

Lake County Schools

East Ridge High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	12
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

East Ridge High School

13322 EXCALIBUR RD, Clermont, FL 34711

<https://erh.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.

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, 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
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 ethical behaviors. Oversees all administrators and leadership team.
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 ethical behaviors. Oversees Social Studies, World Languages and Testing.
Calabrese, Eric	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 ethical behaviors. Oversees Science and Fine/Performing Arts.
Hunt, Keith	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 ethical behaviors. Oversees Mathematics and Athletics.
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 ethical behaviors. Oversees Curriculum, Exceptional Student Education and Guidance.
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 ethical behaviors. Oversees Career-Technical Education and School Safety.
Scott, Reshonda	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 ethical behaviors. Oversees English Language Arts.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Raczkowski, Greg	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 ethical behaviors. Oversees Reading, Physical Education and Algebra 1 team.
Coley, Gail	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Decerbo, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Fine/Performing Arts Department Chair
Ferrell, Timothy	Teacher, K-12	Social Science Department Chair
Furber, Clarissa	Teacher, K-12	World Language Department Chair
Long, Carly	Teacher, K-12	English Language Arts Department Chair
Lopez, Diane	Reading Coach	Literacy Coach
Jemison-Martin, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	Reading Department Chair
Marconi, Nicole	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Moses, Tessine	Graduation Coach	Graduation Facilitator
Pearson, Patti	School Counselor	Guidance Department Chair
Pitts, Kenneth	Teacher, Career/Technical	Career-Technical Department Chair
Shaffer, Craig	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair

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.

The administrative team begins the process of SIP development by analyzing accountability data and reviewing progress toward goals from the previous year's SIP. The process then involves faculty and staff as they return to campus through both the leadership team and guiding coalition. Targets are provided and feedback is generated during opening week content meetings. The SAC, including parents, student leaders and community members have a final review and feedback before the SIP is finalized.

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))

The SIP is formally monitored each quarter as current test and progress monitoring data becomes available. Data is analyzed and progress is reviewed through the same process as the initial SIP development. Administrators, leadership team, guiding coalition, content teams (faculty), and SAC are involved in the process. Data chats are an integral part of monitoring and adjusting SIP goals.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	63%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B

School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	741	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	170	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	164	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	
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	0	0	0	1022

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	0	0	0	86
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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*	49	45	50	49	45	51	53		
ELA Learning Gains				44			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			33		
Math Achievement*	47	40	38	38	33	38	43		
Math Learning Gains				35			29		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29			30		
Science Achievement*	69	62	64	69	38	40	76		
Social Studies Achievement*	68	62	66	73	41	48	78		
Middle School Acceleration					38	44			
Graduation Rate	96	90	89	98	59	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	60	61	65	75	64	67	73		
ELP Progress	37	56	45	40			47		

* 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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	580
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	98

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	42			
ELL	43			
AMI	49			
ASN	82			
BLK	57			
HSP	56			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	72			

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%
FRL	55			

2021-22 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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	41			
AMI	60			
ASN	71			
BLK	50			
HSP	47			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	48			

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

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
All Students	49			47			69	68		96	60	37
SWD	24			23			49	37		24	6	
ELL	22			33			56	27		43	7	37
AMI	50			36				60			3	
ASN	65			69			94	84		80	6	
BLK	48			37			57	65		42	6	
HSP	42			37			59	59		59	7	39
MUL	48			47			78	70		54	6	

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	55			58			79	77		65	6	
FRL	41			35			61	59		50	7	44

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	49	44	30	38	35	29	69	73		98	75	40
SWD	13	27	27	12	22	24	32	41		93	41	
ELL	25	33	29	27	42	35	24	33		100	68	40
AMI	60											
ASN	73	65		55	35		76	82		100	82	
BLK	38	41	29	28	32	32	67	67		99	64	
HSP	40	39	32	30	28	20	53	69		97	74	38
MUL	52	37	0	42	33		68	73		92	83	
PAC												
WHT	59	49	31	49	43	42	83	77		98	80	
FRL	39	39	26	28	28	21	54	70		97	71	53

