

Lafayette District Schools

Lafayette High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lafayette High School

160 NE HORNET DR, Mayo, FL 32066

<https://www.lafayette.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Stewart Hancock

Start Date for this Principal: 9/6/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (66%) 2020-21: (69%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lafayette County School Board on 10/18/2022.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Building a community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide all students with educational opportunities within a safe environment conducive to learning, which will enable them to become successful students and positive, productive citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hancock, Stewart	Principal	
Ginn, Paula	Assistant Principal	
Hanson, Tim	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/6/2022, Stewart Hancock

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

620

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

5

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	106	88	89	80	89	76	615
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	33	37	35	30	4	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	20	19	12	7	13	4	85
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	8	11	4	11	1	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	11	10	12	4	8	0	64
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	16	18	26	16	15	140
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	13	10	0	0	0	49
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	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 who have 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	19	10	12	18	13	12	3	87

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	0	5	3	2	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/9/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	106	88	89	80	89	76	615
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	1	3	3	3	20
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	23	20	18	13	23	15	8	120
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	14	8	7	0	0	53
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	2	1	4	0	1	0	0	8

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	1	3	6	1	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3	3	2	2	19

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	106	88	89	80	89	76	615
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	1	3	3	3	20
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	23	20	18	13	23	15	8	120
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	16	14	8	7	0	0	53
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	2	1	4	0	1	0	0	8

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	1	3	6	1	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3	3	2	2	19

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	53%		52%	57%			56%		56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%		52%	63%			55%		51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%		41%	45%			38%		42%
Math Achievement	64%		41%	71%			64%		51%
Math Learning Gains	59%		48%	54%			43%		48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%		49%	46%			39%		45%
Science Achievement	64%		61%	67%			65%		68%
Social Studies Achievement	76%		68%	75%			70%		73%

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
06	2022					
	2019	43%	43%	0%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	36%	36%	0%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
08	2022					
	2019	64%	64%	0%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	61%	61%	0%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	46%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	48%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	77%	77%	0%	67%	10%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	70%	70%	0%	71%	-1%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	68%	68%	0%	70%	-2%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	69%	69%	0%	61%	8%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	33%	33%	0%	57%	-24%

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	37	24	33	28	25	33		93	46
ELL	45	55	50	62	55	40		80			
BLK	32	48	33	36	40		33				
HSP	47	51	38	56	54	42	63	66	91	100	93
MUL	36	50		42	58						
WHT	58	55	37	70	62	49	70	80	89	97	89
FRL	43	48	34	53	54	53	49	68	72	98	88

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	17	40	35	42	44	30	34	43			
ELL	49	56	23	75	58	62	60				
BLK	40	53	54	59	48	55		60			
HSP	48	63	50	65	54	50	62	80	91	100	100
MUL	40	43		58	36						
WHT	63	65	42	75	56	41	70	76	86	100	91
FRL	46	57	52	59	47	46	56	71	83	100	85

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	21	38	26	38	46	38	23	35			
ELL	35	40		94	43						
BLK	43	43	30	48	38		50	60			
HSP	53	50	33	69	43	46	66	70	62	100	64
MUL				42							
WHT	58	58	42	66	43	39	67	75	85	96	89
FRL	44	51	38	60	44	41	60	66	67	95	76

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	724
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

In reviewing the data, our overall school grade fell three points, from a 69 to a 66. The most notable changes in our subcategories were the decrease in learning gains for Math and ELA of our bottom 25%. Our overall math learning gains improved by 5%. We continue to excel in our middle school & college and career acceleration and graduation rate components.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Though our performance in many categories was very good and we remained an A school for the fourth consecutive year, we have not seen improvement in learning gains of our bottom quartile, specifically learning gains for students with disabilities and our black/African American students.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

A major contributing factor is chronic absenteeism whether due to Covid or other circumstances. Also, finding a balance with our struggling students with regard to supporting them with earning credits versus supporting them with specific gaps in their learning proves difficult.

We are implementing a new attendance policy aimed at preventing chronic absenteeism for the 22-23 school year. Our teachers also participated in professional learning over the summer to support our bottom quartile students. Through master scheduling changes, we are focusing on supporting our struggling students through more collaborative teaching.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The most improvement was overall learning gains in math, and our Civics scores were the highest in the state at 96%. We were number one in the state in middle school acceleration, number two in the state in college & career acceleration, and number one in the state in graduation rate.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We continue to add different pathways for our students to accelerate themselves whether in middle or high school. In Civics, we are focusing on implementing the BEST literacy standards and incorporating them within different subject areas. Through our Peers as Partners program and the utilization of various staff on campus, we are trying to improve small group instruction and target specific learning deficiencies which we feel helped our math learning gains.

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

We feel our Peers as Partners program and the utilization of various staff on campus is improving small group instruction and targeting specific learning deficiencies. This, in turn, improves our math learning gains. We want to focus on this even more moving forward. We have also incorporated many new attendance policies that we feel that will benefit our lower performing students.

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.

Over the summer, our teachers participated in professional development focused on the new BEST standards. We also did extensive training on collaborative teaching, especially with our middle school classrooms. We continue to offer professional learning on high yield engagement strategies which we feel will improve our students' learning, engagement, and attendance.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We have added new career and technical opportunities for our students which positively affects our students' effort and attitude with their education because they are able to apply what they are learning at an earlier age. We will continue to utilize our Peers to Partners program and collaborative teaching to positively impact our lower performing students. Our after school program offers students more opportunities for learning, homework help, and enrichment.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. 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 critical need from the data reviewed.

Our students with disabilities continue to be below the 41% threshold for the third consecutive year. This subgroup was at 36% this year. We will focus on improving achievement in this subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the Students with Disabilities subgroup from 36 to 41%.

Monitoring:

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

We will use progress monitoring data to guide decision making and instruction for these students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stewart Hancock (shancock@lcsbmail.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Small group instruction, collaborative teaching, and individualized learning will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Research supports the effectiveness of the implementation of these strategies. Moby Max will be used in intensive math courses for individualized learning as it is proven to close learning gaps and increase student engagement. CommonLit 360 will be used to individualize learning in intensive ELA courses.

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.

Develop a master schedule that allows for co-teaching with these targeted students. Purchase, utilize, and train on Moby Max and CommonLit 360. Each student will have an individualized learning path.

Person Responsible

Stewart Hancock (shancock@lcsbmail.net)

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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

NA

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?

NA

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

NA

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

LHS implements many strategies to effectively communicate, build positive relationships, and encourage family involvement. Teachers send home reminders and information to parents using the Remind app and conference with parents when needed. Parents have access to student grades and assessment results on Skyward, Edgenuity, and the FL Family Access Portal. Teachers post assignments with detailed instructions on Google Classroom. Deficiencies are sent home each 9 weeks.

Students are recognized for academic and extracurricular achievement at school, online, and at sporting events. Parents are able to find the school's mission and vision on the school's website along with a calendar of upcoming events and recognition of school and student success. Parents complete a survey that allows them to voice any concerns and provide input regarding LHS. The data from the survey is compiled and reviewed to drive future decisions. A School Advisory Council made up of parents, community members, and school staff meets monthly or as needed to address concerns and provide input on improvements that can be made.

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

Our administration sets goals and high expectations for our students, faculty, and staff. Our faculty and staff set goals and high expectations for our students. Our community has high expectations for our school system. Motivating and supporting students to be the best versions of themselves is the responsibility of faculty, staff, administration, parents, community members, and alumni.

Students are responsible for their actions and these actions should ultimately promote a positive school culture and environment.