

School Name: Cheatham Hill Elementary
Date: May 1, 2026

GOAL #1 Literacy (K-2)	K-2 student ELA scores will increase by 10% from August 2026 to May 2027 as measured by the BEACON Assessment.			
	Spring 2026 Scored prepared	August 2026 Baseline scores:	November 2026 Mid-Year scores:	March 2027 End of year scores:
	K: N/a	K:	K:	K:
	1 st : 104/185 56%	1 st :	1 st :	1 st :
	2 nd : 70/129 54%	2 nd :	2 nd :	2 nd :

Action Step(s)	Start Date	What is the desired outcome of the action step? How will the action step be implemented? What artifacts will be used to show implementation? What evidence will be used to progress monitor the outcome?
K–2 teachers will provide daily structured writing opportunities using short written responses, sentence frames, and text-based prompts. Implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs and student work. Student impact will be measured through Wonders curriculum-embedded writing samples scored with a common K–2 writing rubric aligned to Georgia ELA Standards, tracking the percentage of students scoring 3 or higher over time. Grades 1–2 BEACON ELA data will serve as a supporting measure of student growth.		Performance Target: By EOY, at least 85% of K-2 students will independently produce short text-based written responses (grade-adjusted: K ~ 1-2 sentences with drawing/labeling; 1st grade~ 2-3 complete sentences; 2nd grade~ 4-5 sentences or a short paragraph) that demonstrate clear expression of thinking, accurate use of text evidence or content connections, and appropriate conventions, scoring 3 or higher on a common 4-point writing rubric. This target directly supports the overall 10% increase in K-2 BEACON ELA scores by strengthening the writing and oral language expression components measured in the assessment. Implementation (include person responsible): - Daily structured writing block embedded in the Wonders literacy block (immediately following the Shared Read or Literature Big Book) and/or as an extension of UFLI Foundations lessons (using dictation and sentence-building activities). - Wonders integration: Use the <i>Reading/Writing Companion</i> short-response prompts, “Respond to Reading” questions, and text-evidence sentence frames (available in every lesson).

- UFLI integration: Add phonics-aligned sentence writing (e.g., dictated sentences or student-generated sentences using the week's grapheme-phoneme patterns) from the UFLI decodable text or teacher-created sentence starters.

Artifacts:

- "Prompt of the Week" Slide or Chart: A single posted writing prompt used all week (e.g., Wonders shared read response). Examples: "In the story, the character felt ____ because ____." "This text taught me about ____."
- Exit tickets with sentence frames cross curricular: Examples: "Today I learned that ____." , "One detail from the text is ____." , "The word ____ helped me understand ____."
- Weekly UFLI sentence dictation
- Walkthroughs and CCC Writing Data Snapshots

Progress Monitoring:

Student progress in written expression will be monitored using a common K–2 writing rubric aligned to the Georgia English Language Arts standards. The rubric, created or adapted using Wonders instructional rubrics as a foundational resource, will be implemented consistently across classrooms to assess sentence construction, clarity of ideas, use of text evidence, and age-appropriate conventions. Teachers will engage in collaborative scoring of student writing samples to ensure shared understanding of expectations and consistency in rubric application.

Students will complete writing prompts embedded within the Wonders curriculum to measure growth over the course of instructional units. Writing data will be aggregated at the grade level and reviewed during CCC meetings to identify trends in student performance and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional practices. Progress will be examined in conjunction with BEACON Early Years K–2 ELA assessment results, including baseline, mid-year, and end-of-year administrations, to ensure alignment between classroom instruction and assessment outcomes.

Additional qualitative data, including student self-reflection exit tickets and teacher anecdotal notes, will be used to monitor growth in writing stamina, independence, and use of sentence frames. Overall success will be measured by tracking the percentage of students achieving a score of 3 or higher on the common writing rubric. Instructional adjustments and targeted supports will be implemented as needed based on data analysis to support continuous improvement in student writing achievement.

