the assessment scores for our SWD students indicate they are exhibiting similar growth percentages as their non-SWD peers, their proficiency averages are about 5-10% lower on reading grade-level standards.

- Common assessments reveal that SWDs need support in decoding and interpreting complex vocabulary and texts.
- Common assessments revealed that students struggle with utilizing metacognition strategies that require critical thinking, synthesis, and comparisons. These thinking tasks require students to utilize their working memory and attention skills, which are often impacted by learning disabilities.

Summary (EL/SWD):

Our ELLs and SWDs struggle with these standards because they require abstract reasoning, deep language skills, and analysis across multiple texts or formats. These skills are challenging due to linguistic, cognitive, or processing differences.

Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: - Limited opportunities for students to use higher-order thinking, analysis, and language comprehension skills beyond foundational and basic reading skills (e.g. Comprehension, Determining Central Ideas, etc.) - Assessment Design & Data Discussions: - Common assessments are not consistently created (collaboratively) among CCC members before instruction begins. - Assessments are not consistently aligned to grade-level reading standards regarding rigor, depth, and what is taught and practiced formatively. - CCC Teams do not regularly analyze formative assessment data to adjust their instruction or provide targeted reteaching before administering unit summative assessments.																		
ELA Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): ELA writing-based assessments indicate that at least 60% of students are performing proficiently on the following standards (W1, W2, W3) in each grade level: 6th Grade: W1 (argumentative), W2 (informational), W3 (narrative) 7th Grade: 8th Grade: While there were not 60% of students demonstrating mastery for the listed standards, 52% of students demonstrated mastery for the standard: W3 (narrative) SWD: Narrative Writing is where our SWD students perform on par with their non-SWD grade-level peers.	Grade Levels (all students): ELA writing-based assessments indicate that at least 60% of students are not performing proficiently on the following standards in each grade level: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>% of students scoring 75% and above on grade-level common cold-write assessments.</th><th>W1 (Argumentative)</th><th>W2 (Informational)</th><th>W3 (Narrative)</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>6th</td><td>68%</td><td>60%</td><td>98%</td></tr> <tr> <td>7th</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>8th</td><td>45%</td><td>49%</td><td>52%</td></tr> </tbody> </table> EL: Proficiency averages are about 15-20% lower on writing grade-level standards than non-ELL students. SWD: Proficiency averages for <u>informational and argumentative</u> writing grade-level standards are about 5-10% lower than those of non-SWD students.		% of students scoring 75% and above on grade-level common cold-write assessments.	W1 (Argumentative)	W2 (Informational)	W3 (Narrative)	6 th	68%	60%	98%	7 th				8 th	45%	49%	52%
% of students scoring 75% and above on grade-level common cold-write assessments.	W1 (Argumentative)	W2 (Informational)	W3 (Narrative)																
6 th	68%	60%	98%																
7 th																			
8 th	45%	49%	52%																
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership	Root Cause Explanation: Our SWD and ELL students are performing below peers across informational and argumentative writing genres due to persistent gaps in academic language production, organizational structure, and evidence elaboration skills, compounded by challenges with reading comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and executive functioning stamina.																		

☐ Supportive Learning Environment																												
Write Score Assessments SY25 Informational (Winter) & Argumentative (Spring)	Grade Levels (all students):		Grade Levels (all students):																									
	<table><tr><th>Grade</th><th>Genre</th><th>% Below (1–3)</th><th>% Average (4–5)</th><th>% Advanced (6–7)</th></tr><tr><td>6th</td><td>Informational</td><td>64.2%</td><td>32.7%</td><td>3%</td></tr><tr><td>7th</td><td>Informational</td><td>49.8%</td><td>49.8%</td><td>0.4%</td></tr><tr><td>8th</td><td>Informational</td><td>44.8%</td><td>50%</td><td>5.2%</td></tr><tr><td>8th</td><td>Argumentative</td><td>34.2%</td><td>63.3%</td><td>2.5%</td></tr></table>	Grade	Genre	% Below (1–3)	% Average (4–5)	% Advanced (6–7)	6th	Informational	64.2%	32.7%	3%	7th	Informational	49.8%	49.8%	0.4%	8th	Informational	44.8%	50%	5.2%	8th	Argumentative	34.2%	63.3%	2.5%	• 6th grade informational writing is the lowest performing, with almost two-thirds below grade level: 64.2%. • 7th grade informational writing shows improvement, but the group is almost split evenly between below and average. • 8th grade shows continued improvement, especially in argumentative writing, even though informational writing is about 45% below grade level.	
Grade	Genre	% Below (1–3)	% Average (4–5)	% Advanced (6–7)																								
6th	Informational	64.2%	32.7%	3%																								
7th	Informational	49.8%	49.8%	0.4%																								
8th	Informational	44.8%	50%	5.2%																								
8th	Argumentative	34.2%	63.3%	2.5%																								
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	• Weak foundational writing skills among diverse groups, leaving more instructional gaps to close to support students with grade-level writing-based assessments. • Limited Elaboration Skills amongst most students. Students have demonstrated struggles with explaining text evidence with deeper, analytical thinking. Informational and argumentative writing rely heavily on explanation and elaboration writing skills. • Low writing stamina across grade levels, producing average scores even when students remain on topic. • Few students are reaching the advanced level, indicating that our average writers may just be meeting the minimum proficiency due to limited rigorous writing opportunities in the classroom.																											
School Instructional Walks (6 th – 8 th) Shared Teaching Walk Form Results Pearson SIP Walk Form Results	• Pearson Teachers (6th – 8th) consistently incorporate the following instructional strategies and practices in the classroom: ○ Learning targets, unknown word strategies, reading annotation strategies, gradual release model, checks for understanding, positive reinforcement, graphic organizers (RACES, Plot Diagram, Boxes & Bullets), teacher-led chunking of assignments, feedback, visuals, movement, and other student engagement strategies. • Data reveals that 71% of the observed classrooms consistently implement learning targets aligned to the standards, mini-lessons, student activities, and assessments.	Grade Levels (all students): • Limited use of metacognitive strategies Shared teaching classrooms: ○ 42% of observations indicated whole group instruction. ○ Lacking evidence of student choice. ○ 34% of observations included a one teach/one assist co-teaching model, with the general education teacher as the facilitator, and the shared teacher as an assist. EL: • Limited speaking opportunities. • Limited use of scaffolded instructions • 24% of observations indicated no language skills actively practiced for an extended time. SWD: • Limited use of positive learning environment strategies: checklists, social stories, structured breaks, first-then																										
Check the system that contributes to	Root Cause Explanation:																											

the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	• Across grade levels, the limited use of metacognitive strategies likely results from a lack of consistent modeling and professional development focused on teaching students how to think about their thinking. • In shared teaching classrooms, the high use of whole group instruction (42%) and limited student choice suggest teacher-centered practices dominate due to insufficient co-teaching training, limited planning time, and unclear expectations for true collaboration. The frequent one-teach/one-assist model (34%) further reflects an imbalance in instructional roles. • For EL students, limited speaking opportunities and scaffolded instruction stem from instruction prioritizing content coverage over integrated language development. Teachers may lack training or tools to embed structured language practice consistently into daily lessons. • For SWD students, the inconsistent use of positive behavior supports (like checklists, structured breaks, and first-then boards) indicates a need for more systematic training in universal design and proactive behavior strategies.	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation:	

