Inverness Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Inverness Middle School

1950 HIGHWAY 41 N, Inverness, FL 34450

https://ims.citrusschools.org/

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Ba IR D

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Inverness Middle School

1950 HIGHWAY 41 N, Inverness, FL 34450

https://ims.citrusschools.org/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

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 kind, 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Baird, Melissa	Principal	Curriculum, Discipline, and Facilities
Gardner, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, Discipline, and Facilities
Goolsby, Todd	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, Discipline, and Facilities

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Melissa Ba IR D

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
67

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,060

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	340	348	0	0	0	0	1033
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	77	76	0	0	0	0	244
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	77	102	0	0	0	0	202
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	77	66	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	20	28	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	72	68	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	65	60	0	0	0	0	215
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	86	94	93	0	0	0	0	273

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	3	6	16	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	10	0	0	0	0	24

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/17/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				55%	56%	54%	56%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	53%	54%	52%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	47%	43%	46%	47%
Math Achievement				65%	62%	58%	62%	64%	58%
Math Learning Gains				53%	54%	57%	57%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	44%	51%	54%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				46%	55%	51%	46%	56%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				79%	76%	72%	77%	73%	72%

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	2021					
	2019	53%	52%	1%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	56%	55%	1%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	66%	62%	4%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2021					
	2019	55%	49%	6%	46%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	45%	52%	-7%	48%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	77%	74%	3%	71%	6%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	70%	21%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool used by all grade levels was USA Test Prep.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	205	250	247
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	4	4
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	3	3	3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	241	163	182
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	1	3
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	1
	English Language Learners	4	0	3

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	168	222	190
	Economically Disadvantaged	1	3	2
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	1
	English Language Learners	1	5	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	83	145	7
	Economically Disadvantaged	1	2	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	1	0
	English Language Learners	1	5	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	222	219	210
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	3	5
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	1	1	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82	139	136
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	3	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	1	1
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	29	37	21	36	39	8	39			
ELL	36	60		50	45						
ASN	92	82		92	73						
BLK	29	43	43	22	18	9					
HSP	40	42	18	46	41	52	36	69			
MUL	52	50		40	31		45	67	45		
WHT	49	46	35	54	47	39	45	64	43		
FRL	44	46	33	48	43	40	40	59	42		
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		

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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

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

ELA is our main focus area. Data shows a three year downward trend:
2018 - 56%
2019 - 55%
2020 - 45%

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA data - both progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

Key Factors: The three year downward trend in ELA; COVID 19 (student absences and students enrolling and unenrolling in brick-and-mortar and/or virtual school)
Actions: Utilizing Achieve 3000 and Lexia for intervention

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

*Grades 6, 7, 8 showed higher than district in math
*Grades 7 and 8 showed higher than state in math
*Grade 7 was higher than district and state in Civics
*We were higher than state and district in Algebra EOC
*We were higher that state and district in Geometry EOC

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

Key factors include consistent progress monitoring with USA Test Prep. Along with the progress monitoring, teachers held data chat reviews and adjusted lesson plans accordingly.

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

We will utilize our ESE inclusion teachers to better support our SWD population and we will continue to have our SWD participate in LRE. We have Achieve 3000, Lexia, and USA Test Prep as well as ongoing professional development with Best Standards.

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

We will have continued professional development with USA Test Prep and progress monitoring tools, Best Standards, and close collaboration with our school-based Instructional Coach.

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

*Focus on SWD students - inclusion support and LRE
*Continued professional development with progress monitoring tools and Best Standards
*Continued support from school-based Instructional Coach for progress monitoring, data chats, and data review

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area was identified as a critical need after reviewing progress monitoring data from USA TestPrep and statewide assessment scores for FSA ELA. Students at IMS are struggling with concepts specific to identifying Key Ideas and Details, as well as Integration of Knowledge and Ideas from multiple sources.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of students, grades 6-8, scoring a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA assessment will increase by 5% (from 49% to 54%).
Monitoring:	Progress toward this goal will be monitored through three administrations (beginning, middle, and end of year) of districtwide ELA assessments developed in USA TestPrep.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Baird (bairdm@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with intensive reading needs will receive three 45-minute periods of daily instruction utilizing programs such as Achieve 3000 and Lexia.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected based guidelines outlined in the Citrus County K-12 District Reading Plan.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure all FSA level 1 and 2 readers are enrolled with certified teachers for ELA, Reading, and Intensive Reading Courses. Monitor student progress through multiple sources of data, USA TestPrep, course grades, and progress reports from Achieve 3000 and Lexia.

