

Lake County Schools

East Ridge High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

East Ridge High School

13322 EXCALIBUR RD, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://erh.lake.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Julie Robinson Lueallen

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Native American Students Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

East Ridge High School

13322 EXCALIBUR RD, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://erh.lake.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	50%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lake County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The vision of East Ridge High School is to promote a culture that is academically and physically safe for all students to learn and to become productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

When we enter this campus, we are...

1 Knight: Working Together

1 Knight: Striving for Excellence

1 Knight: Bold in Character, Empowered with Strength

1 Knight: Determined to be the Very Best that we can be

1 Knight: Accepting the Challenge to move ERHS from Good to Great!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lueallen, Julie	Principal	Student learning results, student learning as a priority, instructional implementation plan, faculty development, learning environment, decision-making, leadership development, school management, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors. Oversees all administrators and leadership team.
Munoz, Raymond	Assistant Principal	Student learning results, student learning as a priority, instructional implementation plan, faculty development, learning environment, decision-making, leadership development, school management, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors. Oversees Career-Technical education, computer science, custodial, school safety and PASS.
Frana, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Student learning results, student learning as a priority, instructional implementation plan, faculty development, learning environment, decision-making, leadership development, school management, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors. Oversees ESE and Guidance.
Cuebas, Myra	Teacher, K-12	Physical Education/HOPE Department Chair
Mollet, Grant	Teacher, K-12	Social Science Department Chair
Shaffer, Craig	Teacher, K-12	Mathematics Department Chair
Balkaran, Brent	Assistant Principal	Student learning results, student learning as a priority, instructional implementation plan, faculty development, learning environment, decision-making, leadership development, school management, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors. Oversees Social Science, Foreign Language and Testing.
Keaveny, Stacy	Assistant Principal	Student learning results, student learning as a priority, instructional implementation plan, faculty development, learning environment, decision-making, leadership development, school management, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors. Oversees English Language Arts, Reading, ELL, and curriculum.
Long, Carly	Teacher, K-12	English Language Arts Department Chair
King, Justin	Teacher, Career/Technical	Career-Technical Education Department Chair
Hoskinson, Renee	Instructional Coach	Reading Department Chair, School Literacy Coach
Hunt, Keith	Assistant Principal	Student learning results, student learning as a priority, instructional implementation plan, faculty development, learning environment, decision-

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		making, leadership development, school management, communication, and professional and ethical behaviors. Oversees Mathematics and Physical Education/HOPE.
Pearson, Patti	School Counselor	School Counseling Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2010, Julie Robinson Lueallen

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

47

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

53

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

101

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	63%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Native American Students Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students

	Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587	552	590	541	2270	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	82	82	124	352	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	36	24	11	110	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	59	17	6	137	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	59	17	6	137	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88	73	95	33	289	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	64	59	20	224	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	348	347	336	320	1351

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608	678	643	577	2506
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	107	107	80	370
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	137	113	68	405

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	238	229	93	725

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5	26	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4	20

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608	678	643	577	2506	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	107	107	80	370	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	14	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	137	113	68	405	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	238	229	93	725

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4	20

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	50%	56%	58%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	46%	51%	50%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	33%	42%	39%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	51%	44%	51%	57%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	45%	48%	44%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	36%	45%	34%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	80%	68%	68%	80%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	69%	73%	80%	69%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	58%	47%	11%	55%	3%
	2018	56%	46%	10%	53%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	57%	48%	9%	53%	4%
	2018	60%	49%	11%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	66%	14%	67%	13%
2018	73%	61%	12%	65%	8%
Compare		7%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	67%	12%	70%	9%
2018	77%	69%	8%	68%	9%
Compare		2%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	36%	52%	-16%	61%	-25%
2018	43%	62%	-19%	62%	-19%
Compare		-7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	49%	8%	57%	0%
2018	61%	50%	11%	56%	5%
Compare		-4%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	33	25	22	35	35	47	37		96	19
ELL	25	49	42	30	49	41	71	43		83	53
ASN	84	69		64	68		87	88		96	87
BLK	51	48	38	38	41	31	71	73		93	38
HSP	54	49	39	47	50	39	74	72		93	53
MUL	63	71	47	50	57		81	86		89	56
WHT	64	53	33	60	52	49	88	86		94	67
FRL	49	46	32	38	43	33	66	68		92	46
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	24	23	32	43	38	40	52		85	16
ELL	23	45	43	20	43	36	33	39		85	47
ASN	73	69	67	63	47		90	74		97	84
BLK	46	48	50	43	44	38	61	71		94	38
HSP	55	48	39	50	47	36	74	73		91	51
MUL	67	59		56	36		83	84			
WHT	65	56	41	67	55	53	85	89		94	53
FRL	49	49	40	50	49	44	71	73		92	43
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	30	22	29	31	21	39	41		76	17
ELL	7	26	25	23	33	32	48	40		46	53
ASN	69	58		69	47		88	93		90	63
BLK	46	42	33	36	32	20	71	70		83	25
HSP	53	46	36	50	44	39	71	75		80	46
MUL	60	58	40	50	38		88	74		100	33
WHT	63	53	42	68	48	39	88	88		94	61
FRL	45	45	40	46	41	27	71	72		83	40