ELA - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #1: ELA	6TH GRADE	7TH GRADE	8TH GRADE
	Fall Beacon Data: - 220 students tested - 102 students in the support needed category (46%) - 118 students in the near target & prepared category (54%) - 23 students within 25pts of near target - 26 students within 25pts of dropping to support needed	Fall Beacon Data: - 197 students tested - 109 students in the support needed category (55%) - 88 students in the near target & prepared category (45%) - 21 students within 25pts of near target - 18 students within 25pts of dropping to support needed	Fall Beacon Data: - 252 students tested - 110 students in the support needed category (44%) - 142 students in the near target & prepared category (56%) - 19 students within 25pts of near target - 27 students within 25pts of dropping to support needed
	Goal: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the percentage of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories will increase from 54% on the Fall administration to 64% on the Spring administration, as measured by the DRC Georgia ELA BEACON Assessment.	Goal: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the percentage of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories will increase from 45% on the Fall administration to 55% on the Spring administration, as measured by the DRC Georgia ELA BEACON Assessment.	Goal: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the percentage of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories will increase from 56% on the Fall administration to 66% on the Spring administration, as measured by the DRC Georgia ELA BEACON Assessment.
	Numbers Needed: - 141 students need to hit Near Target/Proficient by Spring assessment (at least 23 students needed)	Numbers Needed: - 108 students need to hit Near Target/Proficient by Spring assessment (at least 20 students needed)	Numbers Needed: - 167 students need to hit Near Target/Proficient by Spring assessment (at least 25 students needed)
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• The lack of consistent, explicit vocabulary instruction prevents Pearson students, especially ELL and SWD student groups, from fully accessing and engaging with academic content. • Lack of language-rich Tier 1 instruction. In SY25, significant drops in reading and writing suggest that general education classrooms were not consistently embedding language objectives into content-area teaching.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of ELA and Reading teachers will implement explicit vocabulary instruction and supports 2-3 times per week as measured by classroom observations and CCC lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: 60% of students will score a 75% or higher on ELA and Reading unit vocabulary post-assessments. Evaluation Tool(s):	
Target Student Group			

☒ All Students ☒ EL ☒ SWD		- Reading vocabulary assessments based on each unit's vocabulary lists - ELA vocabulary questions on each unit's post-assessment	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>	Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - Tier 1 Explicit Vocabulary Instruction All Staff PL - August: - Introduce SIP and vocabulary action steps to the staff. - Distribute “must-have” vocabulary lists by grade and unit. - CCC teams establish their interactive word walls. - September: - Begin weekly explicit vocabulary instruction (1-2x/week) - Emphasize visuals, word parts, and student-friendly definitions. - October: - Continue explicit vocabulary instruction and embed vocabulary into reading and writing tasks. - Modeling of academic language use with sentence frames. - November: - Incorporate student-led vocabulary activities (ex., semantic maps, word sorts) - CCC planning for ELL/SWD scaffolds for student-led activities. - December: - Review and reinforce taught vocabulary. - Mid-year assessment and reflection. - January-February: - Refresh explicit vocabulary instruction routines. - Connect vocabulary to EOG-style questions and writing prompts. - Emphasize structured academic conversation with vocabulary. (ex., discussion stems, collaborative tasks) - March-April: - Spiral review of vocabulary for Milestones. - Vocabulary Test-prep (gamified, review tasks, retrieval practice) - May: - Final post-assessment. - Final CCC reflections.	Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ by unit (5 units) Data Analysis Plan: - CCC Level – - Teachers will analyze post-assessment results to adjust instruction, reteach low-mastery words, and modify differentiation supports. - CCC teams will identify strengths and weaknesses in vocabulary acquisition and use, share effective scaffolds, and discuss subgroups' progress (ELL/SWD/Support Needed) - Admin. & Coach – - Will review post-assessment data by unit to identify patterns of low-performing terms or skills across grade levels. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
1. 6th–8th grade ELA and Reading teachers will implement explicit vocabulary instruction using grade-level “must have” vocabulary lists, the six-step Marzano-based vocabulary routine, and visual and linguistic supports (ELlevation) 2–3 times per week, emphasizing supporting language access for ELL and SWD student groups.			

	- Share out of student exemplars, growth, and effective strategies to continue. Artifacts to be Collected: Grade-level vocabulary lists Student work samples CCC Unit/Lesson plans - Vocabulary tied to learning objectives - Vocabulary assessment dates - Word-learning routines Vocabulary Scaffolds (sentence frames, visuals, cognates) Photos of classroom interactive word walls. Informal and formal classroom observations. Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Common assessments are not consistently created (collaboratively) among CCC members before instruction begins. - Assessments are not consistently aligned to grade-level reading standards regarding rigor, depth, and what is taught and practiced formatively. - CCC Teams do not regularly analyze formative assessment data to adjust their instruction or provide targeted reteaching before administering unit summative assessments. - Across grade levels, the limited use of metacognitive strategies likely results from a lack of consistent modeling and professional development focused on teaching students how to think about their thinking. - In shared teaching classrooms, the high use of whole group instruction (42%) and limited student choice suggest teacher-centered practices dominate due to insufficient co-teaching training, limited planning time, and unclear expectations for true collaboration. The frequent one-teach/one-assist model (34%) further reflects an imbalance in instructional roles.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 6 th -8 th grade teachers will implement structured thinking routines/strategies 2-3 times per week as measured by classroom observations and CCC lesson plans.	Evaluation Performance Target: By December 2025, 50% of students will score a 50% or higher on grade-level ELA standards as measured by common assessments.	Harvard's Project Zero Think Routine Toolbox

Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD			
Action Step			
<i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i> 2. 6th-8th grade teachers will integrate structured thinking routines/strategies connected to authentic, real-world tasks as lesson warm-ups and/or openers 2-3 times per week, as measured by classroom observations and CCC lesson plans.	Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - Build a shared understanding of the SIP goal and how structured thinking routines support student engagement and depth of thinking. - Establish the implementation timeline, shared expectations, and introduce the monitoring tools. - August: - Staff professional learning integrating Project Zero thinking routines/strategies and real-world tasks across the content areas. - Teachers choose 2-3 routines to start using. - CCC teams collaborate to create Q1 warm-ups and lesson openers aligned to their content area. - September: - Teachers will implement 1-2 Project Zero thinking routines weekly. - Focus on building consistency and student engagement (refer to Thinking Routines Walk form) - CCC peer discussions on glows and grow of the implementation of Project Zero thinking routines) - October: - CCCs will continue aligning their thinking routines to current unit standards and/or real-world writing tasks. - November: - Teachers will increase the weekly frequency to 2-3 routines/week. - CCC planning focused on adjusting routines for differentiation and scaffolded support. - Incorporate culturally relevant-aligned prompts. - December: - Reflect on selected “go-to” routines and revise for effectiveness. (Utilize data to drive revisions.) - Grade-level showcase of routines in action with student work samples. - January: - Refresh training on deepening rigor in routines. - Teachers will increase the weekly frequency to 2-3 routines/week.	By May 2026, 60% of students will score a 60% or higher on grade-level ELA standards as measured by common assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): - ELA Common Assessment CTLS Reports - Rubric for Student Thinking - Implementation Frequency Tracker - Admin Summary Reflection of Walkthrough and CCC data: % of teachers using routines consistently - Growth in routine quality (authentic, real-world connection, rigor, standards-aligned) - Alignment to action step and goal. Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ Weekly formative assessments Data Analysis Plan: - August: - Data collection: Baseline teacher knowledge (survey), CCC lesson plan samples - Analysis Focus: Identify teacher readiness, existing routine use, and planning needs. - September: - Data collection: CCC lesson plans, initial walkthroughs - Analysis Focus: Evaluate early implementation consistency and instructional alignment. - October: - Data collection: CCC lesson plans, routine reflections, and student artifacts. - Analysis Focus: Analyze student thinking patterns and frequency of usage.	

	▪ Peer observation rounds for best practices. ▪ CCC planning focused on deepening rigor in routines and incorporating grade-level, ELA EOG assessment questions. ▪ February: ▪ CCC continues planning, focused on multimodal texts, writing prompts, and performance tasks. ▪ Continue the peer observation rounds and feedback cycles. ▪ Reflect on which routines students internalize most and adjust CCC planning accordingly. ▪ March-April: ▪ Align routines with test-prep. ▪ May: ▪ Use routines to preview the next grade level's priority standards. ▪ Final reflection of thinking routines/strategies. CCCs select the top 2-3 routines for the next school year. Artifacts to be Collected: Classroom Observations CCC lesson plans and Routines Tracking Log Student work samples Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly	▪ November: ▪ Data collection: Walkthroughs ▪ Analysis Focus: Compare fidelity of use with students' perception of value and diagnostic data. ▪ December: ▪ Data collection: Teacher reflections, content exemplars across grade levels ▪ Analysis Focus: Assess strengths, student needs, and areas for professional learning. ▪ January-April: ▪ Data collection: Ongoing walkthroughs, CCC reviews of student work, CCC planning docs. ▪ Analysis Focus: Track growth in rigor, routine alignment, and student engagement. ▪ May: ▪ Data collection: End-of-year teacher and student reflections, student samples ▪ Analysis Focus: Summarize overall impact and whether to continue/scale up or discontinue action step. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- Pearson students are not consistently receiving explicit instruction in writing conventions across content areas, with ELLs and SWDs being disproportionately impacted. - Weak foundational writing skills among diverse groups, leaving more instructional gaps to close to support students with grade-level writing-based assessments. - Limited Elaboration Skills amongst most students. Students have demonstrated struggles with explaining text evidence with deeper, analytical thinking. Informational and argumentative writing rely heavily on explanation and elaboration writing skills. - Few students are reaching the advanced level, indicating that our average writers may just be meeting the minimum proficiency due to limited rigorous writing opportunities in the classroom.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of 6 th – 8 th grade teachers will implement explicit reading and writing instruction for a minimum of 45 minutes, 2 times per week during the schoolwide intervention block (Pilot Block), using grade-level aligned strategies that target comprehension, conventions, elaboration, and analytical thinking, with differentiated supports for ELLs and SWDs.		
Target Student Group	Evaluation Performance Target: 60% of students will score within the Near Target and Prepared achievement levels by the Spring administration of the ELA Beacon assessment.		
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			
3. 6th–8th grade teachers will implement schoolwide, explicit reading and writing instruction focused on comprehension, conventions, elaboration, and analytical thinking, with targeted supports for	Implementation Plan: - December: - Create intervention groups for select students based on the Winter Beacon ELA assessment data. - Train teaching staff on Literacy Pilot Block expectations- model lesson plans and Pilot Block tool kits for those teaching ELA/Reading Pilot Block. - January: - Begin the implementation of Reading/ELA focused Pilot Block for those students identified based on latest Beacon data. - Begin walkthroughs and feedback cycles to ensure consistent delivery of explicit instruction across grades and monitor the use of the targeted supports.		

