

Lake County Schools

Lake Hills School



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
R.A.I.S.E	19
Positive Culture & Environment	22

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: 10/31/2022

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

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.

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
Coxe, Kayla	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 and supports instructional leadership.
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.
Walker, Melissa	Other	Mental Health Liaison- Provides mental health support to students, families, and faculty
Kotz, Rikki	Teacher, ESE	Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities.
Hass, David	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.
Vigrass, Janine		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.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Monday 10/31/2022, Robin Meyers

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

179

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

38

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

30

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

8

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

36

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

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	15	8	7	22	10	17	21	14	17	13	17	13	60	234	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	14	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
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	1	3	8	5	4	11	12	7	9	8	5	3	3	79

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	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	5	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/7/2022

2021-22 - 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	7	9	18	10	16	29	20	21	21	26	18	19	53	267	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	5	6	3	7	8	8	3	4	6	1	7	65	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	1	3	1	5	3	1	2	0	1	21	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	0	1	0	0	13	
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	2	0	0	0	0	2	
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	1	3	8	5	4	11	12	7	9	8	5	3	3	79

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	1	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	5	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		64%	55%					68%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								63%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								56%	54%
Math Achievement		44%	42%					70%	62%
Math Learning Gains								65%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								54%	52%
Science Achievement		65%	54%					59%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		66%	59%					83%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	32	36	18	37		18	15		73	
BLK	18	36		20							
HSP	17	25		19	50		30				
WHT	12	33		17	32		12				
FRL	15	29	27	18	37		21	15		85	
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			

ESSA Data Review

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	83%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	24

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	21
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
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%	3

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 related to the Areas of Focus?

21-22 the area of focus was to increase high school biology scores. We believed that the biology component was the most problematic due to limited literacy skills and background knowledge. Based upon the 21-22 data showed an overall increase in science testing scores. .

Teachers implemented personalize learning for every students based on their unique learning needs. We are also implementing a progress monitoring tool in order to closely track data on specific literacy skills. By utilizing this tool, tracking data, and providing learning in learning communities, we will positively impact subgroups below 41%.

Teachers met in a learning communities twice per week supported by an instructional leader. They also participated in a professional learning series throughout the year that focused on reading, writing, thinking, and communication needs.

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

Based on the progress monitoring and 2022 state assessment, Science showed the most improvement. Teachers implementation on inquiry-based instruction.

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?

Based on the progress monitoring and 2022 state assessment, ELA demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Lake Hills School is the ESE Center School for Lake County and we serve approximately 185 students with significant cognitive disabilities ages 3-21 and 100% of students have IEPs.

2022 FSAA data reflects the need for improvement in Reading/ELA with a 19.8% increase in the number of students scoring level 1 compared to 2021 FSAA data; a 17.3% decrease in level 2, and a 2.7% decrease in level 3.

2022 FSAA data reflects the need for improvement in Mathematics with a 16.2% increase in the number of students scoring level 1 compared to 2021 FSAA data; a 16% decrease in level 2, and a 1.4% decrease in level 3.

2022 FSAA data reflects improvement in Science with a 10.5% decrease in the number of students scoring level 1 compared to 2021 FSAA data; a 13.2 increase in level 2.

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

When given supports, students with disabilities in an inquiry-based classroom show increased science achievement. One way to ensure this success is in making inquiry accessible for all students. Designing accessible inquiry lessons requires student supports and the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Student supports and accommodations change how content is presented and adapt the environment to meet student needs. Through the implementation of UDL, the learner gains access to content, increasing equity for students with disabilities.

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

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. 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.

Areas of Focus:

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

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

Learning the best practices for teaching students with significant cognitive disabilities gives teachers a crucial advantage in the classroom, where special-needs children face a broad range of difficulties in learning. Teachers who understand the best practices can act appropriately to keep the learning momentum going forward.

Measurable Outcome:

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

80% of teachers will implement the Best Practices Indicators for Access Classrooms by May 2023.

