FY27 Title I Schoolwide Plan

☒Original Plan ☐Amended Plan

School Name	Teasley Middle School
Principal	Kathie Monti
LEA	Cherokee County School District
Funding	Traditional
Factors Used by District to Identify Students in Poverty	Free/Reduced Meal Application

Original Plan			
Principal's Signature	Katherine K Monti	Date	5/28/26
Title I Director/ Designee Signature	Lynda Wallace	Date	5/29/2026

Amended/Revised Plan			
Principal's Signature		Date	
Title I Director/ Designee Signature		Date	

Leadership Team-See attached sign-in sheet		
Name	**Role**	**Date**
Kathie Monti	Principal	3/19/2026
Kari Barbour	Assistant Principal	3/19/2026
Katie Sobolewski	Academic Facilitator	3/19/2026
Angela Gulin	Family & Community Engagement Liaison	3/19/2026

Stakeholders-See attached sign-in sheets		
Meeting Type	**Stakeholder Types**	**Meeting Date**
School Council	Select Parents, Staff and Community Members	2/12/2026
Parent Input Meeting	All Parents	2/5/2026
Staff Input	All Staff	2/13/2026-3/18/2026
Student Revision Meeting	Select TMS Students	1/15/2026

Comprehensive Needs Assessment (ESSA Section 114(b)(1)(A))
The plan is based on a comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school that takes into account 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 challenging State academic standards and any other factors as determined by the local education agency.

Data Analysis
The school conducted a comprehensive needs assessment that included:

<u>Achievement Data</u>
Formative and Summative Assessments

- FY25 Georgia Milestones Assessment System (GMAS)-Georgia Insights
- FY25 ACCESS-District Local
- FY26 CCSD ELA and Math Screeners-District Local (January 2026)
- FY26 Projected Milestones Performance Levels-Power BI

FY25 GMAS ELA				
Grade	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
6	38.7%	27.8%	24.9%	8.7%
7	30.2%	28.6%	30.6%	10.6%
8	28.0%	34.9%	26.2%	10.9%

FY25 GMAS Reading Domains			
	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
Reading & Vocabulary	54.7%	17.5%	27.8%
Key Ideas & Details	52.2%	25.0%	22.8%
Craft & Structure/Integration of Knowledge & Ideas	45.7%	27.8%	26.5%
Vocabulary Acquisition & Use	48.7%	25.2%	26.1%
Reading Informational Text	50.8%	21.8%	27.4%
Reading Literary Text	55.9%	19.9%	24.3%

FY25 GMAS Writing Domains			
	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
Writing & Language	49.0%	16.8%	34.2%
Writing	46.4%	20.6%	33.1%
Language	47.5%	28.2%	24.3%

FY26 Projected GMAS ELA Performance Levels				
Grade	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
6	37.5%	29.0%	27.8%	5.7%
7	30.8%	31.8%	33.8%	3.6%
8	25.9%	37.3%	30.5%	6.3%

FY25 GMAS Math				
Grade	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
6	28.9%	37.9%	26.2%	7.0%
7	23.6%	35.6%	29.9%	11.0%
8	16.2%	29.4%	30.6%	23.8%

FY26 Projected GMAS Math Performance Levels				
Grade	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
6	21.2%	32.0%	25.9%	21.0%
7	15.3%	30.6%	29.0%	25.1%
8	12.8%	24.5%	30.4%	32.3%

FY25 GMAS Math Domains			
Grade 6	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
Numerical Reasoning (1)	58.4%	12.5%	29.1%
Numerical Reasoning: Operations with Positive Rational Numbers (2)	57.1%	15.1%	27.8%
Numerical Reasoning: Operations with Data Problems (3)	49.9%	25.8%	24.3%
Numerical Reasoning: Compare Rational Numbers (4)	48.4%	29.5%	22.1%
Numerical Reasoning: Ratios and Rates (5)	46.4%	28.6%	25.1%
Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Area, Surface Area, and Volume (6)	42.2%	31.5%	26.3%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (7)	59.7%	16.2%	24.1%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Numerical and Algebraic Expressions (8)	43.5%	25.1%	31.5%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: One-Step Equations and Inequalities (9)	63.0%	20.8%	16.2%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Coordinate Plane and Polygons (10)	42.5%	33.5%	23.9%
Grade 7	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
Numerical Reasoning: Operations with Rational Numbers (1)	42.0%	25.0%	33.0%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (2)	48.1%	13.6%	38.3%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Expressions, Equations, and Inequalities (3)	34.0%	30.5%	35.6%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Proportional Relationships (4)	46.6%	23.2%	30.3%
Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Angle Measurement, Area, Surface Area, and Volume (5)	39.7%	34.2%	26.1%
Probability Reasoning: Probability of Simple Events (6)	47.2%	28.1%	24.8%
Grade 8	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
Numerical Reasoning: Irrational Numbers, Radicals, and Integer Exponents (1)	38.2%	26.6%	35.2%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning (2)	38.4%	15.4%	46.2%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: One-Variable Expressions, Equations, and Inequalities (3)	38.6%	24.4%	37.0%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Linear Relationships (4)	31.8%	24.0%	44.2%
Functional & Graphical Reasoning (5)	39.2%	18.8%	42.0%
Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Properties and Uses of Functions (6)	38.8%	31.8%	29.4%
Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Linear Problem Solving (7)	36.4%	19.2%	44.4%
Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Systems of Equations (8)	28.4%	34.4%	37.2%
Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Pythagorean Theorem and Volume (9)	30.6%	25.4%	44.0%

FY25 GMAS Science				
Grade	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
8	33.3%	34.0%	23.4%	9.4%

FY25 GMAS Science Domains			
Science	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
Matter	49.6%	26.0%	24.3%
Energy	42.4%	37.1%	20.5%
Motion	51.3%	26.8%	21.9%
Waves	48.2%	21.2%	30.6%
Force	49.2%	29.4%	21.5%

FY25 GMAS Physical Science				
Grade	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
8	0%	10.6%	47.1%	42.4%

FY25 GMAS Physical Science Domains			
Physical Science	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
Chemistry: Atomic & Nuclear Theory & the Periodic Table	49.6%	26.0%	24.3%
Chemistry: Chemical Reactions & Properties of Matter	42.4%	37.1%	20.5%
Physics: Energy, Force, & Motion	51.3%	26.8%	21.9%
Physics: Waves, Electricity, & Magnetism	48.2%	21.2%	30.6%

FY25 GMAS Social Studies				
Grade	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
8	24.0%	35.3%	30.5%	10.2%

FY25 GMAS Social Studies Domains			
Social Studies	Below Target	Approaching Target	Met Target
History	47.1%	23.6%	29.3%
Geography	49.5%	20.2%	30.3%
Government/Civics	40.7%	36.7%	22.6%
Economics	37.5%	44.3%	18.2%