Person Responsible	Melissa Baird (bairdm@citrusschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area was identified as a critical need after reviewing progress monitoring data from USA TestPrep and statewide assessment scores for FSA ELA and Mathematics. The achievement gap in ELA for SWD students scoring a level 3 or higher versus non-SWD students is 37 percentage points. 53% of non-SWD students scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA versus only 16% of students identified as having a disability. The achievement gap in Math for SWD students scoring a level 3 or higher versus non-SWD students is 40 percentage points. 57% of non-SWD students scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA versus only 17% of students identified as having a disability.
Measurable Outcome:	The achievement gap in ELA and Math for SWD versus non-SWD will decrease by 5%. ELA - 32% (5% reduction from 37%) Math - 35% (5% reduction from 40%)
Monitoring:	Progress toward this goal will be monitored through three administrations (beginning, middle, and end of year) of districtwide ELA and Math assessments developed in USA TestPrep.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Gardner (gardners1@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase inclusive practices: Students identified as SWD will be scheduled in their least restrictive environment (LRE) for ELA and Math. Certified ESE teachers will push into designated inclusion classes to support student success. Differentiation Strategies: On-going professional development for evidenced-based strategies to support the needs of students with a wide variety of learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Inclusive practices foster a culture of respect and belonging, and provide a better quality of education for all students. Students identified as SWD not only demonstrate higher rates of academic success while in an inclusive setting, they also develop positive social skills, problem solving skills, and a more positive self-image. Differentiation (DI) allows teachers to support students at their instructional level while scaffolding their success with grade level standards. Effective DI also leads to an increase in student engagement, confidence, and motivation to learn.

Action Steps to Implement

Schedule students identified as SWD in their LRE for ELA and math according to the IEP.
Schedule certified ESE teachers to push into designated inclusion classes to support student success.
Monitor student progress toward mastery of IEP goals and proficiency with grade level standards.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Gardner (gardners1@citrusschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area was identified as a critical need after reviewing the following data points: number of office discipline referrals, number of assigned days for ISS and OSS, and survey data from staff, students, and parents.
Measurable Outcome:	Office discipline referrals will decrease by 5%.
Monitoring:	Progress toward this goal will be monitored through quarterly reviews of the number of office discipline referrals and number of assigned days for ISS and OSS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Todd Goolsby (goolsbyt@citrusschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continued implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) program to recognize, reward, and encourage students for positive behavior. Weekly Social Emotional Learning (SEL) program implemented campus-wide with all students. Behavior Specialist will regularly meet with high need students to support the development of positive social/emotional skills and reduce the number of office referrals and suspensions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS is an evidenced-based approach used to promote school safety and good behavior. Students at IMS earn PIBS points they can exchange for a variety of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. Programs that address youth mental health and wellness have become an increasing need for students, especially those who have experienced trauma. The weekly SEL lessons are provided districtwide by certified teachers. When student behaviors escalate, the addition of a Behavior Specialist on campus is an invaluable resource for students who need more support and explicit intervention beyond what our schoolwide behavior program (PBIS) provides. The Behavior Specialist will proactively meet with small groups, as well as individual students for social skills instruction, modeling, and role play of replacement behaviors. The Behavior Specialist will also conduct in-class observations to support instructional staff in designing effective behavioral strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

Promote PBIS program with students, staff, and families.
Train teachers in the implementation of the districtwide SEL program.
Identify high need students who will benefit from proactive intervention with the Behavior Specialist.

Person Responsible	Todd Goolsby (goolsbyt@citrusschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Inverness Middle School reported 3.5 discipline incidents per 100 students during the 2019-2020 school year. When compared to other middle schools statewide, IMS falls into the moderate category. This rate is less than the statewide middle school rate of 4.2 incidents per 100 students.
*Violent Incidents: Statewide Rank - 98/553, County Rank - 2/4
*Property Incidents: Statewide Rank - 366/553, County Rank - 3/4
*Drug/Public Order Incidents: Statewide Rank - 500/553, County Rank - 3/4
*Total Reported Suspensions: Statewide Rank - 436/553, County Rank - 2/4

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.

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.

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

At Inverness Middle School it is imperative that all of the following stakeholders work together to promote a positive culture and environment: students, teachers, support staff, administration, parents, community and district support. This requires consistent and clear communication and collaboration from all stakeholders as each plays an integral part in promoting and maintaining a positive culture and environment at Inverness Middle School.