The Best Practices for Access Classrooms initiative includes the process to gather impact data for evaluation for each of the practices to determine its effectiveness.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will be able to implement and monitor the Best Practices in their classrooms and use the tool as topics of discussion during their weekly Collaborative Team meetings.

Administration has developed a learning walk tool to monitor the implementation of each of the descriptors of the Best Practices and will provide continuous feedback to teachers and Collaborative Teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

The Best Practices for Access Classrooms is a systems-thinking approach that includes a range of individual activities and programmatic approaches to achieving positive changes in teacher attitudes and student academic behaviors.

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The Best Practices for Access Classroom is a checklist organized into the following seven categories each having essential descriptors: 1. Environmental Arrangement; 2. Scheduling; 3. Classroom Systems; 4. Instruction/Interaction; 5. Positive Behavior Support; 6. Social Skills and Self-Management; 7. Communication Support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

A systems-thinking approach will develop a knowledge base and a common language about effective instruction in order to develop specific expectations for improvement with their teaching staffs (Systems Thinking for Supporting Students with Special Needs and Disabilities: A Handbook for Classroom Teachers. Mabel Gonzales).

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.

Weekly Collaborative Team Meetings to discuss and monitor standard alignment and implementation of district framework.

Person Responsible

Kayla Coxé (coxek@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 the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Other specifically relating to Positive Culture and Environment**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Teacher Retention - Provide targeted support to all new teachers. The target is worth pursuing to provide targeted support for teachers in order to better meet the needs of our students. New teachers will explore and understand district/school goals, IEP writing, communication supports, behavioral interventions, etc. This is important so teachers will better understand our students and how to support social, emotional, and academic needs.

Measurable Outcome:

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

80% of teachers will be retained at the end of the 2022-2023 school year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through the use of district guiding documents, needs survey, and collaborative conversations. A monthly agenda will be created and resources added to the Google Classroom for reference. Weekly collaborative sessions will include learning and group discussions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

New teachers will be identified and supported throughout the year. They will be added to a Google Classroom with various topics and resources for reference. Additionally, they will be provided with coaching support, group collaboration, and participate in weekly meetings with a coach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Revisit FOCUS and utilize Comprehensive Literacy for All by Karen Erickson to learn how to support students with cognitive disabilities. Explore Project Core and provide modules for teachers to engage with.

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.

Professional Development based upon the needs of teachers and staff, determined during collaborative teams and support meetings.

Person Responsible

Robin Meyers (meyersr@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 the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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 services students ages 3-22, all at different stages of learning, thus differentiation is critical. Teachers meets students where they are academically, differentiating all instruction, ensuring the students needs are meet.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 90% of teachers will implement small group, differentiated instruction by January 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will document the responsibilities of all staff members within the classroom, via the daily schedule form. This form outline the materials, purpose, and activity for each subject area and each group throughout the day. Administration and instructional coaches will monitor via classroom walks and provide feedback on the groups and activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kayla Coxé (coxek@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Differentiation means tailoring instruction to meet the needs of individual students. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and flexible grouping makes this a successful approach to instruction.

Content: The idea here is that the teacher needs to differentiate the content to offer various activities for students. to choice from. Use material that is of interest to the individual student.

Process: Students learning via an array of method; visual, kinesthetic or auditory, consider combined to provide a more vibrant and vivid learning experience.

Product: Allow students to demonstrate their learning in individual, creative, out of the box methods.

Learning Environment: Having a flexible classroom layout is very important, and using various arrangements and furniture types is an extremely good idea.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Differentiation allows all students to demonstrate their level of understanding and learning in unique ways. According to King-Sears (2008), differentiated instruction has the potential to increase the scores on highest assessments for students with disabilities, students at-risk for school failure, typical students, and students labelled as gifted and talented in comparison to students in schools that promote 'one size fits all' instruction. Differentiation allows all students to demonstrate their level of understanding and learning in unique ways.

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.

On-Going Professional Develop

Person Responsible

Kayla Coxé (coxek@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 the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

Collaborative Planning

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Lake Hills School is the ESE Center School for Lake County and we serve approximately 185 students with significant cognitive disabilities ages 3-21 and 100% of students have IEPs.