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	663
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	80
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The overall lowest data component was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (37%). In disaggregating the data into components, Student With Disabilities (SWD) held a significant impact on our lowest performing data across both ELA (18%) and Math (22%), and lower quartile learning gains (ELA - 25%; Math - 35%). ERHS is also concerned with specific subgroup lower quartile gains in ELA for Black (38%), Hispanic (39%) and White (33%), and lower quartile gains in Math for Black (31%) and Hispanic (39%). College and Career percentages for SWD (19%) and Black students (38%) are significantly low. Factors contributing to low performance in these areas could be attributed to lack of focus on struggling students during remediation, failure to re-teach skills that were not mastered, limited instructional support for SWD, and failure to provide and support SWD and Black students with career and technical pathways.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest overall decline from 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 was the Algebra 1 EOC achievement dropping from 43% to 34%. In drilling down to components, this is mirrored in our concern for SWD as they had a significant drop for achievement (-10%) and learning gains (-8%). Factors contributing to this decrease could include lack of focus on SWD and lower quartile students for remediation and that the majority of students taking Algebra 1 in 9th grade are coming into 9th grade below grade level in math.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to state data was the ELA lowest quartile (-5%) and math lowest quartile (Algebra 1 focus; -4%). This gap is discussed in detail in previous question A as it was also the area of greatest decline.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

College and Career acceleration increased 2%-7% in every subgroup area, except two (Black maintained at 38% and Asian fell 3%). We focused on providing an opportunity for industry certification for seniors that had not previously had the opportunity during high school due to remediation classes. We eliminated PE electives for 9th grade and allowed only 1 PE course for 10th grade, requiring these grade levels to take at least one Career Technical course. Counselors advised students of industry certification pathways during registration and course selection.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

1. Attendance - students with attendance below 90%: 9th (64), 10th (82), 11th (82), and 12th (124)
2. Level 1 on statewide assessment: 9th (126), 10th (78)

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Lowest quartile learning gains in ELA and Algebra 1
2. Overall learning gains in ELA and Algebra 1
3. SWD Reading and ELA gains
4. SWD and Black students College and Career Readiness acceleration

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the school data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, ELA lower quartile gains is one of our most critical areas of focus. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because we were below the state in lower quartile learning gains by 5%, and we had a decrease of 6% from 2018, which places our struggling students at more risk of being behind grade level in ELA and at risk of not meeting graduation requirements.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see a 11% increase in our school data of ELA lower quartile gains from 37% to 50%, recovering the loss from 2018 and increasing an additional 7%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Keaveny (keavenys@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	An instructional framework, with a focus on purpose and collaboration that allows for adjustment of instruction in response to student data (both student-to-student and teacher-to-teacher), will be used to increase ELA lower quartile learning gains from 37% to 50%. To monitor this strategy, the ELA lower quartile data will be analyzed twice a quarter through common assessments and PLC's by English 1 and English 2 teachers, the literacy coach and administration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support an instructional focus on purpose and collaboration, then teachers can adjust instruction in response to student data on common assessments, and implement reteaching and remediation in support of lower quartile students, increasing their learning gains and mastery of ELA standard-based skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide all Level 1 ELA students in 9th & 10th grade with Intensive Reading support.
2. Provide ESE support facilitation to work directly with the English 1 & English 2 teams and students.
3. Implement flextime with bi-weekly targeted remediation of lower quartile students.
4. Implement weekly PLC's focused on planning, teaching, and learning through the four questions/ instructional framework, with the support of common planning and administration.
5. Implement school-wide literacy plan to increase reading and writing across content areas (LDC and DBQ) with support from school-based professional development, literacy coach, ELA teams and administration.
6. Implement Pre-AP spiraling curriculum and bi-quarterly common assessments in English 1 and English 2 with training and support from College Board and administration.