K-2 teachers will explicitly teach and model sentence construction, phonics application, and the writing process through shared and interactive writing at least three times per week. Implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs and student work, and impact will be measured using the common K-2 writing rubric and identified ELA data.

Performance Target:

By EOY, at least 85% of K–2 students will independently write grade-appropriate, complete sentences demonstrating correct sentence structure, use of phonics-based spelling, and age-appropriate conventions, scoring 3 or higher on a common 4-point writing rubric. Progress toward this target will contribute to a 10% increase in K–2 ELA BEACON Assessment scores from August 2026 to May 2027 by strengthening written expression and language skills measured in the assessment.

Implementation (include person responsible):

Teachers will conduct shared or interactive writing lessons at least 3 times per week, embedded within the Wonders literacy block and/or UFLI Foundations lessons.

Lessons will include: explicit modeling of sentence construction (capitalization, spacing, punctuation), phonics-based spelling application using current UFLI skill patterns, oral rehearsal before writing (“say it, then write it”), and the use of sentence frames and shared writing before gradual release to independent writing. Instruction will progress developmentally: Kindergarten: shared writing with teacher modeling, drawing with labeling, simple sentences; Grade 1: interactive writing with partial sentence frames and guided spelling; Grade 2: more independent writing with teacher modeling of revision and elaboration. Instructional support will provide: initial professional learning at the beginning of the school year to set writing routines, as well as CCC support for lesson modeling, co-planning, and collaborative grading.

Artifacts:

- Samples of UFLI sentence dictation or sentence construction pages
- Posted classroom sentence frames or writing routine anchor charts
- Writing prompts or responses embedded in student notebooks or journals
- Walkthrough feedback and CCC Writing Data Snapshots

Progress Monitoring:

Student progress in written expression will be monitored using a common K–2 writing rubric aligned to the Georgia English Language Arts standards. The rubric, created or adapted from the Wonders writing rubrics, will be used consistently across grade levels to assess organization, sentence structure, conventions, and clarity of student writing. Teachers will engage in collaborative scoring of student writing samples to ensure scoring consistency and fidelity of implementation across classrooms.

Students will complete writing prompts embedded within the Wonders curriculum, allowing teachers to measure growth over the duration of instructional units. Writing samples will be evaluated using the common rubric, and

	results will be aggregated at the classroom and grade-level to identify trends in student performance. Grade-level CCCs will review rubric data to monitor progress, discuss instructional practices, and determine next steps. Progress monitoring data will be analyzed alongside results from the BEACON Early Years K–2 ELA assessment, including baseline (August), mid-year (November), and end-of-year (March) administrations, to ensure alignment between classroom instruction and assessment outcomes. Teachers will also collect qualitative data through student self-reflection exit tickets and anecdotal notes documenting growth in writing stamina and independence. Success will be measured by tracking the percentage of students scoring a 3 or higher on the common writing rubric. Instructional adjustments, including increased scaffolding or targeted support, will be implemented for classrooms or grade levels not demonstrating sufficient growth. Ongoing data analysis will inform instructional decisions and support progress toward the goal of increased student achievement in ELA.
--	---

GOAL #2 Literacy (3-5)	The percent of 3rd, 4th , 5th grade students will increase student achievement scores by 3% as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG ELA assessment. Spring Beacon: Number/% students scored Prepared: 3rd: 21/168 13% 4th: 50/175 29% 5th: 55/163 34% 3rd : ____% (____/____) students scored at the distinguished/proficient level Goal to increase by 3%: ____% of students will score at the distinguished/proficient level (____ students) 4th: ____% (____/____) students scored at the distinguished/proficient level Goal to increase by 3%: ____% of students will score at the distinguished/proficient level (____ students) 5th: ____% (____/____) students scored at the distinguished/proficient level Goal to increase by 3%: ____% of students will score at the distinguished/proficient level (____ students)
---	---

Action Step(s)	Start Date	What is the desired outcome of the action step? How will the action step be implemented? What artifacts will be used to show implementation? What evidence will be used to progress monitor the outcome?
----------------	------------	---

Grades 3–5 teachers will explicitly teach and reinforce syllabication strategies during small- and whole-group instruction at least three times per week to support the decoding of multisyllabic words. Implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs and CCC review. Student impact will be measured through teacher-created multisyllabic word decoding assessments, grade-level fluency passages with accuracy tracking, and small-group progress monitoring, with a target of at least 85% of students demonstrating mastery of grade-level multisyllabic word decoding skills.