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	53	45	33	43	29	30	76	78		99	73	47
SWD	21	25	23	25	29	30	50	44		98	42	
ELL	28	51	42	25	33	39	49	68		100	62	47
AMI	29	38										
ASN	66	41		56	23		90	87		97	87	
BLK	45	41	33	30	31	36	72	64		100	64	
HSP	43	44	34	35	28	33	67	76		99	73	55
MUL	46	46		39	24		83	69		100	64	
PAC												
WHT	64	47	32	54	31	23	80	85		98	77	
FRL	42	38	29	32	27	30	70	71		98	66	47

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
10	2023 - Spring	45%	44%	1%	50%	-5%
09	2023 - Spring	51%	44%	7%	48%	3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	51%	-29%	50%	-28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	53%	49%	4%	48%	5%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	60%	6%	63%	3%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	60%	6%	63%	3%

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 data component showing the lowest performance is Algebra 1. Though achievement increased from the year before, from 18% to 20%, it is still the lowest performing component, as it is across the district. Contributing factors include experience of the teacher, and failure to identify essential standards and track for student mastery.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year is achievement on the US History EOC, which dropped 6% from 73% to 67%. The contributing factor to this decline is teacher turnover during the school year.

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 the state average is Algebra 1 for 9th grade. Performance on the Algebra 1 EOC for the state is 36%. East Ridge High School is at 22%. As this is also our lowest performing area, the contributing factors remain the same: inexperienced teachers and failure to establish essential standards and track student mastery.

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

The data component with the most improvement was Geometry. Achievement increased from 42% in 2022 to 53% in 2023. New actions included consistency in the work of the Geometry Professional Learning Team, a veteran teaching team, a focus on essential standards, and targeted reteaching and remediation on essential standards.

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

In reviewing early warning data, the most significant area of concern are the percentage of students in 9th and 10th grade that received more than 2 D's or F's (9th - 23%, 10th - 26%) which impacts graduation progress and promotion eligibility at the end of 11th grade. Seventy-four 11th graders were retained in 11th grade at the end of 2023.

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

1. Increase achievement in Algebra 1 from 22% to 51%.
2. Increase ESSA SWD subgroup achievement data from 33% to 43%.
3. Increase mastery of essential standards as reflected in grading practices for 9th & 10th graders:
 - * Decrease number of students with more than 2 D/F in 9th grade from 23% average to 15%.
 - * Decrease number of students with more than 2 D/F in 10th grade from 26% average to 15%.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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 the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, achievement on the Algebra 1 EOC is a critical area of focus. Math mastery and progression has a direct impact in meeting graduation requirements. Achievement and learning gains on the Algebra 1 EOC increased in 2023 from 18% to 20% but still falls significantly below our 2022 SIP goal of 37%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on Algebra 1 identifying and tracking student mastery on essential standards during Professional Learning Teams, and remediation and relearning opportunities, we expect to see learning gains in Algebra 1 increase from 20% to 37%.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly summative assessments from B.E.S.T. PM1/PM2 and Pre-AP Unit Checks will be used to progress monitor learning gains on essential standards with measurable outcomes of 3-4% each quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Raczkowski (raczkowskig@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.)

Targeted intervention through identification of essential standards, mastery tracking and one-on-one and small group remediation during flextime will be used to support students in Algebra 1, thereby improving progress in mastery of the identified essential standards. Resources to provide targeted Algebra 1 intervention will be:

- * Pre-AP Curriculum
- *ALEKS
- *Flextime
- *Targeted Afterschool Tutoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor and support Professional Learning Teams targeted re-teaching and remediation during flextime, the percentage of students that show learning gains through the year will increase from 20% to 37%.

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.

Analyze Algebra 1 state and pre-assessment data from Pre-AP Unit Checks to identify essential standards needing to be mastered. Develop instruction aligned to essential standards within Professional Learning Teams.

Person Responsible: Greg Raczkowski (raczkowskig@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023-May 2024

Targeted re-teach and remediation time for essential standards during the school day, twice a week September-December and four times a week January-April.

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

By When: Weekly per schedule in description.

Training of Pre-AP Algebra 1 teachers on curriculum and implementation of spiraling curriculum.

Person Responsible: Greg Raczkowski (raczkowskig@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 2023 for training; August2023-May2024 for implementation.