Who: Administration, Literacy Coach, Teachers

Frequency: Evaluate bi-quarterly

When: 8/24/20-6/4/21

Evidence: Schedule, District Instructional Focus, CWT's Data, Lesson Plans, Flextime Manager, Common Assessment Data, PLC's

Person Responsible Julie Lueallen (robinson-lueallenj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Based on the school data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, Math lower quartile is a critical area of focus, in conjunction with the subsequent school data in Algebra 1 EOC achievement data.
Description and Rationale:	This area was identified as a critical area of need because we were below the state in lower quartile gains by 4%, and we had a decrease of 2% from 2018, which places our struggling students with significant gaps in meeting mastery of entry-level high school mathematics. Algebra 1 is also identified as a critical area within this context as we had a 7% decrease in achievement from 2018- to 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	By focusing on this area, we expect to see a 9% increase in our school data of Math lower quartile gains from 41% to 50%, recovering the loss from 2018 and increasing an additional 5%. We also expect to see an increase in Algebra 1 EOC achievement from 36% to 48%, recovering the loss from 2018 and increasing 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Keith Hunt (huntk@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	An instructional framework, with a focus on purpose and collaboration (both student-to-student and teacher-to-teacher) will be used to increase Math lower quartile learning gains from 41% to 50%, and Algebra 1 EOC achievement from 36% to 48%. To monitor this strategy, the Algebra 1 and Geometry lower quartile data will be analyzed bi-quarterly through common assessments and PLC's by Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers and administration.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we implement, monitor and support an instructional focus on purpose and collaboration, then teachers can adjust instruction in response to student data on common assessments, and implement reteaching and remediation in support of lower quartile students, increasing learning gains and mastery of math skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule ESE support facilitators to work directly with Algebra 1 and Geometry students and teachers.
2. Implement flextime with weekly targeted remediation of lower quartile students.
3. Implement weekly PLC's focused on planning, teaching and learning through the four questions with the support of common planning and administration.
4. Implement Pre-AP spiraling curriculum and bi-quarterly common assessments in Algebra 1 with training and support from College Board and administration.
5. Utilize SAI funds to provide and implement ALEKS bi-weekly.

Who: Administration and Teachers

Frequency: Bi-quarterly

When: 8/24/29-6/4/21

Evidence: Schedule, District Instructional Focus, CWT Data, Lesson Plans, Flextime Manager, Common Assessment Data, PLC's

Person Responsible Julie Lueallen (robinson-lueallenj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Changing systems within an organization requires ERHS be a catalyst for change. Through professional development, staff diversification, and student and organizational advocacy, ERHS is committed to equity for all stakeholders.

Based on subgroup population data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, College & Career Acceleration is a critical area of focus that aligns with equity and diversity and opportunities we provide all students..

This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because only 19% of our SWD and 38% of our Black students graduated high school with either college curriculum exposure or industry certification, which greatly impacts opportunities in post-secondary education and the workforce.

Measurable Outcome: By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in College and Career Acceleration for SWD from 19% to 30% and for Black students from 38% to 48%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Raymond Munoz (munozr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: A school culture with high expectations, positive relationships, restorative practices and an emphasis on collective efficacy will be used to increase the subgroup data College and Career Acceleration with our SWD from 19% to 30% and with our Black students from 38% to 48%. To monitor this strategy, Early Warning System data, scheduling pathways, attendance, and industry certification data will be analyzed quarterly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we implement, support and monitor high expectations, positive relationships, restorative practices and collective efficacy, then we will see an increase in the collective efficacy of SWD and Black students entering dual enrollment, taking AP courses, and competing industry certifications through guidance and support of school faculty and staff.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Flextime with targeted remediation for AP and industry certification support.
 2. Support HSHT program for SWD.
 3. Integrate AP Course and Exam Description instruction to support all students.
 4. Counseling for all students with a focus on industry pathways in 9th & 10th grade, and industry certification in 11th&12th.
 5. ESE support facilitator to work directly with DIT teachers and students.
 6. Implementation of Equity and Diversity team with faculty/student representatives to focus on culture, equity and access at ERHS.
- * "White Fragility" book study
 - * Equity/access student needs assessment
 - * Analysis of referrals/discipline across race/ethnicity
 - * Analyze curriculum bias across content areas
 - * Diversify faculty, SAC and student leadership roles
 - * Increase mentoring programs
 - * Increase percentage of students of color in higher level math and science
 - * Open access and information for post-secondary planning/scholarships for students of color
- Administration, teachers and counselors

Frequency: Bi-quarterly

When: 8/24/20-6/4/21

Person Responsible Julie Lueallen (robinson-lueallenj@lake.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on ESSA subgroup population data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis, the following components are critical areas of focus: ELA and Math lower quartile gains, and SWD (all areas).
These focus areas were identified as a critical areas of need because they fell below the federal guideline of 41% which indicates that East Ridge High School is not responsive in moving minority and special populations one or more school years of growth.