ELLs and SWDs to strengthen foundational and grade-level literacy skills. (Pilot Block)	○ Follow up with teachers needing additional support to ensure provided lessons are implemented with fidelity. ○ Bi-weekly CFAs that are aligned to focus skills begin. ▪ February-March ○ Continue intervention block implementation, as well as walkthrough and feedback cycles. ○ Follow up with teachers needing additional support to ensure provided lessons are implemented with fidelity. ▪ April ○ Continue intervention block implementation. ○ Administer Spring ELA beacon assessment- measure growth and performance of students attending the Literacy Pilot Block. ▪ May ○ Reflection, Celebrations, and Feedback – share glows, grows, and gain teacher and student input to refine intervention block for the next school year. Artifacts to be Collected: Walkthrough form data, Pilot Block lesson plans, teacher reflections, student work samples Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly	○ Student growth on specific focus skills (by subgroup: ELL, SWD, etc.). ○ Identification of skill gaps and intervention group adjustments. 2. Triannual Diagnostic Data (Fall, Winter, Spring) • Assessment Tool: District ELA diagnostic (DRC Beacon). • Data Review Frequency: Post-assessment, 3x/year. • Analysis Focus: ○ Performance band movement (overall and by subgroup). ○ Comparison of reading vs. writing performance trends. ○ Goal progress: % of students improving one or more bands. ○ Correlation between intervention participation and diagnostic growth. 3. Schoolwide Data Talks • Frequency: At end of each diagnostic window • Participants: Admin, ELA teachers, reading teachers, ESOL/SPED. • Purpose: Celebrate gains, identify trends, and adjust supports. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	
--	---	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	- For EL students, limited speaking opportunities and scaffolded instruction stem from instruction prioritizing content coverage over integrated language development. Teachers may lack training or tools to embed structured language practice consistently into daily lessons. - Minimal integration of listening/speaking into content learning. Few authentic speaking opportunities in the classroom. While listening remained strong, the low speaking scores across the board reveal a gap in oral language instruction, which should be a daily practice across subjects, not just ESOL. - ESOL teachers may be stretched too thin (caseloads, scheduling conflicts, content areas, etc.), limiting their ability to co-plan or co-teach effectively. - Limited progress monitoring by domain or subgroup. Leaders may not track domain data to drive decisions		
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 ESOL bubble groups will be implemented with fidelity, with 85% student participation and monthly progress monitoring tied to ACCESS domains. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: - Identify ESOL bubble students: - Long-term ESOL students with ACCESS composite ≤ 2.9 and reading ≤ 2.5; Students placed in Read180 program; emphasis on foundational literacy and fluency. - ESOL students with ACCESS composite between 4.0 and 4.2; Students receive targeted small group instruction in ELA/Reading classroom during the cruising portion; focus on academic output (writing tasks) and/or academic input (decoding, comprehension, and academic vocabulary). - Literacy lab instruction delivered by designated staff, including Maria Ngong. ELA/Reading teachers will deliver targeted small group instruction during the general education class. - Curriculum aligned to WIDA standards and Georgia ELA standards. October:	Evaluation Performance Target: Students in the bubble groups will demonstrate growth of at least 1 proficiency band in their respective domains on the 2026 ACCESS test, with at least 75% of participating students meeting or exceeding a 4.3 composite score. Evaluation Tool(s): 2026 Access Scores - Writing samples (assessed with WIDA rubric by ESOL lead and academic coach) - Read180 growth data - Monthly progress monitoring form for students not in Read180	
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)			
4. Establish targeted ESOL bubble literacy groups to support ACCESS growth in writing, reading, and composite scores for identified multilingual learners.		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan:	

	○ CCC teams meet to review WIDA rubrics and identify ESOL bubble students in their classes. CCC teams discuss student ACCESS scores and the best Ellevation strategies to implement when pulling students in small groups. ○ Set individual goals for ESOL bubble students aligned to ACCESS domains- share ACCESS scores and goals during parent-teacher conferences for bubble ESOL students ○ Introduce ACCESS-style prompts for homeroom- once a week picture prompts created by ESOL team. ○ November: ○ Begin biweekly instructional walkthroughs, provide teachers with feedback, and continue ACCESS-style practice during homeroom and targeted instruction during the regular class setting. ○ Administer interim reading probes for the Read180 group, continue ACCESS-style practice during homeroom and targeted instruction during the regular classroom setting. ○ December: ○ CCC teams meet to discuss the effectiveness of the Ellevation strategies being used in small groups. Teams discuss ways to intensify the language output and input activities. ○ First semester (Q1 & Q2) data review, revise instruction for Q3, conduct <u>formal</u> mock ACCESS assessment for all domains with bubble students, review rubric scores with students. ○ January ○ Teachers reestablish group norms and academic goals, continue ACCESS-style	1. October: CCC teams, ESOL Lead, Admin, & Coach will complete a check-in to review progress on goals, make any early roster or instructional adjustments, ensure rubric calibration has occurred, and reflect on data as a team. 2. December: All bubble group teachers, ESOL Lead, Admin., and Coach will review Q1/Q2 data and Mock ACCESS scores 3. May: CCC teams, bubble group teachers, ESOL Lead, Admin., and Coaches will review Q3/Q4 and SY2026 ACCESS data, discuss the year's growth summary, and any exits or enrichment recommendations. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ ESOL Lead/ESOL Teachers	
--	--	--	--

	practice during homeroom and targeted instruction during the regular class setting. ○ ESOL bubble students will be placed in literacy Pilot Block groups based on the data received from the mock ACCESS assessment administered in December. These groups will continue to target skills focusing on language input and/or output for these students. ○ February: ○ Continue ACCESS-style practice during homeroom and targeted instruction during the regular class setting, ACCESS Testing Window (dates ____) ○ March-April: ○ Resume small groups post-ACCESS with an enrichment focus ○ May: ○ Celebrate progress with student-led data reflections, final data review, track student performance against original goals, recommend continuation, enrichment, or exit from bubble groups for SY26-27. Artifacts to be Collected: ○ Small group lesson plans ○ Student Goal-Setting Artifacts ○ Walk Form Feedback ○ Teacher Progress Monitoring and Students Reflection Form ○ Progress Monitoring Data (Read180 benchmarks, mock assessments, ACCESS-style prompts and student work) Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal		
--	---	--	--

	☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ ESOL Lead – Mrs. Harper Frequency of Monitoring: Instructional Walkthroughs – Biweekly Student goal tracker – October Student and Teacher Monitoring Forms- Monthly Progress Monitoring – Monthly		
--	---	--	--

MATH DATA				
MATH Milestones Longitudinal Data	SY22 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY23 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY24 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished	SY25 % of students scoring proficient & distinguished
6 th Grade	7.3%	11.7%	16%	18%
7 th Grade	7.7%	14%	10.8%	14%
8 th Grade	15.1%	7.8%	18.1%	15%

Beacon Math Data – Spring Administration	Numerical Reasoning			Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning			Measurement & Data Reasoning			Geometric & Spatial Reasoning		
	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared	Support Needed	Near Target	Prepared
6 th Grade	71	27	2	60	34	6	59	32	10	61	30	8
7 th Grade	65	29	6	61	31	9	59	29	12	52	39	9
8 th Grade	76	21	2	64	28	8	66	27	8	73	24	3

Source	Strengths	Weaknesses
SY24 MATH Milestones (Data by grade & subgroup)	Grade Levels (all students):	Grade Levels (all students): 6th Grade

	The 6th grade cohort from SY 23 to SY 25 increased their proficient and distinguished percent from 11% to 15% as 8th graders. There was a 4% gain in the levels of proficient and distinguished levels for 7th grade of the Math EOG. 35 grew a level...3 students went from level 3 to 4	There has been a consistent decline in 6th grade math levels proficient & distinguished compared to their 5th grade math levels. 7th Grade 45 students dropped 1 level lower than their previous domain 8th Grade 155 students stayed in the same level. 41 students dropped 1 level
Beacon Assessment – MATH (Grade Level & Subgroups)	6-8 (all students): - Based on the 6th grade Beacon results in Math, our 6th grade students have demonstrated strengths in Measurement and Data Reasoning, with 42% (88 students) scoring Near Target or Prepared. - Based on the 7th grade Beacon results in Math, our 7th grade students have demonstrated strengths in Geometric and Spatial Reasoning with 48% (116 students) scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas. - Based on the 8th grade Beacon results in Math, our 8th grade students have demonstrated strengths in Pattern and Algebraic Reasoning with 36% (87 students) scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas. EL: - The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 8% (6 students) are scoring in the Near Target area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 13% (12 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall.	6-8 (all students): - Based on the 6th-grade Beacon results in Math, our 6th grade students have demonstrated weaknesses in Numerical Reasoning, with 71% (171 students) scoring Support Needed. - Based on the 7th grade Beacon results in Math, our student's 7th grade students have demonstrated a weakness in Numerical Reasoning with 65% (156) scoring Support Needed. - Based on the 8th grade Beacon results in Math, our student's 8th grade students have demonstrated a weakness in Numerical Reasoning with 76% (183) scoring Support Needed. EL: - The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 92% (70 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 87% (80 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 8th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 88% (89 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area overall. SWD:

	- The Beacon scores for our 8th Grade EL students in this content area indicate that 12% (12 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. SWD: - The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 18% (4 students) are scoring in the Near Target area overall. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 21% (4 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall. - The Bacon scores for our 8th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 15% (4 students) are scoring in the Near Target and Prepared areas overall.	- The Beacon scores for our 6th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 82% (18 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area. - The Beacon scores for our 7th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 79% (15 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area. - The Beacon scores for our 8th Grade SWD students in this content area indicate that 75% (23 students) are scoring in the Support Needed area
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Lack of Differentiation - Instruction consistently doesn't meet the cognitive needs of ELLs and SWDs. - Based on classroom observations teachers may not have training in scaffolding. Insufficient Collaboration Between General and Specialized Educators - Limited co-planning between ESL, special education, and general education teachers leads to fragmented support. Math Anxiety and Self-Efficacy - Repeated failure can reduce confidence, especially for SWDs with past negative experiences. - ELLs may feel hesitant to participate due to fear of making language errors. Professional Learning Provide more opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning focused on understanding the rigor of the standards and planning aligned learning experiences	
MATH Common Assessments (Grade Level Reading & Writing)	Grade Levels (all students): 6th Grade 59% of students in 6th grade scored 70% or higher on common assessments focused on Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning.	Grade Levels (all students): Less than 50% (35%) of students in each grade level scored 75% or higher on most unit assessments

	7th Grade 53% of students in 7th grade scored 70% or higher on common assessments focused Numerical Reasoning 8th Grade 69% of students in 8th grade scored 70% or higher on common assessments focused on Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning EL: The assessment scores for our EL students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages lower than their non-EL peers. SWD: The assessment scores for our SWD students indicate they are exhibiting growth percentages similar to those of their non-SWD peers.	EL: Pearson common assessment data shows ELL students struggle with math assessments that are heavily language-dependent. Complex vocabulary, word problems, and unfamiliar sentence structures can create barriers that prevent ELLs from fully demonstrating their knowledge. Additionally, many assessments do not provide appropriate language supports or accommodations, putting ELLs at a disadvantage. As a result, their scores may not reflect their true mathematical ability. SWD: Pearson common assessment data shows that SWD students at Pearson is similar to their peers, consistently staying within a 5% range of non SWD common assessments average.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☒ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Vocabulary Knowledge - Math-specific terms like “altogether,” “difference,” “less than,” or “per” can be confusing without explicit instruction. Background Knowledge and Cultural Context - Word problems may include unfamiliar contexts (e.g., baseball stats, below sea level, etc) that disadvantage ELLs. - SWDs may also lack real-world experience that helps with problem interpretation. Language Proficiency ELLs: Students struggle with understanding academic vocabulary, complex sentence structures, or expressions in word problems. SWDs Students struggling with decoding or interpreting text accurately. Impact: Misunderstanding the problem leads to errors unrelated to mathematical reasoning. Professional Development - Limited opportunities for SPED and ESOL teachers to engage in content related professional development to create a stronger understanding grade level standards.	
School Instructional Walks (Grade Level)	6-8 Math teachers have shown consistency in using district resources provided via CTLS. Based on data/documentation teachers have consistently used manipulatives to address student math learning needs.	Instructional walk data shows that there is room for growth in the area of “small group” instruction.

		Instructional walk data shows there is room for group with using the Math 360 boards as a creative instructional tool to promote student engagement.
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☒ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment	Root Cause Explanation: Professional Development: Limited opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning focused on Math 360 Limited opportunities for teachers to engage in professional learning focused on using data to create small groups	
Other Summary Data ☐ Teacher Survey ☐ Parent Survey ☐ Professional Learning Survey ☐ _____		
Check the system that contributes to the root cause:: ☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment		

MATH - IMPROVEMENT PLAN

GOAL #2: MATH	6th Grade: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, at least 65% of 6th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2025. 7th Grade: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, at least 60% of 7th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2025.7 8th Grade: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, at least 60% of 8th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2025		
Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	Vocabulary Knowledge - Math-specific terms like “altogether,” “difference,” “less than,” or “per” can be confusing without explicit instruction. Background Knowledge and Cultural Context - Word problems may include unfamiliar contexts (e.g., baseball stats, below sea level, etc) that disadvantage ELLs. - SWDs may also lack real-world experience that helps with problem interpretation.		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☐ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of math teachers will implement math vocabulary instruction weekly as measured by CCC lesson plans, teacher ppts, and CTLS assessments. Implementation Plan: - Preplanning: Teachers will identify vocabulary for each unit that will be implemented into CTLS assessments. Plan instructional routines and create grade level word lists. - August-September:		Evaluation Performance Target: By December 2025, at least 50% of students in each grade level will score 50% or higher on vocabulary assessments/questions. By May 2026, at least 60% of students in each grade level will score 60% or higher on vocabulary assessments/questions (targets will be adjusted in January 2026 based on December performance). Evaluation Tool(s): CTLS formative and summative assessments.
Target Student Group			
☒ Gen Ed ☒ EL ☒ SWD			
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>			