Performance Target:

By EOY, at least 85% of students in grades 3–5 will accurately decode grade-level multisyllabic words using appropriate syllabication strategies (e.g., vowel identification, word chunking, flexible division), as demonstrated by: 80% or higher accuracy on classroom decoding checks and fluency tasks and improved reading accuracy and comprehension on grade-level texts. Achievement of this target will support a 3% increase in Distinguished/Proficient scores on the 2026–2027 EOG ELA assessment.

Implementation (include person responsible):

- Teachers will incorporate explicit syllabication instruction at least 3 times per week during whole-group phonics or word study instruction, and small-group guided reading or intervention blocks.
- Instruction will include: modeling how to break multisyllabic words into manageable parts, identifying vowels and common syllable patterns, using strategies such as clapping, marking vowels, and chunking words, and applying syllabication strategies when reading connected text.
- Instructional support will: Provide initial and ongoing professional learning, model instructional routines as needed, and support teachers through CCC planning and instructional feedback.

Artifacts:

- Weekly or bi-weekly lesson plans or pacing guides showing syllabication instruction
- Examples of student word work, syllable marking, or anchor charts
- Samples of student decoding practice (ORF fluency reads)
- Walkthrough feedback and CCC notes referencing syllabication routines

Progress Monitoring:

Student progress will be monitored through multiple data sources aligned to foundational reading and decoding skills. Teachers will utilize teacher-created multisyllabic word decoding assessments, grade-level fluency passages with accuracy tracking, and small-group progress monitoring tools to assess students' application of syllabication strategies and reading accuracy. These tools will provide consistent, formative data on student performance related to decoding multisyllabic words within both isolated skill practice and connected text.

Decoding and fluency data will be reviewed during grade-level CCCs to identify trends in student performance and instructional effectiveness. Students receiving targeted reading interventions will be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure timely instructional adjustments and appropriate support. Progress monitoring results will be compared to district benchmark assessments and EOG ELA indicators to evaluate alignment between classroom instruction and grade-level performance expectations.

	Grade-level teams, with support from Instructional Support, will analyze data to determine the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency in multisyllabic word decoding. Instructional plans will be adjusted as needed to address identified gaps. Success will be measured by at least 85% of students demonstrating mastery of grade-level multisyllabic word decoding skills, with additional instructional supports implemented for any grade level performing below 70% proficiency at the mid-year review point. Ongoing data analysis will guide instructional decision-making to ensure progress toward the targeted increase in Distinguished/Proficient performance on the EOG ELA assessment.
Grades 3-5 teachers will explicitly model strategies for analyzing reading and assessment questions at least three times per week, including identifying key information, determining what the question is asking, and selecting or constructing an appropriate response. Implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs and CCC review, and impact will be measured through common formative and grade-level assessments.	Performance Target: By the end of the 2025–2026 school year, at least 85% of students will demonstrate proficiency in analyzing and responding to text-dependent questions, as evidenced by: • Performance on Wonders unit assessments and district common assessments • Improvement in constructed response scores using a standards-aligned rubric (e.g., QAR framework) • Georgia Milestones/EOG assessment results Implementation (include person responsible): Teachers will deliver explicit instruction in question analysis and response construction weekly within Tier 1 instruction. Through the use of think-aloud strategies, teachers will model the cognitive processes required to interpret and analyze questions, including identifying key words and determining the intent of the task. Students will engage in both guided and independent practice using grade-level texts and aligned questioning strategies to strengthen their ability to construct accurate, text-based responses. In addition, teachers will consistently incorporate QAR and CER frameworks across content areas to reinforce transferable comprehension and response skills. Artifacts: • Student work samples demonstrating use of text evidence and constructed responses • Anchor charts and instructional materials (QAR, key vocabulary, CER framework) • Common formative and summative assessment data • CCC notes and data analysis protocols • Walkthrough and observation data aligned to SSP focus Progress Monitoring: Teachers will collect and analyze formative assessment data, including exit tickets and constructed responses, to monitor student understanding and inform immediate instructional adjustments. CCCs will engage in structured data conversations to review common formative assessment results, identify trends in student performance, and collaboratively plan targeted instructional responses to address identified needs. Three times per year, students will

