

Lake County Schools

Lake Hills School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2019-20 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
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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission at Lake Hills School is to provide students with 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.

The vision at Lake Hills is to 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
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
Aguayo, Noris	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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/17/2010, Robin Meyers

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

26

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

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2019-20 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
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	3	10	5	10	20	5	14	11	17	14	15	15	42	181	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	3	5	6	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	
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%	0
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%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	1

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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	31
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	2

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Lake Hills ELA learning gains (20-45%) when compared to math learning gains (41-57%). Although there was an increase of 25%, ELA is an area to continue to improve. A contributing factor is that many of our students have limited communication or are non-verbal.

As a result, most Individualized Education Plans focus on communication needs first.

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

The tested components at Lake Hills increased from 87% to 97%. Neither of our components declined. Lake Hills' students are tested in ELA and Math on the FSAA and Datafolio, both of which increased.

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.

Lake Hills outperformed the state in both ELA and Math learning gains. The state learning gains in ELA averaged 39% compared to 45% at Lake Hills. The state learning gains in math averaged 37% compared to 57% at Lake Hills.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was math. The school has increased the use of communication software, manipulatives, and small group math instruction.

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

Last year we had nine prone physical restraints and that is an area of concern for us. Our goal is to go down to zero. Another area of concern is the use of the seclusion room.

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

1. Increase the number of teachers who are reading endorsed.
2. Implement a restraint-free crisis management technique.
3. Increase ELA learning gains for students with disabilities in grade 4-10 from 45% to 55%.
3. Improve Math learning gains for black and white students in grades 3-8.
4. Provide resources and support services for Economically Disadvantaged Students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Currently, 19% of Lake Hills reading teachers have a Florida Reading Endorsement in accordance with rule 6A-6.053 which states that all intensive reading interventions must be delivered by a teacher who is certified or endorsed in reading. Teachers who attain the endorsement learn to incorporate explicit, systematic, sequential and multisensory approaches to teaching foundational reading skills which will impact student learning. This area has been identified as a critical need due to the state requirement and our ELA learning gains. ELA learning gains improved from 20% to 45% and was rated as Commendable. However, our math learning gains increased from a 41% to 57%.

Measurable Outcome:

100% of Lake Hills reading teachers will attain a Florida Reading Endorsement or certification. As a result of focusing on explicit reading instruction, ELA learning gains will increase from 45% to 55%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Dr. Barbara Foorman, Dr. Timothy Shanahan, and Dr. Janice Dole have provided reading research that support the six components of reading as a process: Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension, and Oral Language. By going through the reading endorsement process, teachers will understand students instructional needs and be able to apply the systematic problem solving process: using data to identify a problem, analyzing the problem to determine why it is occurring, designing and implementing instruction and interventions, and evaluating the effectiveness. This process should be recursive and ongoing.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers who go through the endorsement process learn how to incorporate explicit, systematic, sequential and multisensory approaches to teaching foundational reading skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Meet with all reading teachers and inform them of the steps needed to attain the endorsement. Encourage all teachers to apply for the Florida reading endorsement to determine which competencies they will need to fulfill requirements.

Person Responsible

Noris Aguayo (aguayon@lake.k12.fl.us)

Develop a reading endorsement learning community to provide weekly coaching and support for teachers taking endorsement competencies. This will facilitate the monitoring of progress throughout the year.

Person Responsible

Noris Aguayo (aguayon@lake.k12.fl.us)

Purchase Viewsonic view Board and iPads with SAI funds to incorporate the interactive component of reading endorsement strategies and the multisensory component.

Person Responsible

Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Last year, we documented the use of nine prone physical restraints. We value and respect all students at Lake Hills School. In our quest to teach them all independent skills, it is our desire to eliminate the use of all physical restraints and the seclusion room. Therefore, we would like to incorporate the use of the Ukeru Restraint-Free Crisis Management Technique.

Measurable Outcome: There will be 0% use of physical restraints and the seclusion room.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ukeru is a crisis management technique rooted in the belief that the use of physical restraints is unnecessary and unproductive. Educational and behavioral interventions should be built on an approach of comfort rather than control.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Ukeru is a crisis management program that minimizes the use of restraint and seclusion. This program will help our students thrive in the least restrictive environment, achieving the greatest impact with the least amount of disruption to their routine.

Action Steps to Implement

Contact Ukeru to schedule train-the-trainer professional learning for school behavioral health professionals.

Person Responsible Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Behavioral health professionals will train school campus staff on Ukeru crisis management and proper introduction for Ukeru pads.

Person Responsible Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Purchase Ukeru pads for school and classrooms.

Person Responsible Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Meet with Behavioral Support Team to monitor the use of the Ukeru system quarterly.

Person Responsible Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Lake Hills School provides complete educational services to students whose physical and developmental needs exceed their appropriate integration into the general school population. Many of these students have been in integrated school settings in the past however, that setting was unable to meet their behavioral, medical, mobility and educational requirements. All of these students present significant, and often multiple, disabilities. Their current school program has been designed to meet all mandated educational requirements including academics, independent living, and socialization with adaptations which encompass and complement each student's special needs. The Lake Hills School identifies students, aged 18 to 21, who can benefit from a fully-developed vocational program. While these students will remain in the school until the mandated age of 22, the school and the Lake County School District recognizes its responsibility to help these students to attain a meaningful transition into adulthood to include significant aspects of community involvement and employment as appropriate to the individual needs and potential. While the intensive physical and medical needs of other older students in the school will require transition into adulthood with an essential emphasis upon respite care and medical support, these students can aspire to a variety of vocational opportunities with appropriate training and support

Measurable Outcome: 95% or more Lake Hills students will go through the transition program in order to transition to adulthood with significant aspects of community involvement and employment opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ruth Ryder from Special Education and Rehabilitative Services states that "as students and youth with disabilities prepare to transition to adult life, we must do everything we can to provide them with the information, services, and supports they need to ensure that they have the opportunity to achieve their goals." (US Department of Education, 2017)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Lake Hills provides meaningful transition instruction for students with disabilities in order to build life skills and knowledge to utilize in life and in the workplace.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

By incorporating multisensory reading strategies, students will be further engaged in instruction by using research-based behavior and communication strategies.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Lake Hills addresses building positive school culture and environment by collaborating with all stakeholders. We work hard to foster relationships with the community and as a result, they have supported our school through volunteer work and donations. All of the students at Lake Hills School have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP), which identifies students' priority educational needs. Therefore, we are in constant communication and partnership with parents to ensure that students are meeting their academic and social goals.

The school administration is always visible and visits all classrooms daily. We invite open communication and work with teachers, health services professionals, and staff to problem solve. We provide continuous professional learning for our 70 teacher assistants. The learning includes the use of instructional strategies and behavioral intervention for students with cognitive disabilities.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning				\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0533 - Lake Hills School	IDEA		\$3,000.00

			<i>Notes: Ukeru Train the Trainer Sessions for Behavior Analyst and Behavior Resource Teacher.</i>			
		239-Other	0533 - Lake Hills School	IDEA		\$3,000.00
			<i>Notes: Ukeru blocking equipment and pads and training materials</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:				\$0.00
Total:						\$6,000.00