FY25 GMAS Economically Disadvantaged				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
ELA	43.0%	31.1%	21.0%	5.0%
Math	30.8%	37.7%	23.0%	8.5%
Science	40.7%	35.2%	18.5%	5.6%
Phy. Science	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS
Social Studies	30.8%	41.0%	22.7%	5.4%

FY25 GMAS English Learners				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
ELA	81.7%	15.5%	2.4%	0.4%
Math	59.6%	34.4%	4.4%	1.6%
Science	72.5%	21.3%	2.5%	3.8%
Phy. Science	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS
Social Studies	60.5%	30.9%	6.2%	2.5%

FY25 GMAS Students With Disabilities				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
ELA	76.2%	18.0%	2.9%	2.9%
Math	61.6%	30.4%	5.5%	2.5%
Science	63.8%	23.2%	10.1%	2.9%
Phy. Science	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS
Social Studies	54.3%	31.4%	10.0%	4.3%

FY25 GMAS ELA Race/Ethnicity				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
White	19.8%	30.2%	35.3%	14.6%
Black	38.4%	35.4%	19.2%	7.1%
Hispanic	47.2%	29.4%	19.3%	4.0%
Multi-Racial	30.7%	34.7%	21.3%	13.3%

FY25 GMAS Math Race/Ethnicity				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
White	14.0%	30.2%	36.6%	19.1%
Black	39.4%	38.4%	16.2%	6.1%
Hispanic	31.5%	39.3%	21.4%	7.8%
Multi-Racial	21.3%	36.0%	26.7%	16.0%

FY25 GMAS Science Race/Ethnicity				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
White	18.1%	32.8%	35.0%	14.1%
Black	41.2%	38.2%	14.7%	5.9%
Hispanic	47.0%	33.9%	13.7%	5.5%
Multi-Racial	28.6%	38.1%	23.8%	9.5%

FY25 GMAS Physical Science Race/Ethnicity				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
White	0%	7.9%	47.6%	44.4%
Black	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS
Hispanic	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS
Multi-Racial	TFS	TFS	TFS	TFS

FY25 GMAS Social Studies Race/Ethnicity				
	Beg.	Dev.	Prof.	Dist.
White	14.9%	29.5%	39.4%	16.2%
Black	28.6%	45.7%	22.9%	2.9%
Hispanic	33.8%	40.4%	22.2%	3.5%
Multi-Racial	28.0%	40.0%	20.0%	12.0%

FY25 ACCESS						
Grade 6	Entering	Emerging	Developing	Expanding	Bridging	Reaching
Reading	38.2%	31.5%	22.5%	2.2%	5.6%	0%
Composite Proficiency Level	15.7%	19.1%	47.2%	18.0%	0%	0%
Writing	16.9%	20.2%	44.9%	18.0%	0%	0%
Speaking	20.2%	24.7%	30.3%	21.3%	3.4%	0%
Oral	6.7%	16.9%	32.6%	32.6%	11.2%	0%
Literacy	21.3%	27.0%	44.9%	6.7%	0%	0%
Comprehension	15.7%	29.2%	28.1%	16.9%	9.0%	1.1%
Listening	3.4%	10.1%	16.9%	24.7%	16.9%	28.1%
Grade 7	Entering	Emerging	Developing	Expanding	Bridging	Reaching
Reading	42.9%	31.2%	11.7%	2.6%	7.8%	3.9%
Composite Proficiency Level	18.2%	23.4%	32.5%	22.1%	3.9%	0%
Writing	15.6%	11.7%	50.6%	22.1%	0%	0%
Speaking	29.9%	18.2%	28.6%	20.8%	2.6%	0%
Oral	18.2%	20.8%	26.0%	20.8%	13.0%	1.3%
Literacy	19.5%	24.7%	42.9%	10.4%	2.6%	0%
Comprehension	23.4%	27.3%	23.4%	9.1%	10.4%	6.5%
Listening	10.4%	11.7%	14.3%	19.5%	16.9%	27.3%
Grade 8	Entering	Emerging	Developing	Expanding	Bridging	Reaching
Reading	40.0%	21.3%	20.0%	5.0%	7.5%	6.3%
Composite Proficiency Level	28.8%	6.3%	43.8%	18.8%	2.5%	0%
Writing	26.3%	5.0%	48.8%	20.0%	0%	0%
Speaking	31.3%	21.3%	26.3%	21.3%	0%	0%
Oral	23.8%	10.0%	22.5%	31.3%	12.5%	0%
Literacy	28.8%	8.8%	48.8%	12.5%	1.3%	0%
Comprehension	28.8%	16.3%	12.5%	18.8%	17.5%	6.3%
Listening	21.3%	7.5%	6.3%	12.5%	16.3%	36.3%

FY26 Reading Screener - Proficiency			
Content	Grade	Fall 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency (State)	Winter 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency (State)
Overall	6th Grade	40%	34%
Overall	7th Grade	35.1%	38.8%
Overall	8th Grade	34.6%	36.9%

FY26 Reading Screener – Domain Proficiency			
Domain	Grade Level	Fall 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency	Winter 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency
Language: Vocabulary	6th Grade	33.8%	34.6%
Language: Vocabulary	7th Grade	27.6%	34.7%
Language: Vocabulary	8th Grade	25.8%	33.3%
Practices: Author's Craft	6th Grade	22.4%	24.9%
Practices: Author's Craft	7th Grade	30%	37.6%
Practices: Author's Craft	8th Grade	21.9%	29.4%
Practices: Engagement & Intention for Comprehension & Composition	6th Grade	34.9%	36.3%
Practices: Engagement & Intention for Comprehension & Composition	7th Grade	30.4%	38.8%
Practices: Engagement & Intention for Comprehension & Composition	8th Grade	25.8%	33.9%
Practices: Situating Texts	6th Grade	33.6%	34.6%
Practices: Situating Texts	7th Grade	23.3%	31.4%
Practices: Situating Texts	8th Grade	25.2%	32.4%
Texts: Context	6th Grade	33.4%	34.4%
Texts: Context	7th Grade	24.1%	31.8%
Texts: Context	8th Grade	15%	21.2%
Texts: Periods & Movements	6th Grade	3.9%	3.1%
Texts: Periods & Movements	7th Grade	27.8%	34.9%
Texts: Periods & Movements	8th Grade	17.4%	23.5%
Texts: Research & Analysis	6th Grade	29.7%	31.7%
Texts: Research & Analysis	7th Grade	19%	22.7%
Texts: Research & Analysis	8th Grade	10.5%	15.5%
Texts: Structure & Style	6th Grade	29%	30.4%
Texts: Structure & Style	7th Grade	19.4%	24.5%
Texts: Structure & Style	8th Grade	28.7%	36.1%
Texts: Techniques	6th Grade	29%	30.4%
Texts: Techniques	7th Grade	25.7%	32.9%
Texts: Techniques	8th Grade	19.3%	24.9%

FY26 Math Screener - Proficiency			
Overall	Grade Level	Fall 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency (State)	Winter 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency (State)
Overall	6th Grade	38.7%	47.1%
Overall	7th Grade	37.3%	53.5%
Overall	8th Grade	59.8%	62.5%