	complete a QAR assessment to measure their ability to analyze question types and apply appropriate response strategies. Results will be analyzed by teachers and CCC teams to monitor student growth over time and to inform instructional planning and intervention.
--	---

GOAL #3 Math (K-2)	The percent of Kindergarten, 1st grade, and 2nd grade students scoring prepared will increase by 10% from baseline data in August 2026 to May 2027 based on the Beacon Assessment.		
	Spring 2026 Beacon: Number/% students scored Prepared: K: 32/138 23% 1 st : 97/194 50% 2 nd : 57/129 44%		
	August 2026 Baseline scores: K: 1 st : 2 nd :	November 2026 Mid-Year scores: K: 1 st : 2 nd :	March 2027 End of year scores: K: 1 st : 2 nd :

Action Step(s)	Start Date	What is the desired outcome of the action step? How will the action step be implemented? What artifacts will be used to show implementation? What evidence will be used to progress monitor the outcome?
K-2 teachers will require students to explain and justify mathematical thinking using words, models, and representations during daily math instruction. Implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs and student work, and impact will be measured through CFAs and Beacon math data		Performance Target: 100% of K–2 math teachers will provide explicit instruction and structured opportunities for students to orally, visually, or in writing justify their mathematical reasoning at least three times per week. Students will use words, models, manipulatives, and representations to explain how they solved problems and why their solutions are reasonable.
		Implementation (include person responsible): K–2 mathematics teachers will explicitly model mathematical reasoning and provide students with structured opportunities to justify their thinking at least three times per week during whole group, small group instruction. Teachers will use strategies such as number talks, numberless word problems, the 3 Read Protocol, UPSC problem solving, error analysis, manipulatives, and labeled visual representations to model how mathematicians explain and justify their thinking.

	Students will regularly practice explaining how they solved a problem, why they selected a particular strategy, and how their models or representations support their answers. Grade level CCCs, with support from Instructional Support and school administration, will monitor implementation and student progress through collaborative planning, review of student work, and instructional walkthroughs. Artifacts: Teachers will model strategies for oral and written justifications through number talks, numberless word problems, 3 read protocol, UPSC problem solving strategy, error analysis, manipulatives, and labeled representations. Students will apply these strategies to guided and independent practice. Progress Monitoring: Student progress will be monitored through Common Formative Assessments (CFAs), student problem-solving tasks, and work samples requiring students to explain and justify their mathematical thinking using words, models, manipulatives, and representations. Grade level CCCs will regularly review student responses to identify growth in students' ability to select appropriate strategies, represent their thinking, explain their reasoning, and justify why their solutions are reasonable. Teachers will use identified trends, misconceptions, and areas of need to adjust whole group and small group instruction. Teacher implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and student work samples to ensure students are provided structured opportunities to explain and justify their mathematical reasoning at least three times per week. CCC teams will review evidence of implementation and student performance to determine whether regular practice is resulting in increased student independence and mathematical reasoning. BEACON baseline and quarterly math assessment data will be reviewed alongside CFA and student work data to monitor overall growth in mathematical understanding and problem solving and to determine whether instructional adjustments or additional supports are needed.
K–2 teachers will implement the Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) strategy at least three times per week, providing students opportunities to use manipulatives, drawings, visual models, and number sentences to represent and explain their mathematical thinking. Implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, with a goal of 100% teacher implementation. Student impact will be measured through student work, CFAs, and	Performance Target: 100% of math teachers in grades K–2 will implement the Concrete Representational Abstract strategy while solving problems at least three times per week to strengthen (do we want to focus on a particular domain like numerical reasoning?) Implementation (include person responsible): Implementation: Teachers in grades K–2 will implement the Concrete-Representational-Abstract (CRA) instructional approach at least three times per week during mathematics instruction. Teachers will intentionally provide students with opportunities to first model mathematical concepts using concrete manipulatives, then represent their thinking through drawings, diagrams, or other visual models, and ultimately connect these representations to abstract numbers and symbols. Instruction will emphasize numerical reasoning and problem solving, with teachers modeling

