

Lake County Schools

# East Ridge Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## East Ridge Middle School

13201 EXCALIBUR RD, Clermont, FL 34711

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission at East Ridge Middle School is to intentionally create opportunities for all students to become skilled, passionate, critical thinkers.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a dynamic, progressive, and collaborative learning community, embracing change and diversity while cultivating lifelong learners.

Our Belief is that we wear our SHIELD every day.

S – Self-motivated

H – Hardworking

I – Innovative

E – Empathetic

L – Life long learners

D – Dedicated to the success of ourselves and others.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sidoruk, Jamie	Principal	Started July 2018, oversees other administrators, Department Chairs, PLT Leaders, Guiding Coalition, SAC, School Budget, Clerical/Bookkeeper, Social Studies Department, CTE, and AVID, School Budget and Data and overall working of the school
Everett, Christine	Assistant Principal	Master Schedule, Guidance, Attendance, Course Recovery, Textbooks, Social Media, School Calendar, State Testing
Brooks, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Science/PE/Fine Arts Departments, MTSS, MIP Points Coordinator, SAI Budget, SHIELD/Flextime
Williams, Keith	Assistant Principal	Math, Custodial staff, Active Supervision, Transportation, School Safety Coordinator

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

ERMS meets monthly with a School Advisory Council in which we share information about events happening at the school, as well as fundraising events, and monies spent on our students/staff here. SAC approves SAI budget as well as areas within our school improvement plan.

**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Ms. Brooks monitors the progress towards the SIP monthly and shares with the SAC committee on a bi-monthly basis.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	56%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	57%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Native American Students (AMI) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	63	109	240	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	31	48	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	23	21	72	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	31	22	79	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	56	68	179	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	36	48	139	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	116	149	354

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

## Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	88	93	267	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	32	42	80	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	6	12	60	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	55	88	188	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	56	80	232	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	133	175	409

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	16	43

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	88	93	267	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	32	42	80	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	6	12	60	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	18	33	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	55	88	188	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	56	80	232	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	101	133	175	409	

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	16	16	43

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review****ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	43	49	60	45	50	61		
ELA Learning Gains				52			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			35		
Math Achievement*	69	52	56	67	33	36	64		
Math Learning Gains				71			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			43		
Science Achievement*	58	42	49	61	50	53	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	64	68	75	54	58	74		
Middle School Acceleration	79	70	73	87	45	49	86		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					67	70			
ELP Progress		44	40		71	76	67		

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	568
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

### ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	2	
ELL	46			
AMI	64			
ASN	76			
BLK	54			
HSP	63			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	74			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	55			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL	50			
AMI	62			
ASN	77			
BLK	56			
HSP	59			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	53			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	57			69			58	78	79			
SWD	25			36			26	48	50		5	
ELL	40			54			32	53	50		5	
AMI	45			82							2	
ASN	68			84			60	76	93		5	
BLK	44			56			43	54	71		5	
HSP	51			63			50	77	72		5	
MUL	65			69			62	87	88		5	

## 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	63			75			68	85	81		5	
FRL	42			59			38	69	69		5	

## 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	60	52	38	67	71	57	61	75	87			
SWD	21	40	35	29	55	53	22	41	57			
ELL	43	48	44	46	58	57	29	65	62			
AMI	50	47		61	71			80				
ASN	69	57		84	74		86	73	96			
BLK	47	42	27	49	68	56	55	73	90			
HSP	55	53	43	58	68	57	47	69	79			
MUL	52	51	50	65	78	67	47	45	70			
PAC												
WHT	67	54	40	77	74	57	72	81	89			
FRL	45	45	31	51	64	56	47	61	78			

## 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	61	56	35	64	58	43	65	74	86			67
SWD	23	36	26	29	42	38	23	45	67			
ELL	40	53	48	49	58	50	33	44				67
AMI	65	53		82	53							
ASN	79	63		81	68		83	82	100			
BLK	50	54	37	50	50	37	56	63	66			
HSP	52	53	34	54	52	46	53	59	83			
MUL	58	45		57	43		69	71				
PAC												
WHT	68	60	33	71	64	48	73	85	90			
FRL	44	47	32	47	48	40	49	60	71			

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	51%	43%	8%	47%	4%
08	2023 - Spring	56%	46%	10%	47%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	46%	7%	47%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	55%	1%	54%	2%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	47%	-7%	48%	-8%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	56%	19%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	44%	14%	44%	14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	51%	41%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	60%	*	63%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	67%	10%	66%	11%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school 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 component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA lowest 25th percentile. We have been working to perfect our PLTs as well as focus on essential standards gained 3 points from the previous year.

New curriculum; Amplify

New to LCS teachers; New Literacy Coach; New to BEST standards

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was ELA proficiency. We have been working to perfect our PLTs as well as focus on essential standards.

New curriculum; Amplify

New to LCS teachers; New Literacy Coach; New to BEST standards

**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.**

Biggest gap; 7th ELA achievement;

Mobility of teachers; mid year hire; new to Amplify curriculum; lack of knowledge of BEST standards; misalignment of task to standards

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement with a growth of 13 percent. Thought it was a year to implement new content, our PLTs did a lot of work around essential standards and our SHIELD block which targeted students who needed just in time support.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

One area of concern continues to be our suspensions. We would like to continue to decrease those numbers so that our students spend more time in the classroom learning essential standards.