2022 FSAA data reflects the need for improvement is Reading/ELA with a 15.1% increase in the number of students scoring level 1 compared to 2021 FSAA data:

2022 FSAA 44.16% scored level 1, 38.96% scored level 2 14.29% scored level 3 and 2.6% scored level 4 in Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Lake Hills School is the ESE Center School for Lake County and we serve approximately 185 students with significant cognitive disabilities ages 3-21 and 100% of students have IEPs.

2022 FSAA data reflects the need for improvement is Reading/ELA with a 15.1% increase in the number of students scoring level 1 compared to 2021 FSAA data:

2022 FSAA 44.16% scored level 1, 38.96% scored level 2 14.29% scored level 3 and 2.6% scored level 4 in Reading/ELA

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will achieve a 20% increase of student scoring a level two or higher on the FSAA Reading/ELA Assessment by May 2023.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will achieve a 20% increase of student scoring a level two or higher on the FSAA Reading/ELA Assessment by May 2023.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Administration and instructional coaches will monitor via learning walk tool and provide targeted feedback, ensuring the all elements of the district framework for ELA are being implemented. Teachers will document daily activities via the daily activity sheet, clearly defines the responsibilities for all staff within the classroom.

The team will monitor IEP goal related to Reading/ELA to ensure process is being made.

Teachers will document and track student progress via learning rubrics, providing a clear progression throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Lake Hills School serves students with significant cognitive disabilities who use augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) systems as their primary mode of communication.

The Project Core implementation model is aimed at helping teachers provide students with significant cognitive disabilities and complex communication needs with access to a flexible Universal Core vocabulary and evidence-based instruction to teach them to use core vocabulary via personal augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) systems. The model is designed for students with significant disabilities who do not yet use speech, signs or symbols to communicate in flexible ways. This includes students who rely on early forms of communication such as facial expressions, vocalizations and body movements, as well as students who are beginning to use symbols, signs, or words but cannot yet put them together.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

This implementation model is focused on helping students move toward intentional, conventional, and ultimately symbolic communication in the context of naturalistic interactions across the school day (www.project-core.com).

Erickson, K. A., & Geist, L. A. (2016). The profiles of students with significant cognitive disabilities and complex communication needs, *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 32, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07434618.2016.1213312>

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
1. Literacy Leadership - collaborate with school literacy team to coordinate a plan to provide professional development of Project Core and to monitor the implementation of the program in all classrooms.	Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us
2. Literacy Coaching - The literacy coach, administrators, and the SLP teachers will provide classroom training and support to classroom staff on the implementation and of project core and monitor the fidelity of its' use.	Cook, Kelly, cookk@lake.k12.fl.us
3. Assessment - 2023 FSAA ELA student scores	Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us
4. Professional Learning - Administration and SLP teachers will provide ongoing PD to staff on Project Core and augmentative alternative communication systems in classrooms.	Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Other

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Data will be collected via district guiding documents, collaborative conversations and climate surveys, measuring a range of aspects of the educational environment to assess perceptions and identify specific strengths and weaknesses within a school. Analysis of the data collected will guide the decisions and conversations within our school communities, such as Sunshine Committee, SAC, Leadership Committee and Collaborative Team Meetings.

Professional Development will be provided based upon the data analysis.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

The target area, related data and resulting actions steps will be communicated to stakeholders via committee meetings, collaborative team planning, professional development and staff meetings. Clear and concise communication with all stakeholders is important to ensure a team effect in increase student achievement and obtaining school wide goals.

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.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

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.

Implementation will be monitored via observations, conversations, district guiding documents, collaborative conversations and climate surveys.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Conduct district guiding documents, collaborative conversations and/or climate surveys.	Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us
Professional Development based upon the needs of teachers and staff, determined during collaborative teams and support meetings.	Meyers, Robin, meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us
Revisit FOCUS and utilize Comprehensive Literacy for All by Karen Erickson to learn how to support students with cognitive disabilities.	Meyers, Robin, meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us
Explore Project Core and provide modules for teachers to engage with.	Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us