Lake Region High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Region High School

1995 THUNDER RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

http://www.lakeregionthunder.com/

Demographics

Principal: Amy Hardee

Start Date for this Principal: 6/19/2017

2019-20 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&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 Polk 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 Region High School

1995 THUNDER RD, Eagle Lake, FL 33839

http://www.lakeregionthunder.com/

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)
High School 9-12	Yes	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	I	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

The mission of Lake Region High School is to ensure a safe and caring environment that promotes learning with high expectations and encourages every student to realize his/her fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lake Region High School is that all students will be prepared for success in college and/or careers through an effective system of academic and career-based programs. .

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
Costine, MaryJo	Principal	The administration is responsible for teacher supervision and classroom observations with each administrator having a designated curriculum content focus for planning and observation purposes. The assistant principal of administration is responsible for student supervision, attendance, and building operations. The assistant principal of curriculum is responsible for curriculum development, professional development, and master scheduling. The principal, as manager of personnel, assigns and coordinates responsibilities for all leadership team members. All leadership members are assigned core content areas and the team meets to discuss decisions based on observations and data.
Mitchell, Chauncey	Assistant Principal	
Simpson, Tanishia	Assistant Principal	
Vera, Luciano	Dean	
Nicolodi, Donna	Assistant Principal	
Ounan, Kevin	Dean	
Holby, Robert	Instructional Coach	Oversee the science department and facilitate professional development and guidance.
Kudaisi, Queshonda	Instructional Coach	Oversee the math department and facilitate professional development and guidance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/19/2017, Amy Hardee

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.*
0

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
79

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest

Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422	381	312	325	1440
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	39	23	25	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	60	20	18	173
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	61	26	5	161
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	57	28	3	175
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	139	97	57	429
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	58	125	0	309
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on STAR Reading	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	75	73	28	215
Level 1 on STAR Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3
	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	77	13	11	229

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	173	137	69	9	388
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	30	25	24	97

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 5/26/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514	401	329	322	1566
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	27	28	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	7	2	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	156	133	156	518
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199	154	110	83	546

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	0	0	0	0	0	69	65	38	65	237

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	68	61	19	6	154
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	30	26	17	120

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514	401	329	322	1566
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	27	28	126
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	9	7	2	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	156	133	156	518
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199	154	110	83	546

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	0	0	0	0	0	69	65	38	65	237

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	68	61	19	6	154
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	30	26	17	120

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	32%	47%	56%	31%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	37%	46%	51%	35%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	37%	42%	38%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	32%	43%	51%	33%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	39%	45%	48%	36%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	26%	44%	45%	35%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	51%	58%	68%	39%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	48%	61%	73%	46%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	33%	45%	-12%	55%	-22%
	2018	33%	43%	-10%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	29%	42%	-13%	53%	-24%
	2018	34%	42%	-8%	53%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	54%	-4%	67%	-17%
2018	68%	59%	9%	65%	3%
Compare		-18%			

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	48%	57%	-9%	70%	-22%
2018	50%	57%	-7%	68%	-18%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	50%	-29%	61%	-40%
2018	27%	60%	-33%	62%	-35%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	53%	-6%	57%	-10%
2018	31%	41%	-10%	56%	-25%
Compare		16%			

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	17	38	37	28	76		38	33		76	30
ELL	7	33	36	14			35	6		70	53
ASN										90	
BLK	18	35	44	16	26	17	35	25		79	37
HSP	29	37	36	29	35	38	51	46		81	56
MUL	42	46		38			46	62		71	70
WHT	43	39	27	48	48	23	61	59		80	79
FRL	26	35	35	28	36	32	45	43		76	56

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
SWD	12	38	45	25	48	53	35	38		55	18
ELL	6	32	22	22	50			33		50	47
ASN	50	70									
BLK	21	37	38	22	31	42	67	46		80	51
HSP	35	41	36	32	40	33	74	51		75	65
MUL	48	63		58							
WHT	43	44	39	36	45	43	76	59		78	74
FRL	30	40	36	30	41	40	73	50		73	62

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
SWD	3	24	24	10	37	39	13	17		53	15
ELL	2	32	48	11	28	35	6	10		55	39
ASN	67	55		73	62						
BLK	16	34	33	23	34	29	20	32		69	42
HSP	29	35	42	31	33	35	35	39		76	52
MUL	44	38		47	47			55		79	55
WHT	39	36	37	37	37	36	49	60		78	65
FRL	22	29	36	29	32	33	33	34		70	52

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Mathematics Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - 26%
Historical performance of Algebra 1B students revealed deficits in Algebra 1A and Pre-Algebra.