6-8th grade math teachers will implement math vocabulary instruction weekly as measured by CCC lesson plans, teacher ppts, and CTLS assessments.	▪ Create a consistent system for vocabulary instruction. ▪ Integrate words into bell ringers and exit tickets. ▪ Introduce a math word wall—update weekly/biweekly. ▪ Use visuals, manipulatives, and real-life contexts for abstract terms. ▪ October-December: ▪ Administer a mid-point vocabulary quiz/test. ▪ Use exit tickets to assess use of vocabulary in math reasoning. ▪ January-February: ▪ Implement vocabulary writing tasks (explain a term in your own words, math vocabulary stories). ▪ Continue weekly/biweekly formative checks ▪ March-April Continue weekly/biweekly formative checks Administer Vocabulary Post-Test (mirror format of pre-test). ▪ May: ▪ Reflect on the implementation of the action step and determine if additional support and coaching is needed for full implementation. Artifacts to be Collected: CTLS assessment data and CCC minutes Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Academic Coach will collect vocabulary data biweekly.	○ Local Academic coach will generate vocabulary questions for summative assessments in CTLS Assess. Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☒ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: Results will be analyzed during CCCs and used to plan small group instruction and/or make adjustments to whole group instruction. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	
--	--	---	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	▪ Students' ability to apply multiple concepts together ▪ To increase student understanding and usage of essential grade-level math ▪ Student number sense		
Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	☐ Title I Funds ☒ Local School Funds ☐ Other: _____		
Components	Implementation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.a 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Evaluation Plan <i>SWP Checklist 3.b 34 CFR § 200.26</i>	Resources
Who? One Action (Verb) What? Frequency	Implementation Performance Target: 100% of math teachers will implement math reasoning and number sense talks weekly weekly as measured by CCC lesson plans, teacher ppts, and CTLS assessments.	Evaluation Performance Target: By May 2026 50% of students will score a near target or higher on Numerical Reasoning domain based on DRC Beacon data.	
Target Student Group	Implementation Plan: Preplanning: ▪ Introduce Number Talks purpose and structure ▪ August-September: ▪ Establish class norms: ▪ Evaluate grade-level frameworks to identify when numerical reasoning standards are heaviest and focus number talks during that time. ▪ Train and equip teachers with planning tools ▪ Evaluate and give consistent feedback ▪ October-December: ▪ Conduct a midpoint check-in survey: What's working? What's challenging? ▪ Facilitate peer observations ▪ January-February: ▪ CCC continues planning, focused on creating number talks. ▪ Continue the peer observation rounds and feedback cycles.	Evaluation Tool(s): ▪ DRC Beacon Assessment (numerical reasoning domain)	
☒ Gen Ed ☐ EL ☐ SWD		Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☒ 3 times per year ☐ _____	
Action Step <i>SWP Checklist 2.a, 2.b, 2.c(i), 2.c(ii), 2.c(iv), 2.c(v)</i>		Data Analysis Plan: ▪ Analyze formative and summative classroom assessment data to adjust instruction ▪ Identify and analyze numerical reason standards at the end of each unit.	
6-8 th grade math teachers will implement math reasoning and number sense talks weekly as measured by CCC lesson plans, teacher ppts, and CTLS assessments.		Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal ☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	

	▪ Reflect on which routines students internalize most and adjust CCC planning accordingly. ▪ March-April: ▪ Empower students to take ownership of math talk. ▪ Rotate student facilitators (with sentence stems and prompts as needed) ▪ Use student-created problems occasionally ▪ May: ▪ Administer a teacher reflection survey ▪ Review/analyze survey data Artifacts to be Collected: CCC meeting minutes, SIP walk form data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly		
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	• Common assessments are not consistently created (collaboratively) among CCC members before instruction begins. • Assessments are not consistently aligned to grade-level reading standards regarding rigor, depth, and what is taught and practiced formatively. • CCC Teams do not regularly analyze formative assessment data to adjust their instruction or provide targeted reteaching before administering unit summative assessments. • Across grade levels, the limited use of metacognitive strategies likely results from a lack of consistent modeling and professional development focused on teaching students how to think about their thinking. • In shared teaching classrooms, the high use of whole group instruction (42%) and limited student choice suggest teacher-centered practices dominate due to insufficient co-teaching training, limited planning time, and unclear expectations for true collaboration. The frequent one-teach/one-assist model (34%) further reflects an imbalance in instructional roles.		
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 6-8 th grade math teams will implement structured CCC processes weekly as measured by CCC minutes and common summative assessments. Implementation Plan: ▪ Preplanning: ▪ Introduce and review CCC document and processes. ▪ August-September: ▪ Initial CCC observations by local and District coaches using CCC observation form.	Evaluation Performance Target: 60% of students will score a 70% or higher on grade-level Math standards as measured by common assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): ▪ Math Common Assessment CTLS Reports Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☐ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☒ Weekly formative assessments	
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)			

6-8th grade math teams will implement structured CCC processes weekly as measured by CCC minutes and common summative assessments.	▪ Provide feedback to grade-level CCCs on implementation of processes. ▪ October-December: ▪ Initial CCC observations by local and District coaches using CCC observation form. ▪ Provide feedback to grade-level CCCs on implementation of processes. ▪ January-February: ▪ Possible refresher PL on CCC processes by local academic coach. ▪ CCC observations by local and District coaches using CCC observation form. ▪ Provide feedback to grade-level CCCs on implementation of processes. ▪ March-April: ▪ Initial CCC observations by local and District coaches using CCC observation form. ▪ Provide feedback to grade-level CCCs on implementation of processes. Artifacts to be Collected: CCC Minutes CCC Observation form data Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring: Weekly CCC minutes check; quarterly CCC observations	☒ Unit Summative Assessments Data Analysis Plan: CCCs will analyze formative and summative data after each administration. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☒ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☒ CCC Leads	
--	--	--	--

Root Cause(s) to be Addressed:	▪ Address students lack of foundational concepts ▪ Address of lack real-world experience that helps with problem interpretation. ▪ Create meaningful math lessons for student engagement		
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 Math teachers will implement <u>the use manipulatives to provide concrete math examples</u> monthly as measured by administrative observation of weekly CCC lesson plans and monthly walk forms. 7-8th grade math teachers will utilize Prisms software at least 3 times per semester. Implementation Plan: ▪ Preplanning: Review manipulative spreadsheet from previous year to identify manipulatives usage in each unit. ▪ August-September: ▪ Set classroom norms for tool use ▪ 7-8th grade teachers will evaluate the frameworks to identify the best times to implement Prisms lessons for first semester. ▪ Begin incorporating manipulatives ▪ October-December: ▪ Facilitate gallery walks or math talks using models ▪ Transition from teacher-directed to student-chosen manipulative use	Evaluation Performance Target: 60% of students will score 70% or higher on common summative assessments. Evaluation Tool(s): ▪ CTLS common assessment data/questions linked to standards of manipulatives used. Math team manipulative data sheet/tracker Evaluation Plan: Students will be assessed: ☐ Every 2 weeks ☒ Monthly ☐ Every other month ☐ 3 times per year ☐ _____ Data Analysis Plan: ▪ Monthly : Data collection: CCC lesson plans, routine reflections, and student artifacts. Analysis Focus: Analyze student thinking patterns and frequency of usage. Person(s) Collecting Evidence: ☐ Principal	
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) 6-8th grade math teachers will implement <u>the use manipulatives to provide concrete math examples</u> monthly as measured by administrative observation of weekly CCC lesson plans and monthly walk forms.			

