

Lake County Schools

Lake Hills School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

Lake Hills School

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

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/23/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the 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.
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.
Beach, Shaun	Teacher, ESE	Provides instruction to students with significant cognitive disabilities.
Walker, Melissa	Other	Mental Health Liaison- Provides mental health support to students, families, and faculty
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.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders are involved throughout the develop of the school SIP, by working as a team to analyze school data, identifying areas of strength and improvement. Developing an action plan, including goals and monitoring. Most importantly all stakeholders are involved in the reflection and feedback of the SIP. The school SAC reviews, makes suggested changes and approved the final SIP.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The school leadership team will continually monitor the goals and process of the SIP, when necessary the action plan will be revised by the team to ensure maximum achievement. School administration will also monitor process, through the use of classroom walkthroughs, professional learning teams and best practice indicators. Classroom data will be reviewed weekly, throughout collaborative planning sessions. School wide data will be viewed quarterly, or as needed, with professional learning teams. Walkthrough data, student performance, and teacher/staff feedback will be used by the leadership team to make adjustments.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	8	5	4	11	12	7	9	60

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	14	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	8	5	4	11	12	7	9	79

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	8	5	4	11	12	7	9	60

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	11	62	53	11	64	55	16		
ELA Learning Gains				32			30		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36					
Math Achievement*	10	68	55	15	44	42	18		
Math Learning Gains				37			32		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	15	61	52	13	65	54	21		
Social Studies Achievement*	7	84	68	15	66	59	25		
Middle School Acceleration		73	70		54	51			
Graduation Rate	77	63	74	73	58	50	100		
College and Career Acceleration	0	35	53	0	82	70	7		
ELP Progress		59	55		64	70			

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	17
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	120
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	77

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	26
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	83
Graduation Rate	73

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	17	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	0	Yes	3	3
HSP	18	Yes	2	2
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	24	Yes	4	4
FRL	19	Yes	4	4

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	27	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	25	Yes	2	2
HSP	24	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	21	Yes	3	3
FRL	27	Yes	3	3

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	11			10			15	7		77	0	
SWD	11			10			15	7		0	7	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	0			0							2	
HSP	15			20							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	9			6			18				4	
FRL	12			13			18			0	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	11	32	36	15	37		13	15		73	0	
SWD	13	32	36	18	37		18	15		73	0	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	36		20								
HSP	17	25		19	50		30	0				
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	12	33		17	32		12					
FRL	15	29	27	18	37		21	15		85	0	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	16	30		18	32		21	25		100	7	
SWD	16	30		18	32		21	25		100	7	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	18			9								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	16	40		21	36		27			100	0	
FRL	15	42		17	31		24					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	47%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	54%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	50%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	62%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	44%	*	44%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	51%	*

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	67%	*	66%	*

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Based upon 2022-2023 FSAA Performance Task and Datafolio data English Language Arts (ELA) is the lowest performance content area with 45.30% below proficiency. Lake Hills School serves students with significant cognitive disabilities who use augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) systems as their primary mode of communication. The implementation of the Universal Core Vocabulary will provide students the support needed to improve their skills in ELA. ELA has been the lowest performing content area for the past two years, however trends indicate an decrease in student performing below proficiency. FSAA Performance Task and Datafolio indicate a 23.02% decrease in students performing below proficiency.

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

Based upon 2022-2023 FSAA Performance Task and Datafolio data Civics and US History showed the greatest decline from the prior year. 2021-2022 data indicated 39.53% of students performed at or above proficiency, while 2022-2023 data indicates 34.48% of student performed at or above proficiency, this is a 5.05% decrease .

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.

Social studies had the greatest gap, school data indicated 15% proficiency and the state data indicated 72% proficiency, this is a 57% difference. Limited literacy skills and background knowledge are contributing factors to the current proficiency gap.

Based upon the 22-23 data showed an overall increase in science testing scores from 10% proficiency to 15% proficiency.

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 predict student achievement to continue to increase.

Teachers met in a learning communities twice per week supported by an instructional leaders. They also participated in a professional learning series throughout the year that focused on reading, writing, thinking, and communication needs. Teachers will also participate in professional development focused on creating a highly structured and predictable environment that provides the necessary support in the classroom and throughout the school day to promote student engagement in learning activities, behavior management, communication, and social skills.

