

Citrus County Schools

Inverness Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Inverness Middle School

1950 HIGHWAY 41 N, Inverness, FL 34450

<https://ims.citruschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa BaIRD

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 is pending approval by the Citrus County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Inverness Middle School

1950 HIGHWAY 41 N, Inverness, FL 34450

<https://ims.citruschools.org/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">70%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">16%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridaCIMS.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of the IMS learning community is to empower our students to reach their full potential: to respect the diversity of others and to become responsible citizens and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The IMS vision is to prepare our students to be respectful and responsible.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baird, Melissa	Principal	
Story, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Goolsby, Todd	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Melissa Baird

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	356	353	387	0	0	0	0	1096
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	133	96	0	0	0	0	331
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	54	70	0	0	0	0	143
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	39	50	0	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	61	55	0	0	0	0	173

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	51	61	79	0	0	0	0	191

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	388	346	0	0	0	0	1073
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	145	129	0	0	0	0	334
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	83	73	0	0	0	0	182
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	3	6	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	95	81	0	0	0	0	244

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	125	145	130	0	0	0	0	400

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	56	68	39	0	0	0	0	163
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	388	346	0	0	0	0	1073
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	145	129	0	0	0	0	334
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	83	73	0	0	0	0	182
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	3	6	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	95	81	0	0	0	0	244

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	125	145	130	0	0	0	0	400

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	56	68	39	0	0	0	0	163
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	55%	56%	54%	51%	54%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	53%	54%	49%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	47%	36%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	65%	62%	58%	62%	67%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	54%	57%	54%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	44%	51%	36%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	46%	55%	51%	48%	52%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	76%	72%	72%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	53%	52%	1%	54%	-1%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	56%	55%	1%	52%	4%
	2018	51%	49%	2%	51%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	66%	62%	4%	54%	12%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	54%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	55%	49%	6%	46%	9%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	45%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	45%	52%	-7%	48%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	50%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	74%	3%	71%	6%
2018	76%	71%	5%	71%	5%
Compare		1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	70%	21%	61%	30%
2018	96%	65%	31%	62%	34%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	52%	48%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	51	45	32	45	34	22	61			
ASN	69	53		88	65						

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
BLK	26	36	47	45	53	43		81			
HSP	59	53	36	56	46	44	47	93	33		
MUL	55	48		62	51	42	44	64	60		
WHT	56	55	50	66	53	46	48	78	64		
FRL	50	53	52	58	53	42	42	76	54		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	44	35	31	50	45	11	50			
ASN	81	61		81	83						
BLK	42	47	44	44	44	40	18	50			
HSP	45	44	33	62	53	50	28	83	31		
MUL	63	58		66	73	50	67	89	80		
WHT	57	52	43	62	57	55	46	77	57		
FRL	52	50	43	59	56	52	41	75	53		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	31	29	16	27	21	13	27			
ASN	79	75		74	69						
BLK	28	47	38	41	43	43	40	60			
HSP	41	42	53	53	51	20	29	65	14		
MUL	71	56		68	63	30		89	69		
WHT	52	49	33	63	54	38	49	72	54		
FRL	44	45	32	55	51	35	40	66	40		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Science- new content, instructional changes

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

8th grade ELA- lower performing cohorts (maintained level of proficiency)
Math learning gains- new method of inclusion and intensive support

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.

Math learning gains- new method of inclusion and intensive support
Science- new content, instructional changes

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

8th grade math- instructional change and higher performing cohort, use of computer-based programs

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

Bottom Quartile- students

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

1. SWD Learning Gains
2. Attendance
3. Standards-Based Instruction
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Bottom Quartile students are in need of the most support. Many of our SWD students are in the bottom quartile.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the overall percentage of proficiency of our SWD students by 10% (40% to 50%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Baird (bairdm@citruschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our SWD and Bottom Quartile students will be utilizing Achieve 3000 for reading support through an additional 45 minutes course . For math, those SWD and Bottom Quartile students who need support will be placed in an intensive math class or learning lab utilizing one of the following programs: ALEK, Study Island, or IXL. SWD students will have more access to general education classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are using evidence-based and researched-based programs and strategies to help support our most struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategically scheduling of the SWD students.
2. ESE and Support Staff schedules.
3. Implementation of research-based programs Aleks, Achieve.
4. Monitor student achievement of the SWD in researched-based programs and their academic courses.
5. Monitor student behavior.

Person Responsible Melissa Baird (bairdm@citruschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A teacher that provides a variety of strategies for formative assessments that align with the standards based learning target will improve mastery of the standards.

Measurable Outcome: To increase the overall percentage of our school grade by 5%. (56% to 61%)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Baird (bairdm@citrusschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize District Assessments throughout the school year to assess mastery of standards and guide differentiated instruction. Struggling readers will be supported through Achieve 3000. ALEK, Study Island, and IXL will be utilized with those students who need support in mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are using research based programs to drive instruction and improve achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create with teachers a testing timeline for administering district formative assessments.
2. Monitor and discuss data
3. Spiral vertical alignment of standards

Person Responsible Melissa Baird (bairdm@citrusschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We will hold two Title I Family Nights with curriculum information and family engagement events. All stakeholders are invited to join our quarterly SAC meetings. We notify parents of school wide events through a weekly callout and email. We use a monthly newsletter to help keep our students and parents informed. We have Twitter and Facebook pages we use to share interesting academic and athletic events at Inverness Middle School.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.