

Citrus County Schools

Inverness Primary School



2021-22 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 | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 20 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Inverness Primary School

206 S LINE AVE, Inverness, FL 34452

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

Demographics

Principal: Bridget Merchant

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | Yes |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | <i>[Data Not Available]</i> |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (56%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | [not available] |
| * 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.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Merchant, Bridget | Principal | To provide the leadership and vision necessary to develop and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment conducive to learning and student success. |
| Varnadore, Melissia | Assistant Principal | To deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. They coordinate with the principal and district administration to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty. |
| Mitchell, Melissa | Instructional Coach | Serves as part of the Leadership Team and be responsible for bringing evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with and supporting teachers and administration with the goal of increasing student engagement, improving student achievement, and building teacher capacity. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, 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

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

609

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

4

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

6

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 | 98 | 92 | 96 | 99 | 91 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 558 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 18 | 13 | 20 | 12 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 11 | 25 | 24 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |

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 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 28 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |

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 | 12 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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 | 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 |

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 | 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 |

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 | 56% | | | 60% | 59% | 57% | 53% | 59% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 41% | | | 59% | 56% | 58% | 45% | 50% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 30% | | | 59% | 48% | 53% | 46% | 41% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | 56% | | | 62% | 60% | 63% | 54% | 66% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | 48% | | | 64% | 54% | 62% | 45% | 56% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 29% | | | 67% | 39% | 51% | 41% | 39% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | | | 62% | 60% | 53% | 53% | 61% | 55% |

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 |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 61% | 3% | 58% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 55% | 2% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 58% | 0% | 56% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 58% | 1% | 62% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 59% | 3% | 64% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 60% | 2% | 60% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 58% | 3% | 53% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-5 iReady ELA and Math, District Science Assessment and NGSSS Science for 5th grade.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 14 | 12 | 25 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11 | 9 | 17 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12 | 13 | 28 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 10 | 21 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 18 | 23 | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 5 | 13 | 21 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5 | 9 | 14 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 0 | 1 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 28 | 32 | 38 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20 | 16 | 21 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | English Language Learners | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 2 | 8 | 35 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 1 | 4 | 26 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 23 | 23 | 28 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 10 | 12 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 7 | 12 | 34 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 4 | 7 | 17 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 15 | 24 | 26 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5 | 11 | 12 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 11 | 20 | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6 | 11 | 14 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 49 | 23 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 35 | 13 | 23 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 42 | 54 | | 50 | 23 | | 23 | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | | | 48 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 79 | | | 79 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 42 | | | 27 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 44 | 27 | 57 | 47 | 29 | 42 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 36 | 33 | 50 | 38 | 29 | 31 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

| 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 |
| 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 | | | | |

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) | [not available] |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 43 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 300 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |

Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| 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 |

| 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 | 39 |
| 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 | 79 |
| 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 | 35 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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?

Across the grade levels (3-5) we saw a decrease in the percent of students scoring 3 or above in ELA and Math.

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

The greatest need for improvement K-2 is in the area of phonics. For grades 3-5 the greatest need for improvement is in the lowest quartile for math and reading.

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

The contributing factors are loss of meaningful instruction due to distance learning, social distancing parameters led to eliminating small group instruction, and lack of foundational reading skills. Resources to support interventions for struggling student were also limited.

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

Our progress monitoring data on iReady showed the most improvement in the areas of Reading for 2nd grade with 55% of IPS Students meeting typical growth. In the area of Math, 65% of 4th grade met typical growth.

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

2nd grade revamped their ELA block with a heavy emphasis on phonics instruction. 4th grade implemented tier 3 math groups in the classrooms. This helped close the gap and meet student individual needs.

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

Strategies we will use: Focus on the bottom quartile using a systematic process. Increase foundational reading skills and support to the lower grade levels. Increase student talk and differentiation instruction to meet the diverse needs of 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.

Recently adopted ELA Curriculum, Wonders, with a strong focus on the BEST Standards, Canvas Learning Management System professional developments, Monthly Opportunity Checks (MOCS) where grade level teams compare alike data to guide instruction, Data Days will be used to review data and adjust small group plans, and technology professional development to help integrate high interest activities to standards.