FY26 Math Screener – Domain Proficiency			
Domain	Grade Level	Fall 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency	Winter 25-26 Percent At or Above Proficiency
Functional & Graphical Reasoning: Function Families	8th Grade	1.2%	2.5%
Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Geometric Measurement	6th Grade	0%	0.6%
Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Geometric Measurement	7th Grade	0.4%	3.6%
Geometric & Spatial Reasoning: Geometric Measurement	8th Grade	0.6%	0.6%
Numerical Reasoning: Comparisons	6th Grade	1.4%	2.4%
Numerical Reasoning: Comparisons	7th Grade	0%	0%
Numerical Reasoning: Computational Fluency	6th Grade	1%	2%
Numerical Reasoning: Computational Fluency	7th Grade	3.4%	18.7%
Numerical Reasoning: Computational Fluency	8th Grade	2.8%	9.8%
Numerical Reasoning: Numbers	8th Grade	1.2%	2.9%
Numerical Reasoning: Ratios & Rates	6th Grade	7.1%	14.3%
Numerical Reasoning: Ratios & Rates	7th Grade	0%	0%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Expressions	6th Grade	13.7%	24%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Expressions	7th Grade	2.2%	14.3%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Expressions	8th Grade	0%	0%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Graphing	6th Grade	21.6%	36.5%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Graphing	7th Grade	0%	0%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Graphing	8th Grade	0.8%	1.7%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Patterns	6th Grade	4.9%	11.2%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Patterns	7th Grade	0%	0%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Proportional Relationships	7th Grade	2.2%	12.5%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Proportional Relationships	8th Grade	0%	0%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Variable Equations & Inequalities	6th Grade	18.4%	32.6%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Variable Equations & Inequalities	7th Grade	0.4%	2.6%
Patterning & Algebraic Reasoning: Variable Equations & Inequalities	8th Grade	2.2%	5.6%

Achievement Data Analysis
Analyze the information in the data tables to identify achievement between student groups, observe trends, and/or explore correlations between variables.

ELA
The FY25 Georgia Milestones Assessment System ELA results indicate 41.2% of seventh grade students had a higher percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished when compared to sixth grade (33.6%) and eighth grade (37.1%). The data indicates a relative strength in seventh grade ELA. Sixth grade is Teasley's greatest area of focus in ELA.

The Writing & Language domain is a relative strength at Teasley Middle School with 34.2% of the students at the met target level. Domain areas of focus are Key Ideas and Details, Craft and Reading Literary Texts. The FY26 CCSD Reading Screener projections indicate a slight decrease in the percentage of students scoring proficient or distinguished in all grade levels on the FY26 GMAS ELA.

Teasley's Black student group shows a relative strength in GMAS ELA with 26.3% of students scoring in the proficient or distinguished levels. The Economically Disadvantaged student group shows opportunities for growth in ELA as 74.1% of students scored in the beginning or developing levels. The Students with Disabilities student group scored 94.2% in the beginning or developing levels and provides an opportunity for growth. The English Learners student group has an opportunity for growth in ELA with 97.2% of students scoring in beginning or developing levels.

The FY26 CCSD Reading Screener report for winter 2025 indicates 55% of sixth grade students, 42% of seventh grade students, and 35% of eighth grade students are reading below grade level. Teasley's sixth grade students performed highest in the Engagement and Intention for Comprehension and Composition domain at 36.3% at or above proficiency. Sixth grade's domain of focus is the Texts: Periods and Movements domain with 3.1% of students at or above proficiency. Teasley's seventh grade students performed highest in the Engagement and Intention for Comprehension and Composition domain at 38.8% at or above proficiency. Seventh grade's domain of focus is the Texts: Research and Analysis domain with 22.7% of students at or above proficiency. Teasley's eighth grade students performed highest in the Texts: Structure and Style domain at 36.1% at or above proficiency. Eighth grade's domain of focus is the Texts: Research and Analysis domain with only 15.5% of students at or above proficiency.

Math
The FY25 GMAS Math results indicate that 54.4% of Teasley's eighth scored at the proficient or distinguished levels. Areas of focus are sixth grade math with 33.2% of students scoring proficient or distinguished and seventh grade math with 40.9% of students scoring proficient or distinguished.

A relative strength in sixth grade is in the overall domain of Numerical Reasoning as 29.1% of students met the target. The data identifies an area of focus related to the Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning domain in sixth grade as 24.1% of students met target. Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning is a relative strength for seventh grade as 38.3% of students met target and for eighth grade as 46.2% of students met target. The FY26 CCSD Math Screener math projections indicate all grade levels should show an increase in percent of students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels on the FY26 GMAS Math.

Teasley's Economically Disadvantaged students have a strength in Math with 31.5% scoring proficient or above. The white student group shows a strength in Math with 55.7% scoring proficient or above. The Hispanic students group shows a strength in Math with 29.2% scoring proficient or above. Teasley's Multi-Racial students show a strength in Math with 42.7% scoring the proficient or above.

Teasley's English Learners have an opportunity for growth in Math with 94% scoring in the below proficiency, and the Students with Disabilities student group has an opportunity for growth in Math with 92% scoring below proficiency.

The FY26 CCSD Math Screener report for winter indicates Teasley's sixth grade students performed highest in the Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning: Graphing domain with 36.5% of students scoring at or above proficiency. The greatest area of focus for sixth grade is the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning: Geometric Measurement domain with 0.6% of students at or above proficiency. Teasley's seventh grade students performed highest in the Numerical Reasoning: Computational Fluency domain with 18.7% of students scoring at or above proficiency. The greatest domain of focus for seventh grade is in the Patterning and Algebraic Reasoning: Variable Equations and Inequalities domain with 2.6% of students at or above proficiency. Teasley's eighth grade students performed highest in the Numerical Reasoning: Computational Fluency domain with 9.8% of students scoring at or above proficiency. The greatest domain of focus for eighth grade is in the Geometric and Spatial Reasoning: Geometric Measurement domain with 0.6% of students at or above proficiency.

Science
The FY25 GMAS Science results indicate that 32.8% of Teasley's eighth grade students scored proficient or distinguished. Waves was the domain of strength with 30.6% of students in the met target level. The science domains of Energy and Force showed the greatest percentage of students in the below and approaching target levels.

The FY25 GMAS Physical Science results indicate that 89.5% of students who took the exam scored in the proficient or distinguished levels. The domain of strength for Physical Science is Physics: Waves, Electricity, and Magnetism with 30.6% of students at the met target level. The greatest domain of focus is the Chemistry: Chemical Reaction and Properties of Matter domain.

The GMAS data revealed Teasley's Students with Disabilities student group has a relative strength in science as defined by 13.0% percent of students scoring proficient or distinguished. The Economically Disadvantaged student group presents an area of growth as 75.9% of students scored beginning or developing levels in science. Teasley's White student group has an opportunity for growth in science with 50.9% scoring in the beginning or developing level. Teasley's Hispanic and Black student populations had the highest percentage of students scoring at the beginning and developing levels, 80.9% and 79.4% respectively which provides an opportunity for growth.