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

Science Achievement - 51% 2019, 74% 2018 - decline 23 points
Decline occurred due to an increase in enrollment and greater number of non-proficient readers in Biology.

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.

Mathematics Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - 26% school, 44% state
Historical performance of Algebra 1B students revealed deficits in Algebra 1A and Pre-Algebra.

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

Math Achievement - Geometry showed an increase of 17% points. Focus on teacher training and coaching.

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

English Language Learners 35%Black/African American Students 33%

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

1. Mathematics Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% - 26%
2. Black/African American Students 33%
3. English Language Learners 35%
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Subgroup did not meet the 41% ESSA proficiency percentage. Early warning data indicates a high rate of attendance and discipline issues. Low student engagement and instructional response to intervention.
Measurable Outcome:	Black/African American Students will increase proficiency to 41%. Students will be identified and the MTSS team will use a systematic use of assessment data to most efficiently allocate resources in order to improve learning for subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be identified based on early warning system data. The MTSS team will monitor the indicators and provide interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data on the Black/African American students, District Early Warning System and the MTSS processes and procedures.

Action Steps to Implement

1. MTSS team will identify at-risk students; discipline team will use RtI:B platform to determine specific behavior patterns, extended learning will be provided,
2. Student Success Coach will monitor early warning indicators for identified students and provide support to content area teachers
3. Behavioral Interventionist will monitor early warning indicators for identified students and provide support to content area teachers
4. Professional Development /collaborative planning will be provide increased knowledge of strategies and interventions
5. Paraprofessional will provide classroom learning support
6. Instructional coaches (Literacy, Math and Science) will support teacher development and guide instructional initiatives. Supports for LSI implementation of Target/Task Alignment-Success Criteria.
7. Laptops, Laptop Carts, and instructional technology will be purchased for student access to necessary instructional technology.
8. Field trips with transportation will be planned for post secondary opportunities.
9. Special activity items and supplies will be purchased to support parent and family engagement activities.

Person Responsible	Chauncey Mitchell (chauncey.mitchell@polk-fl.net)

1. SAT/ACT workbooks will be provided for concordant score practice.
2. Gateway supplemental materials will be provided to students in need.
3. Extended learning transportation will be provided to allow students additional time on campus for remediation.

Person Responsible	Tanishia Simpson (tanishia.simpson@polk-fl.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Subgroup did not meet the 41% ESSA proficiency percentage. Early warning data indicates a high rate of attendance and low student engagement and instructional response to intervention.
Measurable Outcome:	The English Language Learners will increase proficiency to 41%. Students will be identified and the MTSS team will use a systematic use of assessment data to most efficiently allocate resources in order to improve learning for subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donna Nicolodi (donna.nicolodi@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be identified based on WIDA test history, LEP Plans, and early warning system data. The MTSS team will monitor the indicators and provide interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data on the English Language Learner students, WIDA history, District Early Warning System and the MTSS processes and procedures

Action Steps to Implement

1. ESOL support class and after-school tutorial implemented
2. MTSS team will identify at-risk students; discipline team will use RtI:B platform to determine specific behavior patterns, extended learning will be provided,
3. Student Success Coach will monitor early warning indicators for identified students and provide support to content area teachers
4. Behavioral Interventionist will monitor early warning indicators for identified students and provide support to content area teachers
5. Professional Development /collaborative planning will be provided to increase knowledge of strategies and interventions
6. Student access to high interest leveled reading materials: Classroom/Media Center/Subscriptions
7. Instructional coaches will support teacher development and guide instructional initiatives.
8. Laptops, Laptop Carts, and instructional technology will be purchased for student access to necessary instructional technology.
9. Field trips will be planned for post secondary opportunities.
10. Special activity items and supplies will be purchased to support parent and family engagement activities

Person Responsible	Donna Nicolodi (donna.nicolodi@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Continued supports will be provided as quarterly data is analyzed for ESSA Subgroups.

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 Region High School hosts a variety of student/parent meetings during the year. In the beginning of the year, an evening orientation is held as well as Title 1 parent meeting and time for parents to meet with teachers. During the year, three parent meetings are held to discuss the academic programs. An academy night is also held in the spring to provide parents a chance to visit the school's career programs. SAC (School Advisory Committee) meetings are held to involve the community along with academy advisory meetings that include the community stakeholders. Guidance counselors conduct student conferences during the year to advise students of their academic progress and a daily Guidance Cafe during lunches provides students with regular access to guidance services. The Lake Region website provides an electronic access to academic information. Guidance counselors schedule and conduct teacher/parent conferences as requested by teacher or parent. Guidance Counselors meet with students and parents regarding college advising and financial aid. Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

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: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00