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

1. ELA achievement
2. Math achievement
3. Suspensions

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

While reviewing the data, our biggest areas of improvement are ELA as well as our lowest quartile in ELA and Math, along with our learning gains. This year, ERMS is really digging into the "Taking Action" text by Richard Dufour. We are expanding our learning on purposefully working within a PLC to intentionally impact student learning by identifying the Essential Standards across our core content as well as building a strong MTSS process. By being clear as a team in these areas, we can align our grade level common assessments and focus on the vital aspects of each core content, as well as remediating. We will use our common planning during our PLT time to reflect on current data and adjust instruction accordingly to meet our student needs in real time. By coupling this with the Instructional Framework and focusing on "Purpose" and "Collaboration" we will be able to target these areas of need and increase student achievement overall.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

An increase of 3% across all core content state assessment, along with lowest quartile and learning gains.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Learning walks by the administration team, PLT weekly collaboration as well as documentation on our Essential Standards Chart, FFAST assessments, end of the year state testing, Instructional Coaching

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jamie Sidoruk (sidorukj@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Lake County Instructional Framework, Learning Walks, the WICOR Program (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, Reading), PLC's/PLT's

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Identify strengths & growth areas during our PLT's and Leadership meetings. Continue digging into our "Taking Action" text

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In order to better support the needs of our students with disabilities, our students who need acceleration, and our students who need remediation we have built an Intervention Block ("SHIELD") into our master schedule. SHIELD is an opportunity for teachers, during the school day, to implement intentional interventions for their own students, including just in time support. The intense focus on this time of the day combines three most impact-full educational practices: Collective Teacher Efficacy, Teacher Estimates of Student Achievement, and Response to Intervention. By continuing our work during SHEILD and utilizing FlexTime Manager, we will continue to be purposeful with our academic time, along with students taking ownership of their learning.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

More than 60% of our bottom quartile students will show learning gains on statewide assessments, and our students with disabilities will grow from 35% to 40% in ELA , as well as from 53% to 60% in Math.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Daily Learning Walks by Leadership Team, Professional Learning Teams, Common Assessments

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jamie Sidoruk (sidorukj@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Response to intervention will be implemented through SHEILD during the school day for this area of focus to increase the percentage of students in the bottom quartile that show learning gains over the 60% mark, as well as our students with disabilities will grow from 35% to 40% in our ELA lowest quartile, as well as from 53% to 60% in our Math Lowest Quartile.

ELA SHIELD co-teachers will be using the iXL program and Math SHIELD co-teachers will be using ALEKs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor, and support walk to intervention, we will see over 60% of our bottom quartile students show learning gains on the 2023 statewide assessments.

Previous year data shows proper implementation of iXL and ALEKs closes student learning gaps and helps students who are below grade level.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on EWS Data from the needs assessment analysis, out of school suspensions is one of our most critical areas of focus, based on the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 data. Though we dropped significantly, we'd like to continue this process. This area of focus was identified as a critical need because of avoidable out of school suspensions which negatively impact student learning.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In 2022-2023 we had a total of 43 students with one or more suspensions. We expect to see a decrease in the number of students with out of school suspensions to by 5%.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Monthly discipline data will be shared at Leadership meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jamie Sidoruk (sidorukj@lake.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports will be used to decrease the number of students with out of school suspensions by 5%. Some PBIS strategies that will be used will include but not be limited to school wide rewards and recognition for students who display our desired character traits of SHIELD (Self-Motivated, Hard Working, Innovative, Empathetic, Life-Long-Learners, Dedicated to the success of ourselves and others; providing teachers with a common classroom intervention list, and providing students with agendas. To monitor this strategy, discipline data will be analyzed monthly by the PBIS Team and adjustments made to the PBIS plan and PASS program. We will continue our department chair meetings, as well as our PLT's, to make sure all of our students have equitable experiences on our campus and with our teachers.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor, and support PBIS strategies and go forward with our Guiding Coalition Team there will be a decrease in the number of students out of school suspended.

Based on EWS Data from the needs assessment analysis, out of school suspensions is one of our most critical areas of focus, based on the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 data. Though we dropped significantly, we'd like to continue this process. This area of focus was identified as a critical need because of avoidable out of school suspensions which negatively impact student learning.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

ERMS meets as a team to review the budget and align it with our SIP. We make sure it is aligned and included within the areas of focus within our SIP. We then present the SIP and SAI budget to our SAC committee for approval before submission.

Our SAI budget for this year will be utilized to provide support to level one and two students in Avid and tutoring. We plan to purchase Avid tutors to assist our Avid Elective students as they work through tutorials in ELA and Math. Additionally, we will hire certified teachers in ELA at Math to tutor students who received a level one and two on their 2022-2023 FAST Assessment. The funds will also be allocated to provide tutoring over the summer to students who require additional support before we commence the 2024-2025 school year.

Here is a list of items that we intend to buy for our dedicated tutors and tutoring program for the year.

Calculators

Pencils

Notebook Paper

Spirals

Folders