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

Based upon the 2022-2023 FSAA Performance Task and Datafolio data English Language Arts (ELA) showed the most improvement with a 23.02% increase in students performing at or above proficiency. 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 model supports teachers and staff in providing 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 AAC systems. Additionally teachers and staff have implemented the Structured Classroom Model. The structured teaching program is an approach to creating a highly structured and predictable environment that provides the necessary support in the classroom and throughout the school day to promote student engagement in learning activities, behavior management, communication, and social skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Lake Hills School serves students with significant cognitive disabilities. where every student has an Individual Education Plan (IEP). Early warning data indicated that 9 students were absent 10% or more days and 60 students had two or more indicators.

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

Continue to increase the number of students performing at or above proficiency ELA.
Increase the number of students performing at or above proficiency in Civics and US History.
Implementation of Structured Classroom program.
Implementation of the Best Practice Indicators
Implementation of Project Core

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Lake Hills School services students ages 3-22, all at different stages of learning, thus differentiation is critical. Teachers meet students where they are academically, differentiating all instruction, ensuring the students needs are met.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 80% of teachers will implement small group, differentiated instruction, best practice indicators and the structured classroom model by January 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will utilize teacher assistance (TA) as instruction leaders. Teachers and TA's will conduct small group lesson throughout all subject areas, lessons will be standards-based, based on Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) that provides students with moderate and severe disabilities access to the general education curriculum.

Administration and instructional coaches will monitor via classroom walks and provide feedback utilizing the best practice indicators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kayla Coxie (coxek@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Differentiation refers to the responses that teachers make to learners' needs. Effective differentiation functions on the premise that every student can do remarkable things with the appropriate guidance and support. Differentiating occurs when teachers provide several learning paths. Differentiate can occur through content, process, products, or learning environment,

Content: The idea here is that the teacher delivers instruction that is standard-based and meets the needs of the individual student. Process: Each classroom consists of an array of needs. In order to meet students needs, instruction should be a blend of hands-on, teacher-led and technology-facilitated instruction.

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

Learning Environment: Promotes independence by utilizing strategies that align with strengths and needs of the students as it incorporates physical and visual boundaries and schedules, and organization.

Structured environments can promote a clear understanding of the schedules, activities, and expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 Learning Teams, meeting bi-weekly. Team are developed based upon grade ranges and students needs. Team meet to discuss curriculum, assessments and analyze data.

Person Responsible: Kayla Coxé (coxek@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

Structured Classroom Professional Development -- PD Series includes the following

Physical structure/classroom environment

Visual schedules

Work systems

Routines and visual strategies

Visual structure of materials

Communication

Classroom management

Teaching time

Person Responsible: Kayla Coxé (coxek@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly and as needed based upon learning walk data.

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Each year Lake Hills School experiences teacher turnover, this is largely due to certification, intensity of the school and other factors. Our goal at Lake Hills is to retain the current teachers providing the students and school with consistency and having a positive impact on student academic and behavioral achievement. We will increase teacher retention by 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 2023-2024 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 learning walk tools, district guiding documents, needs survey, and collaborative conversations. A Google Classroom will be monitored and resources added to the for reference. Weekly collaborative sessions will include learning and group discussions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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. All teachers will participate in the Structured Classroom Model and Best Practice Indicators to learn how to support students with cognitive disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Improving teacher retention can directly benefit school systems and students. Research shows that one main reason teachers leave the profession is the work load and being overwhelming. By providing professional develop, resources, mentors, and professional learning teams, we are providing the supports necessary to reduce the work load and create an environment were teachers feel appreciated and supported.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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)

By When: Weekly through collaborative planning and classroom walk data. Professional development will occur Wednesday afternoon and on district professional development days.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Implementing the Structured Classroom Model:

The structured teaching program is an approach to creating a highly structured and predictable environment that provides the necessary support in the classroom and throughout the school day to promote student engagement in learning activities, behavior management, communication, and social skills.

Lake Hills serves students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities and students with Emotional and Behavioral Disabilities, our students face many challenges. Behavioral challenges in the classroom are on the rise in terms of frequency and severity.

Our goal is to meet the needs of our students and teachers by creating a learning environment that fosters characteristics of resilience, with a strong focus on self-management, problem solving and responsibility. The program is referred to as the Structured Classroom Program and will support teachers in developing a positive, safe, respectful, and supportive classroom for student learning, while providing them with continuous support for the structured classroom environment. Our hope is the students will learn to persevere through difficult situations and will take responsibility for themselves both personally and academically. Equally as important, we hope to provide to classroom staff the knowledge and skills necessary to build a culture of positivity and supportive teamwork.