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

We are going to continue to support teachers with the implementation of the BEST Standards, provide teachers with a weekly extended planning/collaboration time as well as daily common planning. We provide summer planning days in which teams plan for instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | |
| Description and Rationale: | According to our 2021 FSA data, our ELA student achievement decreased to 56 from 60. |
| Measureable Outcome: | During the 2021-2022, we will increase our ELA achievement from 56% to 60%, as measured by FSA ELA. |
| Monitoring: | We will progress monitor using iReady online instruction. This data will be analyzed during team meetings and help guide instruction. We will also use iReady and Lexia Core5 to intervene with identified students. Our Instructional Coach will also model ELA strategies to better meet the needs of students. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citruschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Implement B.E.S.T Standards based instruction |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | In order to better prepare our students for a standards based assessment, we need to ensure we are providing standards based instruction to the depth of rigor necessary. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing B.E.S.T Standards
2. Implement iReady
3. Implement Wonders Curriculum
4. Implement Lexia Core5
5. Implement Demonstration Classrooms
6. Implement lesson frames/learning targets for each ELA lesson
7. Monitor lower quartile progress
8. Implementation of a school based Literacy Team

Person Responsible Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citruschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: According to our 2021 FSA data, our Math student achievement decreased to 56 from 60.

Measureable Outcome: We will increase our Math achievement from 56% to 60%, as measured by FSA Math.

Monitoring: We will progress monitor using Standards Mastery assessments throughout the school year. This data will be analyzed during team meetings and help guide instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citruschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Ready Florida MAFS 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 Florida MAFS curriculum
2. Implement iReady
3. Implement lesson frames/learning targets for each math lesson
4. Implement Demonstration classroom
5. Monitor bottom quartile progress

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citruschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will increase ELA/Math learning gains to surpass the state learning gains and bottom quartile target.

Measureable Outcome: ELA- Learning gains from 59% or higher for overall and bottom quartile.
 Math- Learning gains will be at 64% or higher overall and 67% or higher bottom quarter.

Monitoring: We will monitor student progress monitoring assessment data and track students in the bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissia Varnadore (varnadorem@citruschools.org)

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. Monthly Opportunity Checks to discuss student progress
2. Identify target students and monitor progress
3. Continue implementation of iReady
4. Strategic MTSS support

Person Responsible: Bridget Merchant (merchantb@citruschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on our data review, behavior and discipline has been identified as an area of focus. By increasing Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, we will decrease student referrals.

Measureable Outcome: Students without a major discipline referral will increase to 90%.

Monitoring: Discipline data will be reviewed monthly with the whole staff. The Discipline/PBS Committee will meet monthly to refine processes and make improvements.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement PBS Strategies in classrooms and school-wide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence indicates that schools that effectively implement Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports will have a decrease in negative behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement Eagles SOAR (Support, Overcome, Achieve, Respect) daily SEL instruction
2. Behavior Interventions by Behavior Specialist
3. Check In/Check Out program to build relationships
4. Discipline/PBS Committee with a focus on PBS Events
5. Discipline data reviewed monthly with staff
5. Cafeteria PBS focus with monthly recognition

Person Responsible Melissia Varnadore (varnadorem@citruschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

School culture and environment will be monitored through the staff, student and families surveys. The IPS Discipline/PBS Committee will meet to review discipline data and make adjustments to improve our discipline processes. This data will also be shared out with the staff monthly to collect feedback.

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.

Inverness Primary School has developed a Social and Emotional Committee. This SEL Committee created "Eagles SOAR" which is daily instruction in SEL topics in order to build a classroom community and increase students social skills. IPS also has a Check In/Check out program that aligns students of concern with a mentor that they check in with every day. This program has shown success in decreasing negative referrals and increasing a positive school culture.

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

In order to communicate with families and stakeholders, Inverness Primary uses classroom newsletters, monthly school-wide newsletters, regular callouts, emails, phone calls and conferences. IPS also hosts events during the school year to build strong family connections, support a partnership among the school, parents, and the community, and improve student academic achievement.