



Northshore School District

East Ridge Action Plan

SECTION 1: THE BACKGROUND

School Name: East Ridge

Year: 2026-27

The Central Vision: (North Star) At EAST RIDGE, we provide a learning community that recognizes all students as capable learners. We promote high standards, expect accountability and celebrate success. Cooperation, responsibility, and confidence promote our goals of life-long learning and responsible citizenship.

Focus Population: (Who is the furthest from racial and educational justice?) Students on IEPs and students served in our English Language Development program.

Learning Problem: (Big Picture) Our students on IEPs and our English learners are not showing the same amount of growth in math and reading compared to other students.

SECTION 2: THE SYSTEMIC NARRATIVE

ROOT CAUSE

The central node or pattern that connects your academic, behavioral, and cultural challenges.

The Holistic Inquiry	Response
The Surface Symptoms <i>(What data points are flashing red?)</i>	Math Data (as measured by Spring 2026 I-Ready Diagnostic) 68% of English Learners Met Annual Typical growth in Math, compared to 74% of other students. 41% of Students on IEPs Met Stretch growth in Math, compared to 44% of other students. 17% of students on IEPs were below standard in number sense, compared to 8% of other students. 27% of students on IEPs were below standard in Algebraic Sense, compared to 6% of other students. 25% of English learners were below standard in number sense, compared to 8% of other students. 18% of English learners were below standard in Algebraic Sense, compared to 6% of other students. Reading Data (as measured by Spring 2026 I-Ready Diagnostic) 39% of English Learners Met Annual Stretch growth in Reading, compared to 50% of other students.

	• 46% of Students on IEPs Met Annual Stretch growth in Reading, compared to 50% of other students. • 20% of students on IEPs were below standard in Phonics, compared to 4% of other students • 24% of students on IEPs were below standard in Comprehension, compared to 8% of other students • 11% of English learners were below standard in Phonics, compared to 4% of other students • 21% of English learners were below standard in Comprehension, compared to 8% of other students SEL Data (as measured by the Spring 2026 Panorama survey in grades 3-5) • 59% of students on IEPs, and 50% of English learners had positive responses in the Classroom Effort category, compared to 79% of all students • 54% of students on IEPs had positive responses in the Positive Feelings category, compared to 70% of all students • 41% of English learners had positive responses in the Sense of Belonging category, compared to 64% of all students
The Systemic Root (What are the causes? Are they interconnected and how?)	We are still developing consistent implementation of language-rich, inclusive high-leverage Tier I instruction. This may be limiting access to grade-level learning and access for students on IEPs and our English learners. This impacts academic growth and achievement, student confidence, and sense of belonging. Students with identified needs in phonics, comprehension, number and operations, and algebraic sense may not be receiving aligned, systematic, explicit, or cumulative Tier 2 instruction they need to close gaps. Students with challenges in emotional regulation and behavior may not have sufficient supports to access consistent, coherent academic instruction There is not sufficient structured time or process for ELD teachers and Special Education teachers to collaborate with general education teachers before instruction

SECTION 3: THE INTERCONNECTED ACTION MAP

THEORY OF ACTION

If we strengthen and align Tier I instruction through consistent, language-rich, high-leverage teaching practices, while building coherent systems of intervention for academics and social/emotional learning, then students on IEPs and English Learners will increase their academic achievement, confidence, and sense of belonging. When students have equitable access to academic language, structured opportunities for discourse, and appropriate scaffolds, they are better able to engage deeply with grade-level content and demonstrate sustained academic growth.

SYSTEMIC GOAL:

Increase academic achievement and growth for students on IEPs and English learners in mathematics and literacy by strengthening Tier I instruction, improving language access, and increasing student belonging,

emotional regulation, and engagement.

Multidimensional Systems	Strategic Activities (The "Work")	Resource Inputs (The "Fuel")
Instruction: The theories of learning and the pedagogy - what we teach, and how we make it reach every learner (<i>Instructional & Academic</i>)	Activity: <i>e.g., Training staff on "Universal Design for Learning" (collaborative problem solving).</i> Common, consistent Tier 1 pacing for math and reading instruction, communicated to ELD and SPED staff Consistent high-leverage instructional practices: 1. Teacher clarity and success criteria 2. Access to meaning and structure through explicit teaching 3. Structured, accountable student discourse 4. Foundational skills practice 5. Formative assessment and responsive instruction 6. Targeted intervention SEL instructional practices: • Consistent Tier 1 <i>Second Step</i> SEL instruction • Students identified as at risk for belonging or for social emotional or behavior skills will receive targeted interventions and supports	Resources: <i>e.g., Professional Development Days, Math Coach time.</i> • Professional development in UDL and high-leverage Tier 1 math and reading strategies • <i>Math Genius Squad</i> subscriptions for all teachers and paraeducators ◦ Quick Practice/Daily Routines slides • <i>Haggerty</i> for phonemic awareness intervention groups • <i>Sonday</i> for phonics intervention for English learners and students with IEP goals in reading • Student IEPs and ELD Plans
Culture: Shared values, beliefs, norms, behaviors, and practices that shape how people interact, make decisions, and work together (<i>Cultural & Emotional</i>)	Activity: <i>e.g., Advisory lessons on "Growth Mindset" & Student-Led Conferences.</i> • We will commit to the essential practices and the students we are collectively responsible for • Emphasis on collective responsibility and efficacy through collaborative planning, quarterly data meetings, and professional development • Growth mindset, self-regulation, and executive functioning lessons and practices embedded in Tier 1 instruction	Resources: <i>e.g., SEL Curriculum, Scheduling time for conferences.</i> • Staff Meetings and other contractual PD/Collaborative time • TIDE center and <i>Math Genius Squad</i> resources