Measurable Outcome:

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

50% of classrooms within Lake Hills School, will implement the structured classroom model by May 2024.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will continually monitor the implementation of the Structured Classroom, through learning walks, informal conversations throughout professional learning teams, IEP and Behavioral data, and observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kayla Coxé (coxek@lake.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The structured teaching program is a visually based approach to creating a highly structured and predictable environment that supports students in a variety of educational settings. It promotes independence by utilizing strategies that align with the strengths and needs of the student as it incorporates physical and visual boundaries, visual schedules, routines, work systems and task organization. A structured environment and classroom promotes a clear understanding of the schedule, activities, and expectations for the student and the support staff.

This program consists of eight best practice indicators that comprise the structured classroom. The eight best practice indicators are:

Physical structure/classroom environment

Visual schedules

Work systems

Routines and visual strategies

Visual structure of materials

Communication
Classroom management
Teaching time

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students surrounded by a positive community that fosters moral and civic character skills will show improvement in academic, social-emotional, character and leadership skills. By combining the structured classroom approach, best practice indicators, and character development, including the resiliency tool kit, we can prepare students for life, school, work and beyond.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 on The Structured Classroom

Including the following sessions.

Physical structure/classroom environment

Visual schedules

Work systems

Routines and visual strategies

Visual structure of materials

Communication

Classroom management

Teaching time

Person Responsible: Tecia Johnson (johnsont5@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Bi-Monthly Starting in September.

Professional Development on Residency Education - the standards include health promotion and disease prevention concepts, internal and external influences, access to valid information, products and services, communication skills and resilient behaviors to reduce health risk, advocacy for personal, family and community health.

Person Responsible: Melissa Walker (walkerm1@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: November 2023

Leadership Team provides supports throughout professional learning teams, classroom visits and mentoring,

Person Responsible: Christine Sanchez (sanchezc@lake.k12.fl.us)

By When: Weekly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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.
2023 FSAA data reflects the need for improvement in Reading/ELA with a 45.3% of students scoring below proficiency.
2023 FSAA 23.93% scored level 1, 19.66% scored level 2, 53.85% scored level 3 and 1.71% scored level 4 in Reading/ELA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related 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.
2023 FSAA data reflects the need for improvement in Reading/ELA with a 45.3% of students scoring below proficiency.
2023 FSAA 23.93% scored level 1, 19.66% scored level 2, 53.85% scored level 3 and 1.71% 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 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 Measurable Outcomes

We will achieve a 15% increase of student scoring a level two or higher on the FSAA Reading/ELA Assessment by May 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We will achieve a 15% increase of student scoring a level two or higher on the FSAA Reading/ELA Assessment by May 2024.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

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 implement the Structured Classroom Strategies and Best Practice Indicators.

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

Description:

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. §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, autism spectrum disorder, and behavioral challenges.

The Structured Classroom is an approach to creating a highly structured and predictable environment that provides the necessary support in the classroom and throughout the school day to promote student engagement in learning activities, behavior management, communication, and social skills. . It promotes independence by utilizing strategies that align with the strengths and needs of the students as it incorporates physical and visual boundaries, visual schedules, routines, work systems, and task organization. Structured environments and classrooms can promote a clear understanding of the schedules, activities, and expectations for the students and their teachers.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Academic and behavioral challenges in the classroom are on the rise in terms of frequency and severity, and teachers are not equipped to manage it. Only about a third of teachers are effectively trained to manage challenging behaviors (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2020). More than 40% of teachers think that they are not fully prepared for classroom management and handling student behavior (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2014). The problem is exacerbated by a pattern of teacher distribution, which reveals a disproportionate assignment of less qualified teachers to classrooms with the most challenging students and leading to the unfortunate result being low student achievement (Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Wheeler, 2007). The ability of teachers to organize classrooms and manage the behavior of their students is critical to achieving positive educational outcomes. Research suggests that teacher professional development programs teach classroom organization and classroom management skills, but are not taught thoroughly or with adequate supervision in the real classroom context (Oliver & Reschly, 2007).

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
Professional Development - Provide all staff with professional development in The Structured Classroom and Best Practice Indicators.	Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us
Monitor and Provide ongoing support within classrooms, using the best practice indicators, learning walks and observations.	Meyers, Robin, meyersr@lake.k12.fl.us
Literacy Coaching - The literacy coach, administrators, and other support staff will model lessons and instruction/behavioral intervention strategies.	Coxe, Kayla, coxek@lake.k12.fl.us
Weekly Collaborative Team Meetings - Professional Learning Teams will meet bi-weekly to plan and develop engaging and interactive lessons, analyze academic and behavioral data, as well as reviewing individual education plans and behavioral intervention plans.	

Budget to Support Areas of Focus**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No