

Citrus County Schools

# Inverness Primary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Inverness Primary School

206 S LINE AVE, Inverness, FL 34452

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

## Demographics

Principal: Bridget Merchant

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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 Inverness Primary School mission is to provide opportunities for parents/families to become more involved in the planning, review, and improvement of school programs and the education of their children. We will strive to develop partnership with families for sharing the responsibilities for improved student achievement.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Inverness Primary School mission is to provide opportunities for parents/families to become more involved in the planning, review, and improvement of school programs and the education of their children. We will strive to develop partnership with families for sharing the responsibilities for improved student achievement.

### 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
Harper, Kay	Principal	To provide leadership
Flaherty, Jana	Other	ESE Specialist
Smith, Becky	Guidance Counselor	School Counseling
Varnadore, Melissia	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in providing leadership
Mitchell, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Coach staff to enhance instructional practices

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/1/2016, Bridget Merchant

**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.*

1

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

34

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	64	94	108	104	85	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	6	6	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	1	3	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	8	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 7/21/2020

**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	74	105	95	86	106	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	2	18	11	12	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	12	7	3	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

**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	4	6	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	74	105	95	86	106	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	2	18	11	12	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	12	7	3	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

**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	4	6	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	60%	59%	57%	61%	61%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	48%	53%	48%	40%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	60%	63%	66%	71%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	54%	62%	57%	66%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	39%	51%	50%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	60%	53%	66%	63%	51%



EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	64%	61%	3%	58%	6%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	58%	58%	0%	56%	2%
	2018	48%	55%	-7%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
	2018	54%	67%	-13%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	59%	3%	64%	-2%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	62%	60%	2%	60%	2%
	2018	42%	61%	-19%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	58%	3%	53%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						

### 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	40	59	53	53	74	79					
BLK	53			53							
HSP	41	53		50	40						
WHT	62	59	62	63	65	65	58				
FRL	54	59	59	58	62	65	57				
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	20		33	44		50				
BLK	38	45		25	45						
HSP	48	53		52	40		30				
MUL	50	50		56	50						
WHT	54	43	37	54	44	43	56				
FRL	47	42	49	48	43	42	48				
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	40	27		60	73						
BLK	38			33							
HSP	56	38		67	77						
MUL	47			67							
WHT	63	55	52	67	57	56	68				
FRL	57	49	47	59	58	48	64				

### 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	62
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	59
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.**

ELA data for grades 3-5 was the area of lowest performance. The learning gains for all students and the bottom quartile were also a concern. SWD performed lower than non-SWDs. These students are not on grade level in reading and therefore struggle to show proficiency in this tested area. They make up a large portion of our bottom quartile and struggle to make learning gains.

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

According to our raw data from 2019, we see the largest decrease in the 4th grade math achievement. Inconsistent curriculum implementation and lack of rigorous practice contributed to the decline.

**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.**

Our data does not reflect a gap when compared to the state.

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

SWD math learning gains showed the greatest improvement. One group of ESE inclusion students were split into two small groups, decreasing the student to teacher ratio. After school math tutoring was provided to bottom quartile students. Accommodations were provided to students according to need as documented on IEPs.

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

Attendance below 90% is a continued concern. We have many students flagged in the Early Warning System that are slated to enter the 5th grade for the 2020-2021 school year (3rd grade in 2019 data). 15 students were flagged as having two or more identifications in the EWS. This is potentially a contributing factor to our lower achievement levels at this grade level.

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

1. Continuing to increase student achievement in ELA
2. Continuing to increase student achievement in Math
3. Continuing to increase learning gains for our bottom quartile
4. Continuing to increase learning gains for our level 4 and 5 students
5. Continue to improve student engagement

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to our most recent FSA data, our ELA student achievement was our lowest area.

**Measureable Outcome:** We will increase our ELA achievement from 60% to 63%, as measured by FSA ELA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kay Harper (harperk@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement standards based instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** According to the data, students that were provided rigorous standards-based instruction performed higher on the FSA than those whose instruction was inconsistently based on the standards. In order to better prepare our students for a standards based assessment, we need to ensure we are providing standards based instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Implement Ready LAFS curriculum resource
2. Implement iReady
3. Implement lesson frames/learning targets for each ELA lesson
4. Provide instructional coach
5. Monitor student progress weekly

**Person Responsible** Kay Harper (harperk@citruschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** According to our most recent FSA data, our math student achievement was one of our lowest areas.

**Measureable Outcome:** We will increase student achievement in math from 62% to 68%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kay Harper (harperk@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement standards based instruction

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** According to the data, students that were provided rigorous standards-based instruction performed higher on the FSA than those whose instruction was inconsistently based on the standards. In order to better prepare our students for a standards based assessment, we need to ensure we are providing standards based instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Implement Ready MAFS curriculum resource
2. Implement iReady
3. Implement lesson frames/learning targets for each math lesson
4. Provide instructional coach
5. Monitor student progress weekly

**Person Responsible** Kay Harper (harperk@citruschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:**

We would like to increase ELA/Math learning gains to surpass the state learning gains target.

**Measureable Outcome:**

ELA- Learning gains from 59% or higher for overall and bottom quartile.  
Math- Learning gains will be at a 64% or higher overall and 67% or higher for our bottom quartile.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Implement standards based instruction and data monitoring.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

According to the data, students that were provided rigorous standards-based instruction performed higher on the FSA than those whose instruction was inconsistently based on the standards. In order to better prepare our students for a standards based assessment, we need to ensure we are providing standards based instruction.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Implement Ready MAFS curriculum resource
2. Implement iReady
3. Implement lesson frames/learning targets for each math lesson
4. Provide instructional coach
5. Provide mentors to level 4/5 students to monitor student data

**Person Responsible**

Kay Harper (harperk@citruschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

1. Continuing to increase learning gains for our level 4 and 5 students through Growth period at every grade level.
2. Continue to improve student engagement through monitoring teacher lesson plans and feedback from classroom walk through 5D tool.

**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.

Inverness Primary School strives to build and maintain positive relationships. PTA provides opportunities for families to participate in after school events. Title I funds enable the school to host events for families as well. These events include but are not limited to: movie nights, school dances, Donuts with Dad, Muffins with Mom, fall festivals, cookies with Santa, and other informational nights. Teachers meet with parents regularly throughout the year to discuss student progress.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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