	▪ Academic coach and administration will walk classrooms to monitor the implementation of manipulatives during instruction Analyze data spreadsheet in correlation with assessment data. Administer feedback and ensure spreadsheet is up to data. ▪ ▪ January-February: ▪ Analyze data spreadsheet in correlation with assessment data. Administer feedback and ensure spreadsheet is up to data. ▪ 7-8th grade teachers will evaluate the frameworks to identify the best times to implement Prisms lessons for second semester. ▪ Academic coach and administration will continue walk classrooms to monitor the implementation of manipulatives during instruction. ▪ March-April: ▪ Academic coach and administration will walk classrooms to monitor the implementation of manipulatives during instruction. ▪ May: ▪ Reflect and plan: Which units next year would benefit most from manipulatives Artifacts to be Collected: Manipulative data spread sheet/tracker CCC minutes template	☐ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists ☐ CCC Leads	
--	---	--	--

	Person(s) Monitoring Implementation: ☐ Principal ☒ Assistant Principals ☒ Academic Coaches/ Instructional Support Specialists Frequency of Monitoring:		
--	--	--	--

Family Engagement Plan to Support School Improvement (<i>Required Components</i>)			
Family Engagement Activities (<u>Must be listed in the school policy</u>)	Date(s) Scheduled	Date Completed	"Shall" Standard(s) Addressed
1. Required <u>Annual Title I Meeting – Deadline</u> Parents will learn about Title I, how our school spends Title funds (budget snapshot), highlights of the schoolwide plan, description of curriculum and assessments used, our school compacts and policies, professional qualifications of our teachers, and opportunities for family engagement including use of the family resource center.	9/12/2025 3/19/2026	9/12/2025	☒ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
2. Required <u>Fall Input Survey/ Evaluation (secondary method) – Deadline</u> Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	10/13/2025- 10/17/2025	10/13/2025- 10/17/2025	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
3. Required <u>Spring Input Meeting and Survey (primary method) – Deadline</u> Parents will have the opportunity to assist in planning future family engagement activities, revising our school policy and compact, and considering how to spend our family engagement funds.	4/17/2026		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☒ 6
4. Required <u>FOUR Building Capacity Opportunities (Do not need to be listed in the Policy)</u> <u>Teacher</u> 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	9/19/2025	9/19/2025	☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☒ 3 ☐ 6
	2/5/2026		
5. Required <u>Transition Activities for parents of students entering or exiting our school (Multiple options, not just visit the school)</u> Parents will have an opportunity to learn about the next grade level in their child's education. <u>Briefly describe the transition activities here:</u>			☐ 1 ☒ 4 ☐ 2 ☐ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6
6. Required: Provide information related to school and parent/programs meetings in a format and language parents can understand. <i>SWP Checklist 5.d</i>	<u>List documents translated for parents:</u>		☐ 1 ☐ 4 ☐ 2 ☒ 5 ☐ 3 ☐ 6

School Developed Family Engagement Activities <i>(Required for “Shall’s” 2 and 6)</i>							
School Developed Family Engagement Activities <u>(Must be listed in the school policy)</u>	“Shall” Addressed	Goal(s) Addressed	Resources	Funding Source(s) <i>SWP Checklist 5.e</i>	Date	How is the activity monitored, and evaluated? Include data/artifacts to be collected as evidence.	Team Lead
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4					
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4					
	☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☒ 6	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ 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. Evidence to support this statement includes: The dated schoolwide plans, dated budget meeting agendas and signature pages, and dated committee and input meeting signature pages. SWP Checklist 5(a)
2. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals present in the school, administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), the local educational agency, to the extent feasible, tribes and tribal organizations present in the community, and , if appropriate specialized instructional support personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students, and other individuals determined by the school. Evidence to support this statement includes: The schoolwide plan committee signature page and the Family Engagement fall and spring input meetings. Schoolwide Checklist 5(b)
3. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans remains in effect for the duration of the school’s participation under Sec. 114(b)(1-5) of ESSA, except that the plan and its implementation shall be regularly monitored and revised as necessary based on student needs to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards. Evidence to support this statement includes: The Title I midyear and end of year monitoring of SWP goals, monitoring and approving all Title I expenditures, and revision dates listed on the SWP cover page. SWP Checklist 5(c)
4. Cobb County’s schoolwide plans are available to the local education agency, parents, and the public, and the information contained in such plan shall be in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand. Evidence to support this statement includes: Every Title I school post the Title I plan, Title I budget, and Family Engagement Components on the school’s website and in multiple languages. SWP Checklist 5(d)
5. Describe how the schoolwide plan has been developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State and local services, resources, and programs, such as programs supported under this Act, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities under section 1111 (d), if appropriate and applicable. SWP Checklist 5(e) <u>Include district initiatives that are supported with Title I Funds (For example: Early Literacy Framework (ELF), Math Fluency Initiative (MFI), LETRS, Read 180, etc.)</u> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Pearson Middle 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. Pearson will utilize Twenty-day funds for tutoring support of our students struggling to meet state standards. The Student Assistance Programs department will continue supporting our Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support program (PBIS). Community Partners (Woodmen Financial, Georgia Highlands College, Life University, Keller Williams EF2, and Gracepoint Church) will provide volunteers and support for our parent nights and our Pearson Parent University monthly nights. 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. <i>SWP Checklist 4</i>
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(a)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: The Pearson administrative team and faculty will regularly monitor the growth of the students through formative, summative and standardized assessments and adjust instructional strategies as needed. The Pearson administrative team will provide the time for and monitor weekly professional learning communities where the teachers regularly monitor and discuss student progress, appropriate strategies, and adjustments to instructional practices.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(b)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: Through pre and post scores on local and state assessments, student and parent surveys, classroom observations.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 3(c)</i> SCHOOL RESPONSE: The Building Leadership Team will review the plan monthly to see if we, as a school, are implementing the strategies in place to ensure student success and parent involvement. If strategies are being followed, but are not being successful, revisions will be made as needed to support and promote student achievement and parent involvement.
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. <i>SWP Checklist 2(a)</i>

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: The PBIS philosophy involves teaching behavior expectations and reinforcing them with positive rewards. This is implemented school-wide to reduce discipline and promote positive school culture. Various incentives are provided to promote and encourage positive behavior. Some of the incentives include:

- Fresh Air Friday
- Grade level dances
- Monthly/Quarterly celebrations/festivals
- Afterschool clubs and activities
- Field Trips

Also, Pearson Middle implements Restorative Circles and Restorative Conferencing that strengthen relationships between individuals and social connections within communities, thereby reducing traditional discipline. Our counselors provide professional learning based on culturally responsive frameworks to support the whole child. Lastly, Pearson Middle is entering our second year of AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) that provides additional academic and social emotional support to help improve student achievement and peer-to-peer relationships.