Social Studies
The FY25 GMAS Social Studies results indicate that 40.7% of students scored proficient or distinguished. The domain of strength is Geography with 30.3% of students at the met target level. The greatest area of focus is the Economics domain with 18.2% of students at the met target level.

Teasley's English Learner student group has a strength in Social Studies with 8.7% scoring proficient or above. The Economically Disadvantaged student group has an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 71.8% scoring below proficiency. Teasley's Black students have an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 74.3% scoring below proficiency, and Hispanic students have an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 74.2% scoring below proficiency. Teasley's Multi-Racial students have an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 68% scoring below proficiency.

ACCESS

For Teasley Middle School, a strength in all grade levels for ACCESS is the Listening domain. There is a relative strength in seventh grade with 26.0% of students' overall composite proficiency in the expanding and bridging levels. The greatest opportunity for growth is sixth grade with 18.0% of students' overall composite proficiency in the expanding and bridging levels. Teasley's greatest opportunity for growth in all grade levels is in the Reading and Literacy domains.

Perception Data

Stakeholder Surveys

- FY26 Title I Annual Parent Survey
- FY26 Title I Building Capacity Surveys (Parents and Staff)
- FY26 Title I Professional Learning Surveys (Teachers)
- FY26 Georgia Health Survey (Students)-GaDOE

Parent Engagement	**Title I Annual Parent Survey** *Percentages Based on Parent Participant Responses*	
Activity Title: FY26 Title I Annual Parent Survey		
Date of Activity: Spring 2025		
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
The school staff welcomes me when I visit my child's school.	Always	72%
	Usually	15%
	Sometimes	8%
	Never	0%
	Did Not Visit	5%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
Are you aware of opportunities to volunteer at home or at the school?	Yes	74%
	No	26%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I am encouraged to be involved and participate in school events.	Always	48%
	Usually	24%
	Sometimes	21%
	Never	7%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I find the Parent Engagement Events to be beneficial.	Always	40%
	Usually	17%
	Sometimes	16%
	Never	1%
	Did Not Attend	26%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
Overall, the school provides opportunities for parents to give input in school decisions.	Always	60%
	Usually	24%
	Sometimes	15%
	Never	1%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
My child's school provides information about ways I can engage in the education of my child and the ways I can help my child's learning at home.	True	87%
	False	13%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I have open lines of communication with my child's teacher(s).	Yes	85%
	No	15%

Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I would participate more often in Parent Engagement and Planning events if	An interpreter was available	5%
	Childcare was provided for the event	5%
	I had more time in my schedule	49%
	I had technology to access virtual events	7%
	Topics were of interest/need	18%
	Transportation was not a barrier	16%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
When would you prefer meetings?	Evenings	35%
	Before School	7%
	During School Hours	12%
	Virtual	37%
	Lunch	9%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
Parent Engagement events may be offered at the school based on the needs and interests of parents. Please review the following list of topics and select any that interest you.	Assisting with homework	17%
	ELA/Literacy	10%
	Math	14%
	Monitoring My child's progress	27%
	Science	6%
	Social Studies	6%
	Testing	11%
	Working with Staff	8%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
Our school is required to set aside a percentage of the Title I funds we receive for Parent and Family Engagement activities to engage parents in the academic achievement of their children. In the past, funds have been allocated to provide the school with a Parent Engagement Facilitator (PEF). How would you like to see these funds used? *Multiple Choices May Be Selected	Parent Engagement Facilitator	23%
	Childcare for Parent and Family Engagement Activities/Workshops	8%
	Educational Materials for Parent Use	20%
	Books and Kits	25%
	Materials for Staff Training	24%

Parent Engagement	Building Parent Capacity Survey *Percentages Based on Parent Participant Responses*	
Activity Title: Turning Pages Together		
Date of Activity: 09.17.2025		
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting helped me better understand the grade-level academic expectations for my child.	Strongly Agree	100%
	Somewhat Agree	0%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting made me feel more confident doing academic activities at home that support my child's learning.	Strongly Agree	100%
	Somewhat Agree	0%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting helped me better set goals and monitor my child's progress.	Strongly Agree	100%
	Somewhat Agree	0%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting made me feel more motivated to be involved in my child's academic learning.	Strongly Agree	100%
	Somewhat Agree	0%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting gave me tools to support learning at home for my child.	Strongly Agree	100%
	Somewhat Agree	0%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%

Parent Engagement	Building Parent Capacity Survey *Percentages Based on Parent Participant Responses*	
Activity Title: Count on Love: A Family Math Night		
Date of Activity: 2.5.2026		
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting helped me better understand the grade-level academic expectations for my child.	Strongly Agree	80%
	Somewhat Agree	20%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting made me feel more confident doing academic activities at home that support my child's learning.	Strongly Agree	80%
	Somewhat Agree	20%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting helped me better set goals and monitor my child's progress.	Strongly Agree	80%
	Somewhat Agree	20%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting made me feel more motivated to be involved in my child's academic learning.	Strongly Agree	100%
	Somewhat Agree	0%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This meeting gave me tools to support learning at home for my child.	Strongly Agree	80%
	Somewhat Agree	20%
	Somewhat Disagree	0%
	Strongly Disagree	0%

Parent Engagement	Building Staff Capacity Survey *Percentages Based on Staff Participant Responses*	
Activity Title: Building Strong Relationships with Parents		
Date of Activity: 09.30.2025-10.15.2025		
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I feel more confident in my ability to engage with parents than I did before the training/support.	Strongly Agree	31%
	Agree	65%
	Disagree	4%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I have gained new strategies or tools to support parent engagement.	Strongly Agree	30%
	Agree	67%
	Disagree	3%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I feel equipped to communicate effectively with parents from diverse backgrounds.	Strongly Agree	39%
	Agree	60%
	Disagree	1%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
I know where to find resources or support when I need help working with parents.	Strongly Agree	46%
	Agree	53%
	Disagree	1%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
The support provided has helped me build stronger relationships with families.	Strongly Agree	36%
	Agree	63%
	Disagree	1%

Professional Learning	Professional Learning Survey *Percentages Based on Participant Responses*		
Activity Title: Deconstructing New Standards & Aligning Resources to Support at-Risk Learners			
Date of Activity: August/September 2025 and November/December 2025			
Question	Answer Choices	Pre Survey	Post Survey
Please rate the confidence in implementing the strategies to be introduced in the professional learning.	High Confidence	23%	73%
	Moderate Confidence	54%	27%
	Slight Confidence	23%	0%
	No Confidence	0%	0%
	Unsure	0%	0%
Question	Answer Choices	Pre Survey	Post Survey
The professional learning increased my knowledge on the presented topic.	Strongly Agree		77%
	Agree		16%
	Neutral		0%
	Disagree		0%
	Strongly Disagree		7%
Question	Answer Choices	Pre Survey	Post Survey
The professional learning will change my teaching practices.	Strongly Agree		47%
	Agree		50%
	Neutral		3%
	Disagree		0%
	Strongly Disagree		0%