	We will empower paraeducators through clearly defined roles and responsibilities and aligned professional development	for collaborative unit planning Paraeducator PD for high-leverage strategies during push in and pull out student instruction
Structure: The schedules, policies, roles, and resources that make the work possible - or prevent it <i>(Structural & Policy)</i>	Activity: <i>e.g., Changing the Master Schedule to create longer blocks for deep work; Revising the grading policy.</i> - Inclusive master schedule with math and reading WIN times for every grade level - Develop structures and schedules for collaborative planning time for gen ed teachers with ELD and SPED staff - Guidance team supports for students with behavior or emotional regulation getting in the way of learning - Develop structures for teams to review data, plan instruction and strategies, and record progress - Develop decision-making rules for reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension) and for math (fact fluency and prerequisite skills)	Resources: <i>e.g., Scheduling Committee, School Board approval.</i> - Agreed-upon master schedule - Data collection tools - Shared-Decision-Making process - SDLT - Guidance Team - District MTSS matrix for SEL and behavior - Sensory re-set room

SECTION 4: THE RIPPLE EFFECT SCAN

SYSTEMS THINKING

Holistic leaders anticipate consequences. Before acting, scan for how this plan might unintentionally hurt another part of the system.

Potential Negative Ripple	The Mitigation Strategy	Cross-System Connection
<i>e.g., If we pull students for intervention, they might miss "fun" electives and lose a sense of belonging.</i>	<i>e.g., Interventions will be scheduled during "WIN Time" (What I Need) so no electives are missed.</i>	<i>Which multi-dimensional system does this connect to? How and what is the implication?</i>
Students may be pulled for intervention and miss enrichment, choice time, or community-building experiences, which could	Schedule interventions within protected instructional blocks (WIN time) so students do not miss specialist classes, enrichment, or community-building	Culture + Structure: This connects to student belonging and school climate. Academic intervention must not reduce access to joyful learning

impact belonging and engagement.	opportunities. Ensure intervention is supplemental rather than a replacement.	experiences or weaken students' sense of school identity and connection.
Teachers may feel overwhelmed by expectations to implement Tier 1 culturally-responsive and language rich instruction, data-driven planning for Tier 2 and 3 interventions simultaneously.	Provide clear “non-negotiables” or “essential practices” to provide clarity, consistency, and focus. Reinforce a small number of inclusive, high-leverage instructional practices. Provide professional development and collaborative common planning time.	Instruction + Structure: This impacts instructional coherence and staff capacity. Without prioritization and alignment, instructional quality may become inconsistent and implementation may weaken across systems. Instruction + Culture: This impacts teacher efficacy and instructional quality. Staff belief and capacity are essential for consistent implementation.
Data monitoring and instructional expectations may be perceived as compliance-driven or evaluative, rather than growth-oriented.	Frame data cycles as collaborative inquiry focused on student growth, asset-based reflection, and instructional adjustment. Celebrate small wins and highlight student progress regularly.	Culture and Structure: This connects directly to staff morale and student-centered culture. How data is collected and used will determine whether it strengthens or undermines trust and engagement.

SECTION 5: MONITORING THE WHOLE

LEAD INDICATORS

Don't just measure the test score (Lagging). Measure the health of the change (Leading).

We will monitor both the implementation of our systems and the lived experience of students and staff, not just academic outcomes. These indicators will help us understand whether our instructional, cultural, and structural changes are functioning as intended for students on IEPs and English learners.

Metric Type	Indicator Description	Frequency of Review
The Process Metric (Are we doing it?)	<i>e.g., % of classrooms observed using student-collaboration strategies.</i> Percentage of classrooms consistently implementing:	Monthly

	• Identified essential practices • Small-group instruction during math and literacy WIN time • Academic discourse opportunities (student talk, math reasoning, explanation of thinking) • Frequency of Tier 1 reteaching cycles in Math • Guidance team notes for students at risk for SEL/Behavior Staff meetings, SDLT-Directed and Principal-Directed Agendas and minutes, Calendar of ELD/LAP/LC and gen ed collaboration meetings	
The Experience Metric <i>(How does it feel?)</i>	<i>e.g., Student survey results on "My voice matters in this class."</i> Student interview data (Students served in ELD or Learning Center): Fall, Winter, and Spring Panorama Survey Data Teacher feedback forms from PD and Collaboration meetings	Quarterly
The Outcome Metric <i>(Did it work?)</i>	<i>e.g., Reduction in failing grades; Increase in standardized test proficiency.</i> • SBA ELA and Math proficiency rates • iReady proficiency and growth (Math and Reading) • Intervention pre/post data • Students on IEPs and English learner growth and proficiency in Math and Reading, as measured by i-Ready and classroom-based assessments • Reduction in performance and growth gaps between students on IEPs and English learners compared to peers • Panorama data	Semester/Yearly

	• Reduction of gap in belonging data between students on IEPs and English learners compared to peers	
--	--	--

Summary of the Changes

(How has the work articulated in the SAP changed the learning experience for your focus population? What are the next logical steps to address your learning problem?)