BEACON Math data, with evidence of growth in students' ability to use multiple representations to solve mathematical problems.

the CRA process and providing opportunities for students to explain how their concrete and visual representations connect to their mathematical solutions.

Artifacts:

Teacher will model the CRA strategy through anchor charts, manipulatives, model drawing (part-part-whole strategy, number lines, ten-frames, number bonds, area models, etc...) and number sentences. Students will apply these strategies during guided and independent practice.

Progress Monitoring:

Student application of the CRA strategy will be monitored through Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) and work samples collected during guided and independent practice. Teachers will examine students' ability to use manipulatives, drawings, visual models, and number sentences to represent mathematical concepts and solve problems. Grade level CCCs will collaboratively review student work and formative assessment data to identify trends in conceptual understanding and determine whether students are progressing from reliance on concrete models toward representational and abstract understanding.

Teacher implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and instructional artifacts to ensure students are provided opportunities to engage in CRA instruction at least three times per week. Walkthrough data will examine not only the presence of manipulatives and visual models, but also whether teachers are intentionally connecting concrete experiences to representations and abstract mathematical notation and providing students opportunities to apply these connections independently.

Student performance will be reviewed alongside BEACON baseline and quarterly mathematics assessment results to monitor growth in mathematical understanding and numerical reasoning. CCC teams will use implementation data, student work, CFA results, and BEACON data to identify areas of strength and need and make adjustments to modeling, scaffolding, small group instruction, and opportunities for independent application.

GOAL #4
Math (3-5)

The percent of 3rd, 4th, 5th grade students will increase student achievement scores by 3% as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG Math assessment.

EOG Spring 2026 Proficient/Distinguished score: Number/%

3rd: 84/168 50%

4th: 115/178 65%

5th: 103/163 63%

	3rd : 50% (84/168) students scored at the distinguished/proficient level Goal to increase by 3%: 53% of students will score at the distinguished/proficient level (69 students/129) 4th: 65% (115/178) students scored at the distinguished/proficient level Goal to increase by 3%: 68% of students will score at the distinguished/proficient level (114 students/178) 5th : 63% (103/163) students scored at the distinguished/proficient level Goal to increase by 3%: 66% of students will score at the distinguished/proficient level (107 students/162)	
--	--	--

Action Step(s)	Start Date	What is the desired outcome of the action step? How will the action step be implemented? What artifacts will be used to show implementation? What evidence will be used to progress monitor the outcome?
Grades 3-5 teachers will require students to justify mathematical thinking using written explanations, models, and precise mathematical vocabulary during daily instruction. Implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs and student work, and impact will be measured through CFAs and identified math assessment data.		Performance Target: 100% of mathematics teachers in grades 3–5 will provide explicit instruction and structured opportunities for students to justify their mathematical reasoning in writing at least three times per week. Students will use written explanations, models, and precise mathematical vocabulary to explain their problem-solving strategies and justify why their solutions are correct. Implementation (include person responsible): Grades 3–5 math teachers will explicitly model written mathematical justification and provide students with structured opportunities to explain and justify their reasoning at least three times per week during whole group and small group math instruction. Teachers will incorporate strategies such as error analysis, number talks, numberless word problems, the 3 Read Protocol, UPSC problem solving, manipulatives, and labeled representations to support students in explaining how they solved problems and why their solutions are correct. Students will regularly apply these strategies during guided and independent problem-solving tasks. Grade level CCCs, with support from Instructional Support and school administration, will support implementation through professional learning, collaborative lesson planning, review of student work, and instructional walkthroughs. Artifacts: Evidence of implementation will include teacher models, anchor charts, error analysis tasks, numberless word problems, 3 Read Protocol and UPSC problem-solving tasks, manipulatives, and labeled math representations. Student artifacts will include guided and independent work samples demonstrating written mathematical justification through explanations, models, representations, and precise mathematical vocabulary.