FY26 Georgia Health Survey - Student Responses		
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how many of your teachers have helped you set learning goals?	All of my teachers	15%
	Most of my teachers	21%
	About half of my teachers	16%
	A few of my teachers	31%
	None of my teachers	14%
	Skip	3%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how often do you have group discussions about what you are learning in class?	Almost every day	25%
	1 or 2 times a week	32%
	1 or 2 times a month	18%
	1 or 2 times a year	10%
	Never	8%
	Skip	7%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how many of your teachers have classroom discussions that improve your learning?	All of my teachers	14%
	Most of my teachers	27%
	About half of my teachers	19%
	A few of my teachers	31%
	None of my teachers	6%
	Skip	3%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how many of your teachers give you specific feedback about the quality of your work?	All of my teachers	14%
	Most of my teachers	29%
	About half of my teachers	20%
	A few of my teachers	29%
	None of my teachers	7%
	Skip	1%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how many of your teachers always check with students to make sure they understand instructions?	All of my teachers	25%
	Most of my teachers	30%
	About half of my teachers	18%
	A few of my teachers	23%
	None of my teachers	3%
	Skip	1%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how many of your teachers explain new topics in a way that is easy for you to understand?	All of my teachers	19%
	Most of my teachers	31%
	About half of my teachers	22%
	A few of my teachers	23%
	None of my teachers	3%
	Skip	2%

Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how many of your teachers share examples of quality work before you start an assignment?	All of my teachers	21%
	Most of my teachers	27%
	About half of my teachers	20%
	A few of my teachers	26%
	None of my teachers	3%
	Skip	3%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how many of your teachers give you time to practice what you've learned before moving to a new topic?	All of my teachers	28%
	Most of my teachers	27%
	About half of my teachers	18%
	A few of my teachers	20%
	None of my teachers	5%
	Skip	2%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how often do your teachers tell you what you did well?	Almost every day	14%
	1 or 2 times a week	35%
	1 or 2 times a month	29%
	1 or 2 times a year	10%
	Never	7%
	Skip	5%
Question	Answer Choices	Responses
This year at this school, how helpful is the feedback you get from your teachers?	Extremely helpful	8%
	Very helpful	34%
	Somewhat helpful	39%
	Slightly helpful	12%
	Not helpful	4%
	Skip	3%

Perception Data Analysis
Analyze the information in the data tables to identify achievement between student groups, observe trends, and/or explore correlations between variables.

Annual Parent Survey
Parents indicate they need assistance with monitoring their child's progress and assisting with homework to support their child's achievement. 49% of parents indicate they would come to events more if they had more time in their schedule. They would like books and kits to take home to help build capacity. 17% of parents indicate they need support with homework, and 27% of parents indicate they need support monitoring their child's progress. 85% of parents say they have open communication with their child's teacher.

Parent and Staff Capacity Surveys
100% of parents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that the event helped them better understand the grade-level academic expectations for their child. 100% strongly agreed that the event made them feel more motivated to be involved in their child's academic learning.

The data indicates that 99% of staff agree they feel equipped to communicate with parents from a diverse background. 3% of staff disagree that the training provided new strategies or tools to support parent engagement. This indicates an opportunity for growth at Teasley Middle School.

Professional Learning Surveys
93% of staff responded that they agree or strongly agree with the professional learning increasing their knowledge on the presented topic. 97% responded that they agree or strongly agree that the professional learning would change their teaching practices. There were no specific areas of concern notated in the survey data.

Georgia Health Survey
Areas of strength gleaned from the Georgia Health survey include 57% of students feel they are having consistent collaborative class discussions. Additionally, 55% percent of students feel they are given ample time to practice standards and that teachers check for understanding. An opportunity for growth from these student responses is with teachers helping students set learning goals as 64% of students share that half or fewer of their teachers did this.

Demographics Data

- FY25 Student Attendance-Georgia Insights
- FY25 Teacher Retention-Georgia Insights
- FY26 Enrollment by Student Group-Georgia Insights
- FY26 Free and Reduced Lunch-FRL001

FY25 Student Attendance		
	Student Count	Attendance Rate %
Missing over 15 Days	768	49.2%
Missing 6-15 Days	647	41.5%
Missing 5 or Fewer Days	145	9.3%

FY25 Teacher Retention	
	2024
Fall Teacher FTE	116.71
Retained Teacher FTE	104
Retained Teacher FTE %	89%

FY26 Free and Reduced Lunch
59.69%

FY26 Enrollment by Student Group		
	Student Count	Enrollment %
All Students	1553	100%
ELL	232	14.9%
SWD	277	17.8%
White	763	49.1%
Black	90	5.8%
Hispanic	615	39.6%
Asian	16	1.0%
Multi-Racial	66	4.25%

Demographic Data Analysis

Analyze the information in the data tables to identify achievement between student groups, observe trends, and/or explore correlations between variables.

Student Attendance

90.7% of students missed six or more school days in FY25. Student attendance is an opportunity for growth for Teasley.

Student Enrollment and Free and Reduced Lunch

Student data indicate that Teasley Middle serves a diverse student population. FY26 has 59.69% free and reduced lunch. The data shows that economic need is a characteristic of the school's student population. Teasley's overall student count is 1553. Student enrollment data indicate that Teasley Middle Schools serves a diverse student population. Enrollment includes students across multiple ethnic/racial groups with the white student group representing 49.1% of the student population and the Hispanic student population representing 39.6% of the student population.

Teacher Retention

Teasley has a teacher retention rate of 89%, which is a strength.

Process Data

- FY26 New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) School Process
- FY26 Short-Term Action Plan (STAP) School Process
- FY26 Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) School Process

FY26 NTIP School Process
The New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) is a three-year framework designed to support and retain new educators. Induction Phase Teachers (IPTs) and Emerging Teachers (ETs) are paired with mentors or guides. IPTs complete the following required tasks: develop a Professional Learning Plan in TKES, complete a pre-assessment survey, observe exemplar teachers, participate in a full coaching cycle using Jim Knight's Impact Cycle, and complete a reflection task. Mentors meet with IPTs for at least one hour weekly, and coaches facilitate coaching cycles and professional learning sessions. The program operates through a multi-tiered support system involving administrators, instructional coaches, mentors, guides, and special education facilitators as needed. Each role has defined success criteria to ensure fidelity and effectiveness. Teasley implements NTIP by organizing monthly induction meetings, coordinating mentor-mentee pairings, and ensuring time for collaboration and peer observations. Administrators and school-based coaches monitor progress and provide scheduling flexibility for mentoring and coaching activities. They also facilitate professional learning opportunities and integrate new teachers into PLCs. Additional support, such as special education guidance and targeted interventions, is provided as needed.

