
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	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Riverview High School

11311 BOYETTE RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brian Sp IR O

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	51%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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	18

Riverview High School

11311 BOYETTE RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>51%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>63%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

It is the mission of Riverview High School to prepare all students for a dynamic and diverse society by building knowledge, skills, and character.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Riverview High School is to develop life-long learners who value themselves and others, contribute to their community, and are productive citizens in our dynamic society,

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
Gunder, Ivin	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Brian Sp IR O

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.*

5

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

150

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	51%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	625	621	593	596	2435
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	43	56	44	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	107	106	62	366
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	164	193	154	706
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	195	164	193	154	706
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	113	102	79	408
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	113	102	79	408

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	84	78	89	71	322

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/30/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634	643	657	659	2593
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	113	111	148	445
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	32	29	20	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	156	127	103	506
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	113	102	79	408

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	43	66	53	50	212

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634	643	657	659	2593
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	113	111	148	445
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	32	29	20	103
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	156	127	103	506
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	113	102	79	408

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	43	66	53	50	212

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	58%	56%	56%	53%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	54%	51%	48%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	41%	42%	35%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	57%	49%	51%	59%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	48%	48%	55%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	45%	40%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	84%	69%	68%	68%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	75%	73%	77%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	57%	55%	2%	55%	2%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	56%	53%	3%	53%	3%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	66%	15%	67%	14%
2018	63%	62%	1%	65%	-2%
Compare		18%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	73%	2%	70%	5%
2018	76%	70%	6%	68%	8%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	63%	-14%	61%	-12%
2018	41%	63%	-22%	62%	-21%
Compare		8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	57%	2%	57%	2%
2018	54%	56%	-2%	56%	-2%
Compare		5%			

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	12	36	36	33	46	39	53	46		88	18
ELL	16	40	37	34	53	53	64	37		89	51
ASN	63	53		76	53		92	85		100	70
BLK	41	42	39	42	49	42	75	66		91	31
HSP	52	52	44	53	54	41	82	74		92	53
MUL	65	56		67	71		91	87		97	34
WHT	70	58	48	68	60	45	87	84		93	56
FRL	47	50	44	47	50	44	79	67		91	38

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	15	43	41	28	46	36	28	51		71	13
ELL	19	51	61	37	43	21	35	39		84	58
ASN	63	59		60	53		70	78			
BLK	43	50	40	33	51	33	49	66		93	32
HSP	50	57	56	49	58	42	60	74		87	59
MUL	60	61		79	68		64	95		100	43
WHT	66	62	45	59	57	47	73	83		91	58
FRL	43	52	49	45	51	35	53	68		89	45

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	14	31	29	42	61	42	44	51		72	23
ELL	12	26	25	40	48	39	28	50		83	42
ASN	79	44		77	77		77	80			
BLK	31	41	35	39	46	36	44	70		88	35
HSP	49	47	33	55	51	38	64	76		90	45
MUL	57	41		61	56		77	69		96	67
WHT	62	53	37	70	59	43	79	82		94	54
FRL	40	42	33	49	49	37	54	71		87	39

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
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	682
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	74
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	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	71
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	67
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	57
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.

Lowest 25th percentile in ELA
Down 50% to 44%

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

One area of decline was ELA learning gains from 58% TO 53%

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.

Greatest gap Algebra EOC with negative 12%

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

Biology showed most improvement- reading and biology collaboration

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

Lowest 25th percentile in Math and ELA

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

1. Increase bottom quartile in Math
2. Increase bottom quartile in ELA
3. Maintain Biology growth
4. Increase Algebra EOC
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Through the implementation of action steps initiated by ILT and TTD's, will provide ongoing professional development to all staff concentrating on checks for understanding, analyzing student work, and differentiating instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Through the implementation of action steps initiated by ILT and TD's, all teachers instructional practices will develop affecting positive student achievement. The goal is to increase ELA learning gains by 3% or 47% respectively.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jill Horner (jill.horner@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will work with coaches and TTD's on Analyzing Student Work, a formative assessment tool from the Framework for Teaching. This tool provides insight for teachers to drive their instruction according to students who are below the standard, meeting the standard, or exceeding the standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Analysis of Student Work strategy comes from the research by the Framework for Teaching. It is a tool that provides teachers with information of which students are grasping the standards and to what level.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide professional development on differentiation. ILT, TTD, and Coaches
2. Coaching cycles with individual teachers using ASW- ILT, TTD, and Coaches
3. Teachers drive instruction and differentiate according to data collected.
4. Focus on academic conversations and writing.

Person Responsible Jill Horner (jill.horner@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Through the implementation of action steps initiated by ILT and TTD's, will provide ongoing professional development to all staff concentrating on checks for understanding, analyzing student work, and differentiating instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Through the implementation of action steps initiated by ILT and TD's, all teachers instructional practices will develop affecting positive student achievement. The goal is to increase Math learning gains by 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher will work with the Math Coach on spiraling instruction which is an effective method found according to the University of Chicago. Teachers will spiral their instruction to include re-teaching past concepts to those not meeting the standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this strategy came form the Math PLC's since they often go ahead before all students have master the concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Focusing on Algebra 1 A and B with Math Coach
2. Include ILT members and TTD's to assist in planning for the strategy.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

We strive to brand our school as one of the best high schools in Hillsborough County. From the time anyone steps onto our campus, we want them to feel welcome and valued. As a school, we are in the people business. Taking pride in our customer service is a valuable resource when dealing with others and getting answers to their questions. As the saying goes, "you only get one chance to make a first impression."

Students do not care how much you know until they know how much you care, is a staple of ours here at Riverview High School, and we take that seriously now more than ever as we navigate this pandemic together. Our school motto is #WeSwimTogether, reminding us that no one is alone.

Providing parents with weekly updates through parent links and newsletters has been wonderful with keeping them in the loop of weekly events and expectations here at RVHS. With updated communication, the parents are abreast of academic expectations as our goal is for every student to graduate and be college and career ready. Our teachers work tirelessly to help every student, but all students will be successful as they move through their high school careers with everyone on the same page.

Having partnerships with many local businesses is a great asset for our faculty and staff, along with our students. Many of them provide resources from food to job opportunities, and by the end of the year, the partnership will have flourished and catapulted into the next school year. Building positive relationships is key to our success and goal of becoming an "A" school and helping Hillsborough County become an "A" district.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00