Use of ALEKS for additional Tier 3 remedial support in Algebra 1.

Person Responsible: Greg Raczkowski (raczkowskig@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023-May 2024

Utilizing SAI funding for afterschool tutoring and grade recovery through mastery of essential standards (\$11,000) and SAC funding for concordant score (SAT/ACT) registration (\$5,000).

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

By When: September 2023-May 2024

Utilize SAI funds for teacher writing teams to analyze data, identify essential standards and develop common assessments (\$8000).

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

By When: September 2023-May 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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 ESSA data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, the Federal Index for Students with Disabilities is our most critical area of need. This area of focus was identified as a critical area of need because only our Students with Disabilities subgroup missed the federal target of 41%, coming in at 33% for 2022. If we focus our instruction within the Lake Instructional Framework, with teachers focusing on identifying essential standards, tracking student mastery of essential standards and providing targeted remediation on essential standards, achievement for Student with Disabilities at East Ridge High School will increase.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on this area, we expect to see an increase in Students with Disabilities achievement, as determined by the Federal Index, from 33% to 43%.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly summative assessments (APM/FAST/B.E.S.T. and Pre-AP Unit Checks) will be used to increase achievement and learning gains as addressed in the measurable outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacy Keaveny (keavenys@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.)

Professional Learning Teams, and the programs noted below for each area, will be used to increase student achievement and learning gains by 3%-5% each quarter in order to meet the measurable outcome. To monitor this strategy, student progress monitoring data from the resources listed by administration, the leadership team and content areas teams within our Professional Learning Teams.

*Achieve 3000 (ELA)

*StudySync (ELA)

* Pre-AP Curriculum (ELA and Algebra 1)

*Khan Academy (ELA)

*ALEKS (Algebra & Geometry)

*Flextime (all content areas)

*Targeted Afterschool Tutoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor and support Professional Learning Teams targeted re-teaching and remediation of essential standards during with these resources, the percentage of students that show learning gains through the year will increase from 33% to 43%.

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.

Analyze SWD state and pre-assessment data from Pre-AP Unit Checks to identify essential standards needing to be mastered. Develop instruction aligned to essential standards within Professional Learning Teams.

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

By When: August 2022

Develop protocols with Learning Strategy teachers to focus instructional time on reading and math essential standard support integrated into Learning Strategy standards and instruction.

Person Responsible: Nicole Marconi (marconin@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2024

Tested area support facilitators will provide targeting re-teaching and remediation during flextime to support the content area standards and student mastery. Support facilitation teachers will use the listed resources for support of essential standard mastery with the classroom teacher.

Person Responsible: Stacy Keaveny (keavenys@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: September 2023-May 2024

Utilizing SAI funding for afterschool tutoring and essential standard grade recovery (\$11,000) and SAC funding for concordant score (SAT/ACT) registration (\$5,000).

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

By When: September 2023-2024

Utilize SAI funds for teacher writing teams to analyze data, identify essential standards and develop common assessments (\$8000).

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

By When: September 2023-May 2024

#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 the EWS data from the Needs Assessment/Analysis section, East Ridge High School had an average of 23% of 9th and 26% of 10th graders with 2 or more D/F's for 2023.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on student mastery essential standards and aligned grading practices, we expect to see a decrease in 9th & 10th grade students earning two or more D/F from an average of 25% to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

D/F reports will be analyzed twice a quarter for trends in students success as indicated by grades and aligned to the identified essential standards by Professional Learning Teams. The identified struggling students will be assigned specific remediation time with that content area teacher for targeted intervention on essential standards and progress monitoring will continue every 4.5 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Julie Lueallen (robinson-lueallenj@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.)

Targeted Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention through identification and monitoring of essential standards, mastery tracking and one-on-one and small group remediation during flextime will be used to support students in mastery of essential standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we implement, monitor and support students through targeted intervention on essential standards, mastery tracking and one-on-one and small group remediation during flextime, student learning, mastery and achievement will increase the percentage of students earning 2 or more D/F will decrease by an average of 10% by the end of the year.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Analyze bi-quarterly gradebook data to identify low-performing students and coordinate essential standards needing to be mastered. Develop instruction aligned to essential standards within Professional Learning Teams.