FY26 STAP School Process
The FY26 Title I Short-term Action Plan (STAP) is a strategic framework designed to drive continuous school improvement through structured, data-driven cycles. This plan aligns with each school's School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals and Schoolwide Reform (SWR) strategies, ensuring instructional practices and student achievement targets are systematically addressed throughout the academic year. The STAP process divides the year into three defined cycles, each focused on setting SMART goals for strategy implementation and student performance, collecting baseline and progress data, and evaluating effectiveness. Teasley implements targeted action steps through professional learning sessions, PLC discussions, and instructional monitoring, supported by ongoing data analysis. This approach emphasizes data-driven decision-making and accountability, enabling Teasley staff to make timely, evidence-based adjustments that improve student outcomes. By fostering collaboration and continuous improvement, the STAP ensures that Teasley remains on track to meet SIP goals and enhance instructional quality throughout the year.

FY26 MTSS School Process
The Targeted Intervention process uses a multi-tiered intervention model to provide increasing levels of support based on student needs. Tier 1 delivers high-quality, differentiated core instruction aligned with district standards. Students identified through screening who require additional help move to Tier 2 or Tier 3. Tier 2 interventions are targeted to specific skill deficits and delivered in small groups (no more than six students) at least twice per week for 10–15 minutes, or as recommended by the intervention protocol. Progress monitoring occurs every two weeks, and meetings are held at least once per semester to review data. The Tier 2 team includes at least two school personnel, one of whom teaches the student.

Parents are informed of the referral and progress, but attendance is optional. The Formal Targeted Intervention Plan documents goals (1–4, preferably no more than 2 at a time), selected research-based interventions and data collection responsibilities. If a student shows insufficient progress after four data points, the team meets promptly to adjust interventions.

Tier 3 interventions increase in intensity and are individualized, providing at least four times per week for 15–20 minutes, or as recommended by the intervention protocol. Progress monitoring occurs weekly, and meetings are held at least once per quarter, with additional meetings scheduled if progress is inadequate. The Tier 3 team includes at least three school personnel, including the student's teacher. The school psychologist and speech-language pathologist must be invited for consultation. Parents must be invited to all Tier 3 meetings and receive copies of meeting minutes. Documentation includes completion of referral forms, updated Formal Targeted Intervention Plans, and hearing/vision screening consent if needed. Goals and interventions are research-based, directly address identified weaknesses, and are adjusted based on data review.

Process Data Analysis

Analyze the information in the data tables to identify achievement between student groups, observe trends, and/or explore correlations between variables.

NTIP

Teasley's NTIP monthly meetings provide collaboration time for new teachers and topics that are aligned with current school needs for new teachers. Intentional mentor and mentee pairings provide the most valuable support for new teachers. An opportunity for growth is to provide time for new teachers to visit model classrooms alongside the mentor.

STAP

Teasley's STAP process that includes collecting learning walk data on instruction. The administrative team and instructional coaches use the data to determine new opportunities for coaching. A challenge within the STAP process is utilizing timely formative data that is directly aligned to grade level standards.

MTSS

A strength of the MTSS process is scheduling our Tier 3 students in specific homerooms where they receive targeted interventions and support based on individual needs. A challenge in the MTSS process is providing intentional and protected time for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to receive targeted interventions based upon individual needs.

Strengths and Challenges
Summarize the main findings including an examination of all student groups of 15 or more, i.e., students identified as economically disadvantaged, students identified as English Learners, students with disabilities, and students by major racial and ethnic groups. Findings should include detailed analysis of instruction, professional learning, and parent and family engagement strengths and challenges. This analysis should show direct relationships from the data and root causes in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment to the priorities identified in the next section.

Achievement

Economically Disadvantaged	
Strength	Teasley's Economically Disadvantaged students have a strength in Math with 31.5% scoring proficient or above.
Challenge	Teasley's Economically Disadvantaged students have an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 71.8% scoring below proficiency.

English Learners	
Strength	Teasley's English Learners have a strength in Social Studies with 8.7% scoring proficient or above.
Challenge	Teasley's English Learners have an opportunity for growth in Math with 94% scoring in the below proficiency.

Students With Disabilities	
Strength	Teasley's English Learners have a strength in Social Studies with 8.7% scoring proficient or above.
Challenge	Teasley's Students with Disabilities have an opportunity for growth in Math with 92% scoring below proficiency.

White	
Strength	Teasley's White students show a strength in Math with 55.7% scoring proficient or above.
Challenge	Teasley's White students have an opportunity for growth in Science with 50.9% scoring below proficiency.

Black	
Strength	Teasley's Black students show a strength in ELA with 26.3% scoring proficient or above.
Challenge	Teasley's Black students have an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 74.3% scoring below proficiency.

Hispanic	
Strength	Teasley's Hispanic students show a strength in Math with 29.2% scoring proficient or above.
Challenge	Teasley's Hispanic students have an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 74.2% scoring below proficiency.

Multi-Racial	
Strength	Teasley's Multi-Racial students show a strength in Math with 42.7% scoring the proficient or above. Math -42.7%?
Challenge	Teasley's Multi-Racial students have an opportunity for growth in Social Studies with 68% scoring below proficiency.

Instruction	
Strength	57% of students feel they are having consistent collaborative class discussions, and 55% percent of students feel they are given ample time to practice standards and that teachers check for understanding.
Challenge	64% of students share that half or fewer of their teachers help students set learning goals.

Professional Learning	
Strength	93% of staff responded that they agree or strongly agree with the professional learning increasing their knowledge on the presented topic. 97% responded that they agree or strongly agree that the professional learning would change their teaching practices.
Challenge	There were no specific areas of concern notated in the survey data.

Parent and Family Engagement	
Strength	For both events, 100% of parents strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that the event helped them better understand the grade-level academic expectations for their child. 100% strongly agreed that the event made them feel more motivated to be involved in their child's academic learning.
Challenge	A challenge in parent and family engagement is Teasley reaching more families to increase attendance at the family engagement events.

Needs Identification and Root Cause Analysis
Prioritize the overarching needs as evidenced by the Comprehensive Needs Assessment by drawing conclusions from the results obtained in the previous section.

Overarching Need #1	**Increase student achievement in ELA.**
Root Cause #1	
Root cause to be addressed	Inconsistent use of Tier 1 instructional strategies.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No
Root Cause #2	
Root cause to be addressed	Lack of focus on literacy across all content areas.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No
Root Cause #3	
Root cause to be addressed	Lack of independent reading through leveled texts.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No
Root Cause #4	
Root cause to be addressed	Inconsistent application of standards-defined rigor in instructional planning, task design, and student expectations.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No
Overarching Need #2	**Increase student achievement in Math.**
Root Cause #1	
Root cause to be addressed	Inconsistent use of Tier 1 instructional strategies.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No
Root Cause #2	
Root cause to be addressed	Lack of foundational math skills and number sense due to limited manipulative use.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No
Root Cause #3	
Root cause to be addressed	Lack of consistent instruction on academic vocabulary and focus on language acquisition associated with math.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No
Root Cause #4	
Root cause to be addressed	Inconsistent application of standards-defined rigor in instructional planning, task design, and student expectations.
This is a root cause and not a contributing factor	☒Yes ☐No
This is something we can affect	☒Yes ☐No

Schoolwide Reform Strategies and Development of Schoolwide Plan
A schoolwide reform strategy requires a school to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment, identify and commit to specific goals and strategies that address those needs, create a comprehensive plan, and conduct an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the schoolwide program and revise the plan annually or as necessary. A schoolwide Plan consists of goals, action steps and methods for monitoring implementation and effectiveness. Provide detail for the schoolwide plan below to show how the school will upgrade the entire educational program and improve the outcomes for the lowest-achieving students.

