

Lake County Schools

# Lake Hills School



## 2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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: 8/13/2021

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	ESE
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Special Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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*
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Commendable 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: No Rating
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>	2023-24: No Rating

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## 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.

#### **Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.**

The students at Lake Hills School have severe cognitive and physical disabilities. In order to meet their needs, we are both socially and academically focused. Teacher leaders on campus collaborate to create specially designed instruction to meet specific student needs. Professional staff are included in the collaboration and assist in creating instructional opportunities to ensure equity and access for all students.

### School Leadership Team

#### **Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Meyers, Robin	Principal	Provides leadership to the ESE Center School community of students and faculty. Oversees all operations and procedures of Lake Hills School and serves as an instructional leader on campus.
Aguayo, Noris		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 and supports instructional leadership.
Walker, Melissa	Other	Mental Health Liasion- Provides mental health support to students, families, and faculty
Avery, Krysta	Instructional Coach	Provides instructional coaching and mentoring to teachers on campus. Creates and provides instructional support tools for 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
Kotz, Rikki	Teacher, ESE	Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities
Lerner, Robert	Teacher, ESE	Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities.
Lott, Corey	Instructional Technology	Provides instructional technology support to teachers and students with significant cognitive disabilities.
Hass, David	Teacher, ESE	Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities

**Is education provided through contract for educational services?**

No

**If yes, name of the contracted education provider.****Demographic Information****Principal start date**

Friday 8/13/2021, Robin Meyers

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

29

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.**

44

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

189

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

10

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

7

## Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

#### 2021-22

**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	7	4	12	5	10	16	6	18	11	19	11	17	15	151	
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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	12	
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**

Friday 8/13/2021

**2020-21 - 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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA 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		12
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	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					68%	61%		67%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					63%	59%		53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					56%	54%		46%	52%
Math Achievement					70%	62%		69%	61%
Math Learning Gains					65%	59%		60%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					54%	52%		51%	52%
Science Achievement					59%	56%		65%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					83%	78%		77%	77%



**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					

### Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	30		18	32		21	25		100	7
HSP	18			9							
WHT	16	40		21	36		27			100	
FRL	15	42		17	31		24				
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

### ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31
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	249
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	63%

### Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	14
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	34
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	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

100% of Lake Hills students have an IEP. In previous years, we have utilized IEP data and FSAA to progress monitor.

#### Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The information we have right now is that we decreased from Commendable to Maintaining. Due to our special population numbers, we are only able to compare high school ELA 2, Biology and US History assessments. ELA 2 numbers showed a marked improvement of 24% from the 2018-19 school year. Biology numbers during the 2018-19 school year went from 6% to 29%, improving by 23%. US History scores went from 6% to 33% which is a 27% improvement. US History showed the most improvement due to a higher population of students tested.

#### What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

100% of our students have a significant cognitive disabilities causing gaps in terms of literacy development and skills. In terms of high school tested areas, that we have data on, biology showed to be the most in need of improvement. We believe that the biology component was the most problematic due to limited literacy skills and background knowledge.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Due to the medical fragility of our students, we were unable to assess many students during the testing window. Many of our students chose the distance learning or hospital homebound option and were unavailable for testing. More specific subgroup data is unavailable at this time due to limited numbers tested.

#### What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will continue to personalize learning for every students based on their unique learning needs. We are also implement a progress monitoring tool in order to closely track data on specific literacy skills.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

We will continue to provide professional learning around authentic literacy. Our teachers will meet in a learning community twice per week supported by an instructional leader. The professional learning series throughout the year will continue to focus on reading, writing, thinking, and communication needs.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

#### **Areas of Focus:**

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Leadership team discussion surfaced lack of true ELA data to capture growth and areas of needs beyond the FSAA and IEP goals.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The school will assign a team of instructional/teacher leaders on campus to create an ELA progress monitoring tool to monitor current literacy skills and growth goals.

**Monitoring:**

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

Once the tool is created, we will roll out a sample group to implement the tool and provide feedback.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

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,

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Comprehension, and Oral Language. Through the use of a 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 and a progress monitoring tool will help teachers determine how students are performing and how to personalize instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

According to research, teachers who incorporate explicit, systematic, sequential and multisensory approaches to teaching foundational reading skills will yield positive results. Skills should be appropriately monitored to measure growth and areas of focus.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Assign a team of instructional/teacher leaders to develop a progress monitoring tool.

**Person Responsible**

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

Survey stakeholders to gather feedback.

**Person Responsible**

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

Make changes as appropriate.

**Person Responsible**

Krysta Avery (averyk@lake.k12.fl.us)

Create and deliver professional learning on the rationale and use of progress monitoring tool for teachers.

<b>Person Responsible</b>	Noris Aguayo (aguayon@lake.k12.fl.us)
Implement and monitor the use of the progress monitoring tool with students across campus.	
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Robin Meyers (meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us)
<b>Monitoring ESSA Impact:</b>	
If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	100% of students at Lake Hills School have physical and/or cognitive disabilities.



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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:**

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

**Monitoring:**

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

The transition program will be monitored for enrollment and completion.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Ruth Ryder from Special Education and Rehabilitative Services stats 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:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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:**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Meet with transition team to support with instructional and vocational support.

**Person Responsible**

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

Monitor completion of transition program on campus.

**Person Responsible**

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

**Monitoring ESSA  
Impact:**

The transition program will impact all students at Lake Hills School to help attain academic, independent living, and socialization skills.

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We value and respect all students at Lake Hills School and have adapted a hands-off approach with students. We have eliminated the use of physical restraints across campus. Last year, we used the seclusion room once. We no longer have a seclusion room and would like to train staff on de-escalation techniques by focusing on the zones of regulation. We will also continue to expand the use of the Ukeru Restraint-Free Crisis Management Technique across campus when needed.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

At least 90% of staff will be trained on the zones of regulation and de-escalation techniques.

**Monitoring:**

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

Teachers will continue to track daily behavior data daily.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The Zones of Regulation is a framework for thinking and a treatment approach that is based on immense evidence in the fields of autism spectrum disorders (ASD), attention deficit disorders (ADD/HD) and social-emotional theories (<https://www.zonesofregulation.com/evidence-based-or-based-on-evidence.html>).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We would like teachers to avoid power struggle with students by incorporating de-escalation techniques.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Provide training on the zones of regulation and de-escalation techniques.

**Person Responsible**

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

Provide resources to all teachers on campus.

**Person Responsible**

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

Monitor data tracking and the use of behavior management techniques.

**Person Responsible**

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

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting

Behavior data will be monitored and utilized to adjust goals as needed during IEP meetings.

the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#### **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.**

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.

#### **Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.**

Leadership team - support social and instructional delivery across campus.

Teachers- provided with leadership roles and work as a collaborative team to problem-solve.

Teacher Assistants-major support of instruction across campus. Collaborate with teachers to meet student social and academic needs.

Professional Support Staff- provide specific support and guidance to access instruction on campus.

Parents- partner with school staff to ensure we meet holistic student needs. Provide additional support as needed.

Students-Despite physical and cognitive disabilities, are included in decision-making as able.

Community Members- Volunteer and provide numerous donations to meet student needs.