

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?
Teachers will provide daily, structured writing opportunities connected to reading and content by incorporating short written responses, sentence frames, and text-based prompts, so that students build stamina and learn to express their thinking clearly in writing.		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.

Teachers will explicitly teach and model sentence construction, phonics application, and the writing process through shared and interactive writing at least 3 times per week, so that students can independently write complete, detailed sentences using appropriate spelling and conventions.

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?
----------------	------------	---

Teachers will explicitly teach and reinforce syllabication strategies during small group and whole group instruction at least 3 times per week to support decoding of multisyllabic words.

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.
Teachers will prepare students for EOG/Milestones by explicitly teaching them to listen to and analyze questions carefully during reading and assessment tasks at least 3 times per week, using think-alouds and modeling how to identify key words, determine what the question is asking, and select or construct accurate responses.	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?
Teachers will deepen students' mathematical understanding by consistently requiring them to explain their thinking using words, models, and representations during daily math instruction, so that students can justify their answers and make their reasoning visible.		Performance Target: 100% of math teachers in grades K–2 will provide explicit instruction in mathematical reasoning during daily number talks to support student development of mathematical reasoning. OR 100% of math teachers in grades K–2 will provide explicit instruction of oral/written justification of mathematical reasoning used to solve a problem at least 3 times per week to support student development of mathematical reasoning.
		Implementation (include person responsible): Teachers will incorporate math reasoning through daily number talks OR Teachers will incorporate oral/written justification of mathematical reasoning through solving word problems at least three times per week. Teachers will incorporate these strategies into daily lessons and small group instruction. Implementation will be supported through professional learning, lesson planning collaboration, and ongoing monitoring of student performance on problem-solving tasks.

	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: We will use our Beacon base line scores and quarterly Beacon scores to monitor progress. We will progress monitor the problem-solving strategy we implemented in the 2025-2026 school year using Common Formative Assessments.
Teachers will strengthen students' understanding of mathematical concepts by providing daily opportunities to model their thinking using manipulatives, drawings, and visual representations, so that students can solve problems and clearly show their understanding in multiple ways.	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): 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:

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?
Teachers will increase students' ability to reach the proficient and distinguished levels by requiring them to justify their mathematical thinking using written explanations, models, and precise vocabulary during daily instruction, so that students can explain why their answers are correct and demonstrate deep understanding of mathematical concepts.		Performance Target: 100% of math teachers in grades 3-5 will provide explicit instruction in written justification of mathematical reasoning used during error at least twice per week. OR 100% of math teachers in grades 3-5 will provide explicit instruction of written justification of mathematical reasoning used to solve a problem at least 3 times per week to support student development of mathematical reasoning. Implementation (include person responsible): Teachers will incorporate math reasoning through error analysis at least twice per week OR Teachers will incorporate written justification of mathematical reasoning through solving word problems at least three times per week. Teachers will incorporate these strategies into whole group and small group instruction. Implementation will be supported through professional learning, lesson planning collaboration, and ongoing monitoring of student performance on problem-solving tasks.

		Artifacts: Teachers will model strategies for written justifications through error analysis, number talks, numberless word problems, 3 read protocol, UPSC problem solving strategy, manipulatives, and labeled representations. Students will apply these strategies to guided and independent practice. Progress Monitoring: We will use our Beacon base line scores and quarterly Beacon scores to monitor progress. We will progress monitor the problem-solving strategy we implemented in the 2025-2026 school year using Common Formative Assessments.
Teachers will strengthen students' performance on Georgia Milestones by implementing regular practice with multi-step, standards-aligned problems and explicitly teaching strategies for analyzing questions, selecting appropriate methods, and checking for accuracy, so that students can independently solve complex problems and avoid common errors.		Performance Target: 100% of math teachers in grades 3–5 will provide explicit instruction in multi-step problem solving, using targeted strategies (like UPSC and 3 Read Protocol) and practices aligned with the Georgia Milestones assessment format. Instruction will occur at least twice per week and be integrated into both whole-group and small-group lessons. Implementation (include person responsible): Teachers will implement structured problem-solving strategies at least three times per week. Teachers will incorporate these strategies into daily lessons and small group instruction. Implementation will be supported through professional learning, lesson planning collaboration, and ongoing monitoring of student performance on problem-solving tasks. Artifacts: Teachers will model strategies such as UPSC, 3 Read Protocol, numberless word problems and visual models to help students break down and analyze multi-step problems, and students will apply these in guided and independent practice. Progress Monitoring: Progress will be monitored using Georgia Milestones style multi-step problems and common formative assessments that include multi-step problems.

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?
Teachers will strengthen students' ability to construct and support scientific arguments by consistently implementing Claim-Evidence-Reasoning (CER) during science instruction at least 2–3 times per week, requiring students to use accurate evidence and clearly explain their reasoning, so that students can independently analyze questions and justify their answers on EOG-aligned 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 (<i>include person responsible</i>): 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.
Teachers will deepen students’ understanding of science vocabulary by explicitly teaching and consistently reinforcing academic language in context, requiring students to use key terms in speaking and writing, so that students can accurately interpret and respond to science questions.	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