Goal 1: ELA	Teasley Middle School will improve the percentage of 6th, 7th and 8th students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels in ELA by 6 percentage points (6th grade from 33.3% to 39.3%, 7th grade from 32.9% to 38.9%, and 8th grade from 33.7% to 39.7%) from May 2024 to May 2027 as measured by the ELA Georgia Milestones Assessment.
Schoolwide Reform Strategy(ies)	Differentiation, Standards-Defined Rigor, Student Engagement
Action Step Instruction: Provide instructional supports for students to increase achievement in ELA, using differentiation, standards-defined rigor and student engagement instruction.	
Method for Monitoring Implementation	Short-Term Action Plan (Classroom Observation Forms), Remedial Teacher Schedules, Remedial Progress Reports, Sample Staff Schedules
Method for Monitoring Effectiveness	Short-Term Action Plan (Classroom Observation Analysis of students), MOY & EOY Reading Screener analysis, ELA GMAS Assessment Data Analysis, Remedial Progress Report Analysis
Position Responsible	Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach
Timeline for Implementation	3 Times per Year
Action Step Professional Learning: Provide training, coaching, modeling, and feedback on differentiation, standards-defined rigor and student engagement in ELA.	
Method for Monitoring Implementation	Short-Term Action Plan, Professional Learning Documentation (Sign-in sheet, agenda, presentation, handouts, survey/feedback), Professional Learning/Coaching Log
Method for Monitoring Effectiveness	Short-Term Action Plan Data Analysis (Classroom observation analysis for teachers), Survey/Feedback Analysis, PL Reflection Form Analysis, Professional Learning/Coaching Log Analysis
Position Responsible	Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach
Timeline for Implementation	Quarterly
Action Step Family Engagement: Provide events and resources for families to build parent capacity in ELA and provide training to staff to increase their capacity to engage with families.	
Method for Monitoring Implementation	PFE Documentation (Sign-In Sheets, Handouts, Agenda, Presentation, Handouts, Survey/Feedback), Completed Checklists Parent and Family Engagement Log
Method for Monitoring Effectiveness	Annual Parent Survey Analysis, Parent Input Form Analysis, Parent Engagement Reflection Form Analysis, Event Feedback Analysis, Staff Surveys Analysis, Parent and Family Engagement Log Analysis
Position Responsible	Academic Success and Parent Engagement Coach
Timeline for Implementation	Bi-Annually

Goal 2: Math	Teasley Middle School will improve the percentage of 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students scoring at the proficient or distinguished levels in Math by 8 percentage points (6th grade from 28.6% to 36.6%, 7th grade from 33.4% to 41.4%, 8th grade from 39.9% to 47.9%) from May 2024 to May 2027 as measured by the Math Georgia Milestones Assessment.
Schoolwide Reform Strategy(ies)	Differentiation, Standards-Defined Rigor, Student Engagement
Action Step Instruction: Provide instructional supports for students to increase achievement in math, using differentiation, standards-defined rigor, and student engagement instruction.	
Method for Monitoring Implementation	Short-Term Action Plan (Classroom Observation Forms), Remedial Teacher Schedules, Remedial Progress Reports, Sample Staff Schedules
Method for Monitoring Effectiveness	Short-Term Action Plan (Classroom Observation Analysis of students), MOY & EOY Math Screener analysis, Math GMAS Assessment Data Analysis, Remedial Progress Report Analysis
Position Responsible	Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach
Timeline for Implementation	3 Times per Year
Action Step Professional Learning: Provide training, coaching, modeling, and feedback on differentiation, standards-defined rigor and student engagement instruction in Math.	
Method for Monitoring Implementation	Short-Term Action Plan, Professional Learning Documentation (Sign-in sheet, agenda, presentation, handouts), Professional Learning/Coaching Log
Method for Monitoring Effectiveness	Short-Term Action Plan Data Analysis (Classroom observation analysis for teachers), Observation Analysis, Survey/Feedback Analysis, PL Reflection Form Analysis, Professional Learning/Coaching Log Analysis
Position Responsible	Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach
Timeline for Implementation	Quarterly
Action Step Family Engagement: Provide events and resources for families to build parent capacity in ELA and provide training to staff to increase their capacity to engage with families.	
Method for Monitoring Implementation	PFE Documentation (Sign-In Sheets, Handouts, Agenda, Presentation, Handouts, Survey/Feedback), Completed Checklists Parent and Family Engagement Log
Method for Monitoring Effectiveness	Annual Parent Survey Analysis, Parent Input Form Analysis, Parent Engagement Reflection Form Analysis, Event Feedback Analysis, Staff Surveys Analysis, Parent and Family Engagement Log Analysis
Position Responsible	Academic Success and Parent Engagement Coach
Timeline for Implementation	Bi-Annually

Schoolwide Reform Strategies
Address the reform strategies the school will implement to meet the school needs, including a description of how strategies will:

a. provide opportunities for all children, including all subgroups defined in section 1111(c)(2), to meet the State's challenging academic standards;

Outlined previously in plan components.

b. strengthen the 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;

Title I evidence-based strategies that the school employs to strengthen the academic program in the school (SWP-2b) and address the needs of all children, particularly those most at risk of not meeting the challenging State academic standards (SWP-2c) include:

Instruction
- Title I Teachers (and substitutes) to increase the amount and quality of learning time by providing additional support for individual students and small groups (SWP-2b) of students at-risk of not achieving proficiency on the State academic standards.
-Title I Remedial Teachers (part-time) to provide supplemental instruction in ELA and math for students at risk of not meeting the State academic standards.
- Materials to support instruction in ELA and math.

Professional Learning
Professional learning is offered to teachers, paraprofessionals and other school personnel to improve instruction (SWP-2c.iv). This professional learning includes analyzing data from academic assessments. Professional learning strategies include:
- Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach to provide instructional support to teachers.
- Substitutes for certified staff to attend professional learning on differentiation, standards-defined rigor, and student engagement instruction.
- Materials for professional learning supporting schoolwide reform strategies in ELA and math.