	Progress Monitoring: Student progress in mathematical reasoning will be monitored through Common Formative Assessments (CFAs), student problem-solving tasks, and work samples requiring written justification. Teachers will examine students' ability to accurately solve problems, explain their strategies, use appropriate models and representations, apply precise mathematical vocabulary, and justify why their solutions are correct. Grade level CCCs will collaboratively review student responses to identify trends in mathematical reasoning, common misconceptions, and areas requiring additional instruction or support. Teacher implementation will be monitored through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, and student work samples to ensure students are provided structured opportunities to write about and justify their mathematical reasoning at least three times per week. Walkthroughs and artifact reviews will monitor both the frequency of these opportunities and evidence that students are independently applying mathematical reasoning and justification strategies. BEACON baseline and quarterly mathematics assessment data will be reviewed alongside CFA and student work data to monitor overall growth and progress toward proficient and distinguished levels of performance. CCC teams will use implementation and student performance data to adjust whole group instruction, small group instruction, modeling, scaffolding, and opportunities for independent practice.
Grades 3–5 teachers will provide standards-aligned multistep problem-solving practice at least three times per week and explicitly teach strategies for analyzing questions, selecting appropriate methods, and checking for accuracy. Implementation will be monitored through monthly walkthroughs and student work. Student impact will be measured through CFAs and EOG-style, standards-aligned multistep problems, tracking growth in the percentage of students who independently analyze, solve, and check multistep problems accurately and demonstrate proficiency on grade-level mathematics standards.	Performance Target: 100% of mathematics teachers in grades 3–5 will provide explicit instruction and structured practice with standards aligned, multistep problems at least three times per week. Teachers will model and reinforce targeted problem-solving strategies, such as UPSC and the 3 Read Protocol, to support students in analyzing questions, selecting appropriate methods, solving accurately, and checking their work for reasonableness. Practice will be integrated into whole group and small group instruction. Implementation (<i>include person responsible</i>): Grades 3–5 math teachers will provide explicit instruction and structured practice with standards aligned, multistep problems at least three times per week during whole group and small group math instruction. Teachers will model strategies such as UPSC, the 3 Read Protocol, numberless word problems, and visual representations to help students analyze questions, identify relevant information, select appropriate problem-solving methods, complete multiple steps, and check solutions for accuracy and reasonableness. Students will regularly apply these strategies during guided and independent problem-solving practice, with scaffolds gradually reduced as students demonstrate increased independence. Grade level CCCs, with support from Instructional Support and school administration, will support implementation through collaborative planning, professional learning, review of student work, and instructional walkthroughs.