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

By When: September 2023 - April 2024

Analyze student grading and summative assessment data quarterly to identify students in need of flextime remediation on essential standards, comparing alignment to grading practices.

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

By When: Every 4.5 weeks; August 2023-May 2024

Utilizing SAI funding for afterschool tutoring and grade recovery (\$11,000) and SAC funding for concordant score (SAT/ACT) registration (\$5,000).

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

By When: October 2023

Utilizing SAI funds for teacher writing teams to identify essential standards and develop common assessment and remediation instruction.

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

By When: September 2023 - April 2024

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).

Resources allocated to East Ridge High School include Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) and School Advisory Committee (SAC) funds.

SAI funds are reviewed and needs are identified during pre-planning with the school leadership team and departments as previous year achievement data is analyzed. Funds are then allocated to support the goals of the School Improvement Plan and approved by stakeholders through East Ridge High School's School Advisory Committee. SAI funds for 2023-2024 were recommended for the following categories:

- * Teacher writing teams to identify essential standards, mastery tracking and instructional remediation at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels (\$8,000 +benefits)
- * Afterschool tutoring on essential standards targeting SWD and low socio-economic status students (\$11,000 +benefits)
- * Test prep resource supplies for low achieving and low socio-economic students in 11th & 12th grade to be used in Intensive Reading to support achievement of concordant scores for graduation (\$2,282.30).

SAC funds are reviewed and needs are identified during pre-planning with the school leadership team, departments and the School Advisory Committee as previous year data is analyzed at the first SAC meeting in September. Funds are then allocated, voted on and approved through SAC meetings in September and October with additional resources allocated as needed, voted and approved during the school year. SAC voted and approved the following allocation of funds in September:

- * ACT & SAT testing fees for low socio-economic students at risk of not graduating due to failure to meet graduation testing requirements.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA****Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

After being reviewed and approved by all stakeholders attending SAC meetings, the School Improvement Plan is shared and reviewed with faculty and staff at the first faculty meeting after approval. The goals are addressed in parent meetings through the year (orientations, Meet the Knights Open House, future scheduling orientation) in a way that aligns the SIP goals with parental understanding of graduation requirements and preparing for college and career. The SIP continues to be reviewed by faculty as Professional Learning Teams analyze their bi-quarterly data and adjust their student targets to achieve SIP goals. The SIP is also posted on at www.lake.k12.fl.us/erh.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

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, students, 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, mailings and personal phone calls for critical information such as targeted tutoring for ELL, SWD and struggling students.

Parent meetings focused on orientation, success at high school, federal aid, scholarships, course registration, college and career planning and other critical high school areas take place during parent meetings and student meetings both after school and during the school day.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

For 2023-2024, East Ridge High School is focusing on identifying essential standards, tracking student mastery and providing timely and targeted remediation and reteaching through the structure of the Professional Learning Team. All SIP goals can be support with this process, and all focus on strengthening the academic program at ERHS.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

East Ridge High School has 10 Career-Technical Pathways support by Lake County Schools and funding.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

East Ridge High School has six counselors and one mental health liaison on campus. Counselors are available every lunch shift in Guidance Express (near the cafeteria) for student to ask questions or make appointments. The mental health liaison provides crisis assessments and on-going counseling for students.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

East Ridge High School has 10 Career-Technical programs, 20 Advanced Placement courses, 3 AICE courses, the AP Capstone Diploma Program and the AICE Diploma program on campus. Students also have access to dual enrollment with Lake-Sumter State College and University of Florida.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The Response to Intervention (RTI) model is used at East Ridge High School and integrated into how we assess bi-quarterly data as outlined in our SIP goals. All students start at Tier 1 with classroom instruction. Formative assessments are used throughout the lesson to move students to Tier 2 and additional classroom instruction and support. Students moving to Tier 3, whether they have a program placement of not, are supported through PLT's and ERHS Guiding Coalition.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional development provided at East Ridge High School support SIP goals, the Professional Learning Team process and Response to Intervention. Additional professional development to support these areas is provided by the district.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00

Total:		\$0.00
--------	--	--------

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No