Parent Engagement
- Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach to assist families with supporting the education of their children by implementing effective parental engagement activities to ensure that parents are provided opportunities and experiences that enable them to promote high student academic achievement and be involved in an effective partnership and provide training to staff to increase their capacity to engage with families.
- Materials to support parent engagement events as well as activities and resources focused on building parent capacity in ELA and math.

c. addressing 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:

i). counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas;

The school offers counseling, school-based mental health programs, specialized instructional support services and other strategies to improve students' skills outside of academic subject areas (SWP-2c.i). These additional school reform strategies that the school provides to meet the needs of students through a well-rounded education include:
- Individual and small-group counseling is provided to identified students.
- School care teams meet regularly to discuss students' social and emotional needs.
- Students are supported through processes for special education, 504, and Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS).
-De-escalation/restraint training is offered for staff.

ii). preparation for and awareness 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;

Teasley Middle School offers opportunities for student awareness of career and technical programs as well as advanced track coursework (SWP-2c.ii). These opportunities include:
- Counselors provide career lessons and meet with students to discuss career possibilities and interests.
- Career days, including Student Career Fair, exposing students to working professionals and their careers are also offered to students.
- STEM lessons are implemented to support access to career pathways.

iii). a 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.);

The school implements a schoolwide multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) model to prevent and address problem behavior and provide early intervening services (SWP-2c.iii). This model is coordinated with services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Students are provided academic, behavioral, and connectedness/well-being support through a 3-tiered model. Support and interventions are tiered (Tier I: Instruction/Core Curriculum; Tier II: Intervention; Tier III: Intensive Intervention). Students identified with behavior issues receive Tier 2 interventions from the classroom teacher. If behavior progresses, students receive Tier 3 interventions. If unsuccessful at Tier 3, a functional behavior analysis will take place, and appropriate recommendations will be implemented. In some cases, a Behavioral Intervention Plan (BIP) will be put into action. Positive behavior and restorative practices are also implemented. Students with behavioral concerns are afforded additional opportunities such as a check-in and check-out system with a teacher mentor. These practices reduce the need for removal of students from the classroom. Additionally, a progressive discipline model is followed, behavior mentors are assigned as needed and a student-based incentive program is offered at each grade level.

iv). 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;

Teasley Middle School works to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high needs areas (SWP-2c.iv). The school participates in job fairs and networks within the RESA region to attract and hire experienced teachers. Teachers are engaged in professional learning opportunities on differentiation, standards-defined rigor, and student engagement instruction with state and federal funds. A Title I Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach and an Instructional Lead Strategist provide instructional coaching to teachers as well. If students are retained, they are placed with a different teacher the following year when possible. Experienced teachers are placed on every grade level team. Distribution of teachers with varying levels of experience is monitored by the Human Resources Division through scheduling practices and the employee transfer process.

Consistent monitoring of the processes at both the district and school levels ensures students are not served at a disproportionate rate by an ineffective, out-of-field or inexperienced teacher.
Ineffective
- Professional Learning Goals and Professional Learning Plans are monitored in the TKES and PowerSchool Platforms.
- Academic Success and Family Engagement Coach and Instructional Lead Strategist provide coaching and technical assistance on academic content standards, assessment practices, and instructional strategies.
- District instructional coaching and technical assistance is provided on academic content standards, assessment practices and instructional strategies.

Out-of-Field
- Evaluation practices and allotment processes are focused on staffing levels and staff placement/certification verification. Additionally, the student scheduling processes ensure the highest opportunity for an effective teacher for each student.

Inexperienced
- The District's New Teacher Induction Program (NTIP) provides a year-long, school-based mentor for new teachers as well as specific professional learning for this critical group of teachers.
- School-based Instructional Lead Strategist facilitates the NTIP program and provides instructional coaching for all teachers.

v). strategies to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs.

Not Applicable

Schoolwide Plan Development Process (ESSA Section 1114(2)(B)(i-v)), Evaluation of the Schoolwide Plan (ESSA Section 1114(b)(3)); 34 CFR § 200.26, and Assurances and Documentation (ESSA Section 1116(b)(1))

The school follows the Cherokee County School District process for the Annual Review, Comprehensive Needs Assessment and School Improvement Plan/Schoolwide Plan. The schoolwide plan is developed during a 1-year period (SWP-5a). Annually, amendments are made to the plan based on student needs and it remains in effect for the school's participation in Title I, Part A (SWP-5c). The following process is used to amend the plan:

- Internal and external stakeholders are engaged in the review and amendment process (SWP-5b). Stakeholders include parents, members of the community, teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, classified staff (including paraprofessionals), district staff and support staff.
- The Title I school team conducted an Annual Review and Comprehensive Needs Assessment and completed the Title I Schoolwide plan in March that took into account 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 challenging State academic standards (SWP-1). During this meeting, schoolwide reform strategies were selected to strengthen the academic program of the school (SWP-2b). During this process, internal and external stakeholders were engaged in multiple meetings to review school data, discuss the needs of the school, provide input on the proposed Title I Schoolwide Plan, and provide feedback on the Parent and Family Engagement Plan for Shared Student Success. Stakeholders were also able to provide input through an online form if they were unable to attend a meeting. Staff feedback was obtained to ensure that the plan was developed in coordination, as appropriate, with other Federal, State and local services, resources and programs (SWP-5e). Schools jointly developed with parents and family members of participating children a written parental and family engagement plan. This plan was agreed on by parents (SWP-4).
- In April, the Title I school team met with the district Title I team to review the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Title I Schoolwide Plan. During this meeting, the schoolwide program checklist was reviewed to ensure that all components were met.
- In May, school leaders completed the Annual Review for the year. This included a review of Georgia Milestones data (EOY evaluation), other state annual assessments, Schoolwide Plan goal achievement and progress monitoring for second semester (SWP-3a). School teams utilized this information to determine if the schoolwide program was effective in increasing the percentage of students meeting the challenging State academic standards (SWP-3b).
- The plan remains in effect for the duration of the school year and is regularly monitored to ensure that all students are provided opportunities to meet the challenging State academic standards (SWP-5c). Student progress is monitored through short-term action plans, district reading and math screeners, unit assessments, and classroom formative assessments (SWP-5a).
- The plan is made available to parents and the public through meetings, the website and upon request (SWP-5d). The plan is shared in an understandable and uniform language that parents can understand (SWP-4). Interpreters are available upon request to answer questions regarding the plan.
- In the fall, the school Parent and Family Engagement Plan for Shared Student Success is distributed to parents and the local community via the website, newsletter, at the Title I Annual Meeting and copies are placed in the front office (SWP-4). The policy is distributed in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable in a language that parents can understand. It is always shared in English and Spanish. Interpreters are also available upon request.
- Throughout the school year, school teams regularly monitor the implementation of the Schoolwide Plan through the Short-term Action Plan (STAP) (SWP-3a). The school leadership team will revise the Schoolwide Plan in collaboration with the district Title I team, if necessary, based on regular monitoring to ensure continuous improvement of students in the school (SWP-3a, 3c, and 5c).

- Developed over a one-year period with input from stakeholders.
- Includes collaboration with parents, teachers, administrators, and community members.
- Integrated with other federal, state, and local programs.
- Will be monitored and revised as needed.