	Artifacts: Evidence of implementation will include teacher models, anchor charts, UPSC and 3 Read Protocol resources, numberless word problems, visual models, and standards aligned, EOG style multistep problem-solving tasks. Student artifacts will include guided and independent work samples demonstrating students' ability to analyze questions, select appropriate strategies, complete multiple steps, and check solutions for accuracy and reasonableness. Progress Monitoring: Student progress will be monitored through EOG style, standards aligned multistep problems, Common Formative Assessments (CFAs), and student work samples. Teachers will examine students' ability to analyze questions, identify relevant information, select appropriate problem-solving methods, accurately complete multiple steps, and check solutions for accuracy and reasonableness. Grade level CCCs will regularly review student performance data and work samples to identify trends, common errors, misconceptions, and areas of need and will use the results to make instructional adjustments and plan targeted whole group and small group support. Teacher implementation will be monitored through lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, instructional artifacts, and student work samples to ensure students are provided structured opportunities to practice standards aligned multistep problem solving at least three times per week. Walkthroughs and artifact reviews will monitor evidence of explicit strategy instruction, regular student practice, and opportunities for students to apply problem-solving strategies with increasing independence. CCC teams will review implementation and student performance data to determine whether consistent practice is resulting in increased accuracy, independence, and proficiency with multistep, EOG style problems. Instructional supports and scaffolds will be adjusted based on student performance, with the goal of students independently analyzing and solving complex problems without reliance on a specific teacher directed strategy.
--	--

GOAL #5 School Selected	The percent of 5th grade students scoring proficient and distinguished will increase by 3% as measured by the 2026-2027 EOG Science assessment. 5th: 54% (90/166) students scored at the distinguished/proficient level Goal to increase by 3%: 57% of students will score at the distinguished/proficient level (92/162students)
--	---

Action Step(s)	Start Date	What is the desired outcome of the action step? How will the action step be implemented? What artifacts will be used to show implementation? What evidence will be used to progress monitor the outcome?
-----------------------	-------------------	---

5th-grade teachers will implement Claim-Evidence-Reasoning (CER) with fidelity during science instruction at least 2-3 times per week. Implementation will be monitored through walkthroughs and student work, and impact will be measured through common CER assessments/rubrics and EOG-aligned science tasks.

Performance Target:

By the end of the school year, at least 80% of students will demonstrate proficiency (scoring 3 or higher) on a CER rubric aligned to EOG expectations. Throughout the year, students will show measurable growth in their ability to construct scientific arguments as evidenced by baseline, mid-year, and end-of-year CER writing assessments, including QAR- and CER-based tasks. In addition, walkthrough data will reflect consistent implementation of Claim-Evidence-Reasoning instruction in classrooms during science instruction, indicating strong instructional fidelity across grade levels.

Implementation (include person responsible):

Teachers will embed Claim-Evidence-Reasoning (CER) tasks into science instruction weekly, ensuring alignment with grade-level standards and current units of study. They will model each component of CER—Claim, Evidence, and Reasoning—through think-alouds and the use of strong exemplars to support student understanding. Instruction will include structured supports such as sentence stems, graphic organizers, and anchor charts, with a gradual release of responsibility to promote student independence. Teachers will also utilize common CER rubrics to evaluate student responses and provide targeted, actionable feedback that strengthens scientific writing and reasoning.

The Instructional Support Specialist will support implementation by providing professional learning focused on CER strategies. They will develop and distribute common CER tasks and rubrics that are aligned to grade-level standards to ensure consistency across classrooms. In addition, the coach will support CCCs in analyzing student work, identifying trends in understanding, and using data to inform instructional adjustments.

Administration will conduct walkthroughs with a focus on CER implementation and student engagement in scientific discourse. Feedback provided will be aligned to the SSP goal and will support continuous improvement of instructional practices. Administrators will also monitor fidelity of implementation across classrooms and celebrate growth and progress to reinforce effective CER instruction schoolwide.

Artifacts:

- Student work samples (baseline, mid-year, end-of-year CER responses)
- CER rubrics with teacher feedback
- Anchor charts and student graphic organizers
- PLC meeting notes and data analysis protocols
- Walkthrough observation data (look-fors aligned to CER)
- Common assessments aligned to EOG-style constructed responses

Progress Monitoring:

	CCCs will review student CER responses from common tasks to identify trends in student understanding. Teachers will analyze strengths, misconceptions, and gaps in reasoning in order to make timely instructional adjustments and provide targeted supports to improve student outcomes. Teams will examine schoolwide trends in CER implementation, including a review of student work samples across grade levels to ensure consistency and calibration of expectations. This ongoing analysis will support alignment of instructional practices and strengthen vertical and horizontal coherence in CER instruction. Three times per year—at baseline, mid-year, and end-of-year—students will complete common CER/QAR constructed response assessments. These assessments will be scored using a shared rubric to measure student growth over time and to provide a clear picture of progress toward proficiency. In addition, multiple data points will be considered to inform instruction, including the correlation between CER performance and science unit assessments, as well as students’ ability to transfer CER skills to unfamiliar, EOG-style questions that require independent reasoning and application of scientific thinking.
5th-grade teachers will explicitly teach and reinforce academic science vocabulary and require students to use identified vocabulary in speaking and writing during science instruction. Implementation will be monitored through monthly walkthroughs and student work. Student impact will be measured through common science vocabulary assessments, constructed responses, unit assessments, and EOG-style questions, tracking growth in the percentage of students who accurately use science vocabulary in context and apply academic language to interpret, explain, and respond to grade-level science content.	Performance Target: By the end of the school year, at least 80% of students will demonstrate proficiency in science vocabulary usage as measured by district- or school-created assessments, including constructed responses and unit assessments. Students will show measurable growth from baseline to mid-year and end-of-year assessments in their ability to correctly apply academic vocabulary in context. Additionally, walkthrough data will reflect consistent, intentional vocabulary instruction and student use of academic language in science classrooms. Implementation (<i>include person responsible</i>): Teachers will intentionally embed explicit vocabulary instruction into daily science lessons by directly teaching academic and content-specific terms and reinforcing their meaning through repeated exposure in context. Instruction will require students to use precise scientific vocabulary during discussions, written responses, and collaborative tasks. Teachers will support vocabulary development through strategies such as word walls, student-friendly definitions, visual representations, sentence stems, and structured talk opportunities that require academic language use. Ongoing formative checks will be used to ensure students are not only recognizing vocabulary but applying it accurately in scientific reasoning and communication. Instructional or academic coaches will support implementation by providing professional learning on effective vocabulary instruction strategies, modeling lessons that integrate academic language development. In CCCs, Instructional Support Specialists will facilitate the analysis of student work to identify patterns in vocabulary usage and support teachers in adjusting instruction based on student needs.

Administration will conduct walkthroughs with a focus on academic vocabulary instruction and student use of scientific language. Feedback will be provided to support consistent implementation and ensure alignment with the SSP goal. Administrators will also monitor instructional fidelity across classrooms and highlight effective practices that promote strong academic language development in science.

Artifacts:

- Word walls (classroom and interactive/digital) with unit-specific science terms
- Student-created vocabulary tools (Frayer models, concept maps, illustrations, vocabulary journals)
- Anchor charts modeling correct use of academic science language
- Student speaking and writing samples demonstrating use of targeted vocabulary
- Common formative assessments and unit assessments with vocabulary-based items
- CCC notes documenting analysis of vocabulary data and instructional adjustments
- Walkthrough observation notes focusing on academic language use in instruction and student discourse
- Intervention/enrichment materials targeting vocabulary development (small group supports, reteaching tools)

Progress Monitoring:

CCCs will review student work samples and assessment data to analyze how effectively students are using science vocabulary in context. Teams will identify patterns in student understanding, including common misconceptions, partial understanding of terms, and gaps in application, and will use this information to refine instructional strategies and supports.

Grade-level teams will examine schoolwide trends in academic vocabulary instruction and student usage to ensure consistency and alignment across classrooms. Student work will be reviewed for calibration of expectations, with attention to the accurate and meaningful use of scientific terminology.

Three times per year—at baseline, mid-year, and end-of-year—students will complete common vocabulary-based assessments embedded within science tasks, including constructed response items. These assessments will be scored using a shared rubric that evaluates both understanding and application of academic language over time.

Additional data sources will include the relationship between vocabulary usage and science unit assessment performance, as well as students' ability to transfer and correctly apply academic vocabulary in unfamiliar, EOG-style questions and performance tasks that require independent scientific reasoning.



Assistant Superintendent