Lake Hills School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Hills School

909 S LAKESHORE BLVD, Howey In The Hills, FL 34737

https://lhe.lake.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Robin Meyers

Start Date for this Principal: 7/17/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Lake Hills School

909 S LAKESHORE BLVD, Howey In The Hills, FL 34737

https://lhe.lake.k12.fl.us/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Provide students opportunities to reach their full potential by providing a comprehensive education designed to meet their individual needs through personalized learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Foster a school culture that believes all students can learn and that the possibilities are endless.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Meyers, Robin	Principal	Provides leadership to the ESE Center School community of students and faculty. Oversees all operations and procedures of Lake Hills School.
Walker, Melissa	Other	Mental Health Liasion- Provides mental health support to students, families, and faculty
Kotz, Rikki	Teacher, ESE	ESE teacher- Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities
Hass, David	Teacher, ESE	ESE teacher- Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities
Lott, Corey	Teacher, ESE	ESE School Specialist- Facilitates IEP, Evaluation/Re-evaluation meetings
Ward, Dominique	Assistant Principal	Assist the school principal in providing leadership to the ESE Center School community of students and faculty. Assist in supervising staff of Lake Hills School.
Lerner, Robert	Teacher, ESE	ESE teacher- Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities
Avery, Krysta	Teacher, ESE	ESE teacher- Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities
Vigrass, Janine	Other	SLP- Provides speech and language services to eligible students on campus and provides communication support to all teachers and students on campus to embed in daily classroom instruction

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	3	5	10	3	12	6	13	6	6	6	3	6	0	79
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	6	3	5	3	5	3	2	3	0	2	0	37
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	2	1	4	2	3	0	17

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	1	1	0	2	1	6	1	2	2	0	12	31

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
32

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 8/4/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	9	5	6	5	5	3	6	5	4	3	17	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	4	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FSAA Level 1 ELA	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	3	0	6	7	0	23
FSAA Level1 MATH	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3	2	2	1	18	34

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	9	5	6	5	5	3	6	5	4	3	17	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	4	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FSAA Level 1 ELA	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	1	3	0	6	7	0	23
FSAA Level1 MATH	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	21

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3	2	2	1	18	34

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	68%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	65%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	70%	62%	0%	69%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	65%	59%	0%	67%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	65%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	59%	56%	0%	64%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	83%	78%	0%	82%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	3 (0)	5 (0)	10 (0)	3 (0)	12 (0)	6 (0)	13 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	0 (0)	79 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	1 (0)	4 (7)	6 (9)	3 (5)	5 (6)	3 (5)	5 (5)	3 (3)	2 (6)	3 (5)	0 (4)	2 (3)	0 (17)	37 (75)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (2)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (1)	3 (4)	7 (11)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (0)	0 (2)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	17 (0)

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	22	47	38	27	56		16	10		91	
BLK	21	36		20							
HSP	27	62		36							
WHT	25	45		29	55		19	15			
FRL	22	42		24	46		14	13			
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	299
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	31
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	27
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

Even though Lake Hills' ELA learning gains improved from 20% to 45% since last school year, the gains are lower than the math learning gains, which improved from 41% to 57%.
The majority of our students are non-verbal or have limited communication. As all of our students have Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs,) which identifies students' priority educational needs. Communication is almost always each one of our student's priority educational need, which affects ELA learning gains.

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

Both of Lake Hills' tested measures improved. ELA learning gains and Math learning gains increased. Additionally, the overall tested student component increased from 87% to 97%.

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.

ELA learning gains- Lake Hills: 45% State average: 39%
Math learning gains- Lake Hills: 57% State average: 37%

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

Lake Hills' math learning gains improved from 41% to 57%. We continued to teach math using instructional scales while teaching math in small groups. Manipulatives and communication software were used in all math lessons.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Student absences is a concern for Lake Hills. About 90 of our 200 students have medical complexities that require them to be home when they are not feeling well. We do provide hospital homebound services when appropriate, but due to the nature of our school, we recognize that sometimes a student has to be home for their own safety. Additionally, many of our students take medication that have to be changed on occassion; when this happens, a student needs to stay home for at least 48 hours for the family to monitor.

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

1. Improve ELA learning gains for all SWD students in grades 4-10.
2. Implement School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention System
3. Improve Math learning gains for Black and White students in grades 3-8.
4. Provide resources and support for Economically Disadvantaged Students
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Guided Reading
Rationale	45% of Lake Hills students in grades 4-10 made learning gains in ELA on the 2018-2019 ELA FSAA.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of Lake Hills students in grades 4-10 will make learning gains in ELA, as measured on ELA FSAA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement Dr. Jan Richardson's guided reading strategies into daily classroom instruction. Throughout the second semester of 2019-2020 school year, teachers will learn how to use prompts, discussion starters, and teaching points used during guided reading to help pre-literacy and emergent students process more effectively, think more deeply, and express their ideas more thoughtfully.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence shows that pre-emergent and emergent readers benefit from explicit guided reading instruction.

Action Step	
Description	1. Professional development delivered to staff, beginning in January. 2. Implementation of guided reading strategies will start following staff training. 3. Discussion of strategy effectiveness will be done in weekly PLC meetings. 4. Purchase smart iPads with SAI funds to utilize the interactive components of reading curriculum, enCORE. 5. Provide professional development to teachers to use interactive components of reading curriculum, enCORE.
Person Responsible	Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Positive Behavior Intervention System
Rationale	70% of Lake Hills students exhibit maladaptive behavior in school and/or home due to their limited communication and/or significant cognitive delay.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	70% of students will demonstrate progress, as measured on their social emotional goals identified on Individual Educational Plans.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Lake Hills faculty will implement a school-wide Positive Behavior Intervention System (PBIS) in classrooms and throughout campus, targeting four focus areas: PAWS- Positive Attitude, Act respectfully, Work Hard, and Safe Choices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS is an approach schools can use to improve school safety and promote positive behavior. It also helps schools decide how to respond to a child who needs support. PBIS recognizes that kids can only meet behavior expectations if they know what the expectations are. A hallmark of a school using PBIS is that everyone knows what's appropriate behavior. The culture of Lake Hills School is positive and always problem-solving, so this is a collaborative effort to increase behavior expectation consistency and overall school culture.

Action Step	
Description	1. Lake Hills PBIS Planning Team develop School-Wide PBIS- PAWS! 2. Create Training Video to Use for Faculty Kick-Off. 3. Teachers Implement in Classrooms and Provide Parent Training through Dr. Sylvia Diehl's Online Modules 4. Teachers Collect Quarterly Data on Social Emotional IEP Goals 5. Continue PBIS Implementation and Monitor Progress
Person Responsible	Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Improving ELA and Math gains for all subgroups will be addressed by using research-based reading strategies and by using research-based behavior and communication strategies to make learning meaningful.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Guided Reading				$3,800.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0533 - Lake Hills School	School Improvement Funds	0.0	$3,800.00
			Notes: Guided Reading Training - Lake Hills School Julie Taylor - Trainer January 24 - April 4, 2020 The Next Step Forward in Guided Reading. Author, Jan Richardson Objective: Teachers will learn how to use prompts, discussion starters, and teaching points used during guided reading to help pre-literacy and emergent students process more effectively, think more deeply, and express their ideas more thoughtfully.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Positive Behavior Intervention System				$0.00
					Total:	$3,800.00