Measurable Outcome:

By focusing on these areas, we expect the following results:

1. ELA Achievement: SWD 18% to 41%
 2. Math Achievement: SWD 35% to 41%
 3. ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gains: SWD 25% to 41%; Blk 38% to 41%, Hsp 39% to 41%, Wht 33% to 41%
 4. Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains: SWD 35% to 41%, Blk 31% to 41%; Hsp 39% to 41%
 5. Social Studies Achievement: SWD 37% to 41%
 6. College & Career Acceleration: SWD 19% to 35%; Blk 38% to 41%
- (With a focus on ELA and Math lower quartile gains, we also expect an impact on overall learning gains not listed here.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Frana (franam@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

An instructional framework, with a focus on professional learning communities that plan what students need to know and be able to do, how will we know if they know it, how we will respond if they don't know it, and how we will respond if they do know it, will be used to achieve the learning gains established in our measurable outcomes. To monitor this strategy, the lower quartile and subgroup population data will be analyzed bi-quarterly through common assessments and PLC's across all content areas by teachers, coaches and administration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

If we implement, monitor and support PLC's with a cyclical focus on the four planning, teaching, and learning questions, then teachers across all content areas can adjust instruction, remediate and re-teach in response to evidence-based student data provided by common assessments in support of lower quartile and subgroup populations, increasing their learning gains and mastery of core content tested areas as well as school-wide curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement/maintain quarterly mentoring groups for Black and Hispanic males with a focus on school success.
2. Provide Level 1 ELA students in 9th-12th grades with remedial reading support.
3. Schedule ESE support facilitators to work directly with SWD in tested areas (English 1, English 2, Algebra 1, Geometry, Biology, and Digital Information Technology).
4. Implement bi-weekly remediation targeting lower quartile and SWD through flextime.
5. Implement weekly PLC's focused on planning, teaching and learning through the four questions with the support of common planning and administration.
6. Implement school-wide literacy plan daily to increase reading and writing across content areas (LDC and DBQ) with support from school-based professional development, literacy coach and administration; include a focused concentration on supporting 9th&10th grade core courses of Earth/Space Science and World History, and Career Technical Education as the plan and monitor literacy and writing during their PLC's.

Person Responsible Julie Lueallen (robinson-lueallenj@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The data identified in 2.E. is addressed in the 4th focus area for Students with Disabilities. All other areas were within the ESSA subgroup guidelines.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

East Ridge High School established and maintains active membership with parents, families, and other community stakeholders through the School Advisory Council (SAC). Members are representative of our populations and includes teachers, non-instructional, parents, administrators and community partners. ERHS participates monthly in the Chamber of Commerce meetings, and has business community support through the High School High Tech program. ERHS communicates with all stakeholders through the website, school messenger, Facebook and Twitter. ERHS hosts an ELL parent night yearly and provides ELL after school tutoring in ELA and math.

East Ridge High School provides an orientation for each grade level in August prior to the start of each school year. The freshman class receives a more in depth version of the orientation, including campus tours and interaction with teachers and student government representatives. Parents also have 90 minutes information session during new student orientation. In the spring, school counselors and administrator attend an orientation at each of the feeder middle schools to help students register for classes, which is followed up with a parent night to go over the same material. Students meet one-on-one with a counselor to schedule classes and make changes to schedules. Students and parents schedule appointments as needed, and their request, throughout the school year. Counselors, teacher and administrators meet with students and parents on a variety of issues that impact high school success throughout the year.

ERHS has a mental health counselor on-site for social-emotional learning and supports students with mental health challenges through one-on-one sessions, evaluations, referrals as well as and parent and faculty education and communication. The PASS allocation provides restorative practices among students and faculty, and social-emotional support for students on-campus in lieu of out-of-school suspensions. Sophomore, Junior and Senior classes have additional opportunities to attend class meeting and college

and career nights throughout the school year, that allows the opportunity to meet with school counselors and college representatives.

Systems, Leadership, Instruction, and Culture (SLIC)- This model allows focus on our vision, communicating strategy and collaborative problem-solving. SLIC aligns goals to specific, measurable, attainable, realistic and timely strategic objectives, establishing a functional structure conducive to continuing success.

Social/Emotional Support:

*Anti-Bullying Programs

*PASS

*Capturing Kids Hearts

*Storming the Castle

* Meet the Knights Orientation

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00