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: Cobb Collaborative Communities- Focused professional development based on high standards of teaching and learning is essential to improving teaching and increasing student achievement. It must be focused on what teachers' district-wide and in the individual schools need to know and be able to do for their students. Professional development should build "professional communities" committed to higher

student learning. Continuous learning opportunities that are focused, reflective, and coherent are essential. The following are research-based practices in professional development that support career-long development of teaching and student learning:

- Provide on-going learning opportunities for all
- Improve teaching and learning
- Target higher student outcomes and instructional goals of schools that fit our profile
- Set time aside to allow teachers to implement new techniques learned and to plan collaboratively
- Establish study groups (e.g., book studies, professional magazine articles, etc.)
- Involve all teachers including, Special Education, ESOL, paraprofessionals and specialists (music, art, science, math, and physical education)

The following initiatives will be used to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments:

- Mentor support from veteran teachers to those teachers that are new to our building
- Instructional Coaching for any other teacher in need of support
- Continue the implementation of AVID teaching strategies in the classroom
- Weekly collaborative team meetings focused on instruction and common assessment data
- Targeted professional learning, facilitated by the academic coaches, that is aligned to Pearson's academic goals
- Monthly school-wide research-based instructional strategies presented by teacher leaders as needed.
- Monthly instructional technology trainings as needed.
- District – continued ESOL instructional training and support.

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:** 8th Grade Articulation
- Local school counselors will meet with students to discuss high school course offerings, activities, and high school operations
- Vertical Alignment with 9th grade teachers
- 8th and 9th grade Teachers will meet and discuss the student's performance on standards and which standards students are having trouble mastering and the supports that will need to be put in place to assist students with mastering the standards.
- Families with rising 9th graders are provided the opportunity to attend a Welcome and Orientation evening where graduation requirements, course offerings, CITA (Cobb Innovation and Technology Academy) program opportunities, and general information is provided.
- 8th Grade CTAE Pathways Fair with Osborne and Campbell High Schools

- Pearson offers the following classes to all students grades 6-8 that will lead into the high school CTAE courses and increase awareness of opportunities for post-secondary education and the workforce.
- Business education and computer science
- Engineering
- Family and Consumer Science
- AVID
- Families also can attend the CTAE pathways fairs at both Osborne and Campbell High Schools
- 8th Grade Magnet Presentation
- District leaders' partner with local school counselors to provide students with an overview of the different high school magnet program opportunities and the application process. The High school magnet program curriculums are designed to expose and train students for post-secondary career opportunities and education.
- 8th Grade CITA Presentation (Cobb Innovation and Technology Academy)
- District leaders' partner with local school counselors to provide students with an overview of the different CITA program opportunities and the application process.
- CITA is a state-of-the-art learning environment and a tuition-free Academy for 9th-12th graders, designed to prepare students to lead tomorrow's workforce and increase the awareness of opportunities for post-secondary education. Students at the Academy will have access to work-based learning opportunities and internships, job shadowing, career-specific honor societies & even career certifications.
- Counselors visit students in classrooms throughout the year to assist students in establishing Naviance accounts and review Naviance lessons. Naviance is a planning tool that prepares students for college, career, and life readiness after high school. It creates connections between their strengths and interests to success after high school. Each year from 6th grade through 12th grade students will participate in various learning activities that will introduce them to both career opportunities, colleges of interest, and life skills. Students can access Naviance from home and school using their school login. (Sample lessons include learning styles inventory, career matchmaker, strengths explorer, dual enrollment, advanced placement, and Individualized Graduation Plan (IGP))
- 6th Grade Open House - End of August
- Families are invited to attend a meeting where they will meet their student's teachers, learn about grade level curriculum, and school wide expectations.
- Rising 6th Grade School Visits in March or April 5th graders from our feeder elementary school will take a bus over to Pearson and take a tour of the building and hear essential information from our faculty and administration.
- Rising 6th Grade Informational Night in May-Hosted by the school administration to provide families with grade level curriculum standards, school wide expectations, and answer questions.

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?
Teacher	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Develop, implement, and facilitate standard-based instruction that supports students understanding and mastering grade-level Standards.
Teacher	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	Develop, implement, and facilitate standard-based instruction that supports students understanding and mastering grade-level Standards.
Parent Facilitator	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	The Parent Facilitator will support the overall instructional program at Pearson Middle School by creating community and family partnerships, conducting professional learning sessions to parents, teachers, and staff, and providing frequent communications to parents on the academic programs, events, and student information.
	☐ Goal 1 ☐ Goal 2 ☐ Goal 3 ☐ Goal 4	☐ Coherent Instruction ☐ Professional Capacity ☐ Effective Leadership ☐ Supportive Learning Environment ☐ Family Engagement	

School Improvement Goals
Include goals on the parent compacts and policy

Goal #1	6 TH GRADE	7 TH GRADE	8 TH GRADE
	Fall Beacon Data: - 220 students tested - 102 students in the support needed category (46%) - 118 students in the near target & prepared category (54%) - 23 students within 25pts of near target - 26 students within 25pts of dropping to support needed	Fall Beacon Data: - 197 students tested - 109 students in the support needed category (55%) - 88 students in the near target & prepared category (45%) - 21 students within 25pts of near target - 18 students within 25pts of dropping to support needed	Fall Beacon Data: - 252 students tested - 110 students in the support needed category (44%) - 142 students in the near target & prepared category (56%) - 19 students within 25pts of near target - 27 students within 25pts of dropping to support needed
	Goal: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the percentage of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories will increase from 54% on the Fall administration to 64% on the Spring administration, as measured by the DRC Georgia ELA BEACON Assessment.	Goal: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the percentage of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories will increase from 45% on the Fall administration to 55% on the Spring administration, as measured by the DRC Georgia ELA BEACON Assessment.	Goal: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, the percentage of students scoring in the Near Target or Prepared categories will increase from 56% on the Fall administration to 66% on the Spring administration, as measured by the DRC Georgia ELA BEACON Assessment.
	Numbers Needed: - 141 students need to hit Near Target/Proficient by Spring assessment (at least 23 students needed)	Numbers Needed: - 108 students need to hit Near Target/Proficient by Spring assessment (at least 20 students needed)	Numbers Needed: - 167 students need to hit Near Target/Proficient by Spring assessment (at least 25 students needed)
Goal #2	• 6th Grade: By the end of the 2024–2025 school year, at least 70% of 6th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2025. • 7th Grade: By the end of the 2024–2025 school year, at least 65% of 7th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2025. • 8th Grade: By the end of the 2024–2025 school year, at least 65% of 8th grade students will score at Level II or higher on the Georgia Milestones Math Assessment, as measured by state testing results in Spring 2025.		