Riverhills Elementary Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Riverhills Elementary Magnet School

405 S RIVERHILLS DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

http://riverhills.mysdhc.org

Demographics

Principal: Crystal Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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 Hillsborough 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

Riverhills Elementary Magnet School

405 S RIVERHILLS DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

http://riverhills.mysdhc.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To guide all learners by providing meaningful opportunities which inspires life long innovators to be caring, responsible, and successful. Students will develop into globally minded citizens through collaboration, reflection, action, and inquiry.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering children to create a better future.

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
Connolly, Todd	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary public school by performing assigned duties personally or through subordinate supervisors. Serves as the instructional leader, develops and evaluates educational program to ensure conformance of state, national and school board standards.
	Assistant Principal	Lakeyshea Bryant is Assistant Principal Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of an elementary public school by performing assigned duties personally or through subordinate supervisors. Serves as the instructional leader, develops and evaluates educational program to ensure conformance of state, national and school board standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2011, Crystal Brown

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.*
0

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
39

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	80	82	79	82	76	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	477
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	2	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/11/2020

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	81	85	82	88	80	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	3	7	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	81	85	82	88	80	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	3	7	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	58%	52%	57%	62%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	55%	58%	48%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	50%	53%	36%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	54%	63%	62%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	40%	57%	62%	47%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	46%	51%	27%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	50%	53%	58%	48%	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	67%	52%	15%	58%	9%
	2018	66%	53%	13%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	55%	3%	58%	0%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
	2018	68%	55%	13%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	57%	-5%	64%	-12%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	60%	-1%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	61%	51%	10%	53%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
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	26	50		33	47						
ELL	47	50		53	75						
ASN	80	67		90	80		75				
BLK	45	30	22	46	28	22	52				
HSP	45	42		45	32		71				
MUL	65	38		48	23						
WHT	73	56		66	50	20	75				
FRL	43	32	28	39	26	21	58				

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	35	50	30	48	40	33	18				
ELL	56			69							
ASN	70	85		100	62						
BLK	51	50	40	52	47	25	33				
HSP	58	42		65	75		50				
MUL	53	36		35	55						
WHT	72	45		72	55		61				
FRL	52	48	43	52	49	30	37				

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	22	27	27	26	33						
ELL	25			50							
ASN	90			100							
BLK	56	52	24	52	39	20	50				
HSP	68	36		71	41		60				
MUL	68			58							
WHT	60	52		65	56						
FRL	52	46	41	52	37	27	54				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	78
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	35
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	47

Hispanic Students	
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	44
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	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Students making gains in our bottom quartile in both ELA and Math were our lowest performance areas in 2018-2019. This was closely monitored in the 2019-2020 school year and we were seeing evidence of growth in these areas. We will continue to make this a priority in the 2020-2021 school year.

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

We dropped 7 points in the area of mathematics proficiency and dropped 6 points in the percent making learning gains as measured by the 2018-2019 FSA assessment. Both of these were closely monitored in the 2019-2020 school year and we were seeing evidence of growth in both areas. We will continue to make this a priority in the 2020-2021 school year.

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 4th grade math data had the largest gap in the 2018-2019 administration of the FSA. This was a gap year in textbook adoption. We took many measures during the 2019-2020 school year to address this area, including improved planning practices, work with our district office in lesson planning, modeling and providing teacher feedback. We will continue to make this a priority in the 2020-2021 school year.

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

We showed the greatest improvement in our science scores during the 2018-2019 administration of the FSA Science. Evidence from assessment monitoring during the 2019-2020 school year showed that we were maintaining the growth that was demonstrated in 2018-2019.

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

We have made improvements in attendance of students below 90%. This was an area of focus of ours over the past school year. We were able to decrease the number of students in this category from 38 students in 2018-2019 to 19 students in 2019-2020.

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

1. Continuing to make improvements in percentage of students making learning gains in our bottom quartile.
2. Continuing to increase the percentage of students making learning gains overall.
3. Continuing to increase the proficiency of students in the area of mathematics.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will continue our efforts of improving standards-aligned instruction in 2020-2021. Our data from the administration of FSA in 2018-2019 showed a need for improvement in this area. This was a major focus for us in 2019-2020. Our formative data from the current school year was showing that we were making growth with our bottom quartile students (40% in Math and 46% in Reading) and the number of students overall making learning gains in reading (62%) and math (67%). These percentages were taken from trend data using Formative Assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of students making learning gains in 4th and 5th grade reading and mathematics will increase to 65 percent as measured by the 2020-2021 administration of the FSA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Todd Connolly (todd.connolly@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student assessment data will be collected (formative, monthly assessments, etc) and analyzed for evidence of students making gains. The school leadership team and grade level PLC's will problem solve and plan interventions for students not showing evidence of making gains. Such strategies could include day time ELP, RTI interventions, student assigned a mentor, implementation of enrichment groups and remediation groups, etc. This will include closely monitoring and planning for improvement with our subgroups needing to show improvement (Black, SWD and Economically Disadvantaged Students).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This is a strategy that we implemented during the 2019-2020 school year and we were seeing significant results with students making learning gains overall, as well as our bottom quartile making improvement toward learning gains. This constant monitoring of student data allowed us to provide interventions that allowed our students to achieve success through standards based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Feedback to classroom teachers will be tied to our school improvement goals. Administration will provide feedback twice monthly and provide follow-up to ensure feedback is being implemented.

Person Responsible	Todd Connolly (todd.connolly@hcps.net)

We will conduct two book studies and teachers will implement strategies learned from these texts into their instructional practice. The books are: Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind and Quality Questioning. This action step will also help us increase our subgroup data. We are currently finishing up with Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind and will then move on to Quality Questioning which will be completed by the end of January.

Person Responsible	Todd Connolly (todd.connolly@hcps.net)

All students making up our Sub groups have been placed with a teacher who is rated highly effective per our school districts evaluation ratings from the 2018-1019 school year. These students have also been assigned a mentor who will meet with them once per week beginning in November.

Person Responsible	Todd Connolly (todd.connolly@hcps.net)

SIPPS will be used to build foundational skills for all students for our bottom quartile students, including students in our subgroups.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Having seen a significant reduction in students attending school less than 90% of the time, we will continue to monitor and implement strategies used in 2019-2020.

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 implement "IB attitudes" as a part of our International Baccalaureate program. Students, staff, parents, and community members recognize students and other stakeholders who are exhibiting and contributing to our ib attitudes and a positive school culture. A student is elected by their classmates monthly to represent their class as student of the month for demonstrating the IB Attitude of the Month.

Students in need are assigned mentors to help them with behavior or academic needs.

Our PE coach, school resource officer and guidance counselor have initiated boys and girls clubs to help students develop leadership skills and to improve behavior and academics.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**