

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Riverview Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Riverview Elementary School

10809 HANNAWAY RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Teri Madill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2012

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Riverview Elementary School

10809 HANNAWAY RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

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 PK-5	Yes	75%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

In a safe, nurturing and inclusive school community ALL students will be empowered to become life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Riverview Elementary promotes a high achieving environment for ALL learners.

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
Murphy, Melody	Principal	Instructional leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/23/2012, Teri Madill

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

2

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	91	84	83	90	64	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	10	7	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	18	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	10	27	25	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
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

Wednesday 6/17/2020

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	80	75	85	70	76	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	9	5	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	22	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	12	22	10	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	80	75	85	70	76	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	9	5	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	22	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	12	22	10	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	49%	52%	57%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	55%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	53%	46%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	50%	54%	63%	62%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	57%	62%	52%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	51%	41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	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	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	54%	53%	1%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	54%	-8%	62%	-16%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	57%	-8%	64%	-15%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
	2018	61%	54%	7%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	52%	7%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	25	29	26	30	46	43	13				
ELL	34	33		41	52						
BLK	32	35		33	50	55	36				
HSP	48	45	50	45	57	57	41				
MUL	58	55		53	55						
WHT	51	48	27	57	63		48				
FRL	45	47	35	41	54	44	41				
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	42	38	32	50	48	33				
ELL	34	42		34	50		40				
BLK	37	35		40	54		60				
HSP	45	54	46	47	53	45	52				
MUL	47	45		59	64						
WHT	60	60	50	72	72	62	68				
FRL	43	49	38	52	64	53	55				
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	21	39	33	35	36	31	22				
ELL	32	38	45	48	28	30					
BLK	47	52	64	47	48	50	20				
HSP	39	51	36	52	39	18	53				
MUL	65	73		65	73						
WHT	59	55	44	69	54	47	65				
FRL	42	49	47	51	48	30	47				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
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	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	
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	40
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	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
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	49
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	44
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.

For the past three years RES bottom quartile learning gains in reading have been falling. We have seen a trend, especially with fourth grade of our students' learning gains dropping. For the past three years we have not had a reading coach. Supplemental allocations have been used for a full time psychologist, reading resource (.5) or TTD units. For the 2019-2020 school year we were allocated a .5 Reading Coach.

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

ELA learning gains showed the greatest decline from 51.3% of students showing learning gains in 2017-18 to 46% in 2018-19. For the past three years we have not had a reading coach. Supplemental allocations have been used for a full time psychologist, reading resource (.5) or TTD units. For the 2019-2020 school year we were allocated a .5 Reading Coach.

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.

ELA learning gains showed the greatest decline from 51.3% of students showing learning gains in 2017-18 to 46% in 2018-19. For the past three years we have not had a reading coach. Supplemental allocations have been used for a full time psychologist, reading resource (.5) or TTD units. For the 2019-2020 school year we were allocated a .5 Reading Coach. For the 2020-21 school year we have allocated a 1.0 reading coach.

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

RES math bottom quartile gains continued to exceed the district and state with 50% of students making gains. RES continued to use spiraled learning to revisit skills and strategies taught, incorporated backward design, used performance scales and developed authentic assessments.

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

RES SWD continues to be a problematic group, specifically our reading gains and our bottom %ile SWD students.

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

1. Bottom %ile learning gains
2. Reading overall learning gains
3. Science (students scoring 3 or <)
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	RES SWD are in the F zone for ESSA. Only 26% of SWD made learning gains in ELA based on FSA 2017-18 data.
Measurable Outcome:	RES will increase the percent of SWD making a learning gains from 26% to 50% on the ELA section of FSA in 20-21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	RES hired a 1.0 reading coach (allocated) and a learning specialist para-professional. VE teachers are meeting weekly to identify the specific needs of their struggling learners and providing targeted interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Support for struggling students must be prescriptive. We must start with skills/ strategies that are missing (gaps in learning) and fix those areas to help students. Their small group instruction must happen daily and consistent.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For the past three years RES bottom quartile learning gains in reading have been falling. We have seen a trend, especially with fourth grade of our students' learning gains dropping.
Measurable Outcome:	RES will improve learning gains in ELA from 46% making gains to 55% making gains on the 2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	For the 2020-2021 school year we are allocated a 1.0 Reading Coach. iReady will be used to improve reading skills based on needs to the students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	RES will be implementing prescriptive instruction that supports the specific needs of each student using data from iReady, DRA, teacher generated assessments and interim form assessment data.

Action Steps to Implement

Research shows that teacher training and support to implement new strategies has a higher return on student achievement. Having a reading coach to provide this high level of support for teachers will increase student learning.

Person Responsible	Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Science instruction is tied closely to reading and RES has seen a significant drop in students scoring a 3 or higher on the FSA. In 2018-19 RES dropped Science achievement on the SSA has fallen over the last year.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	In 2018-19 RES SSA scores dropped 18 percentage points from 63% of students scoring a three or higher to 45% scoring a three or higher. RES will increase the percent of students scoring a three or higher on the SSA from 45% scoring three or higher to 55% scoring three or higher on the SSA 20-21
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	RES will have a .5 Science coach for the 20-21 school year. She will work with teachers to plan, implement and assess the SSS standards and monitor student learning. She will train teachers to understand and teach science in a meaningful and effective way.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Networks of teachers working together to understand and implement changes in their instruction can be powerful mechanisms for supporting implementation of science standards (Coburn et al., 2012; Penuel and Riel, 2007). Such networks provide a mechanism for teachers to share ideas about teaching, learning, and assessment; stories about students' successes and difficulties; strategies for managing learning groups; and tips for using technology (Penuel and Riel, 2007).

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	RES African American students are in the D zone for ESSA. Only 32% of SWD made learning gains in ELA based on FSA 2017-18 data.
Measurable Outcome:	RES will increase the percent of African American students making a learning gains from 32% to 50% on the ELA section of FSA in 20-21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melody Murphy (melody.murphy@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	RES hired a 1.0 reading coach (allocated) and a .5 Science Coach. Teachers are meeting weekly to identify the specific needs of their struggling learners and providing targeted interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Support for struggling students must be prescriptive. We must start with skills/ strategies that are missing (gaps in learning) and fix those areas to help students. Their small group instruction must happen daily and consistently.

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.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Teachers are trained in using CHAMPS for the school. Character Education is taught to each grade level by the Guidance Counselor. Love and Logic training is implemented. Students are rewarded for positive gains in ELA and Math based on iReady data.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$59,088.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	100-Salaries	3641 - Riverview Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$59,088.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$45,002.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	100-Salaries	3641 - Riverview Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$45,002.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$0.00
Total:						\$104,090.00