

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Riverview High School



2021-22 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 | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

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: 7/29/2021

| | |
|--|---|
| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 51% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

* 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 | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 21 |

Riverview High School

11311 BOYETTE RD, Riverview, FL 33569

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 46% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 63% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Spiro, Brian | Principal | Oversee SIP goals and instructional priorities |
| Horner, Jill | Instructional Coach | SAC Chair, ILT facilitator |
| Hall, Kimberly | SAC Member | ILT member |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*

4

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

139

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,491

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

20

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

12

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 631 | 653 | 629 | 578 | 2491 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 130 | 125 | 10 | 396 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 85 | 55 | 53 | 244 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 116 | 110 | 42 | 400 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 120 | 98 | 36 | 352 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 126 | 110 | 87 | 414 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 85 | 89 | 0 | 280 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | |
| 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 | 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 | | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/23/2021

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 | 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 | 52 | 43 | 56 | 44 | 195 |
| One or more suspensions | 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 | 195 | 164 | 193 | 154 | 706 |
| Course failure in Math | 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 | 114 | 113 | 102 | 79 | 408 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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 | 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 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 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 | 52 | 43 | 56 | 44 | 195 |
| One or more suspensions | 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 | 195 | 164 | 193 | 154 | 706 |
| Course failure in Math | 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 | 114 | 113 | 102 | 79 | 408 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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 | 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 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | | | | 58% | 56% | 56% | 56% | 54% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 53% | 54% | 51% | 58% | 53% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44% | 41% | 42% | 50% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 57% | 49% | 51% | 51% | 48% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 56% | 48% | 48% | 57% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 43% | 45% | 45% | 42% | 45% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 84% | 69% | 68% | 64% | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 77% | 75% | 73% | 77% | 73% | 71% |

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 |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 57% | 55% | 2% | 55% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 56% | 53% | 3% | 53% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |

| 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 |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 81% | 66% | 15% | 67% | 14% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 75% | 73% | 2% | 70% | 5% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 49% | 63% | -14% | 61% | -12% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 59% | 57% | 2% | 57% | 2% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Achieve 3000 data for ELA

Baseline and Mid-Year assessment for ELA, Biology, Geometry, and Algebra.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 38 | 40 | 43 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 29 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 34 | 36 | 37 |
| | English Language Learners | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28 | 49 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 47 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 28 | 51 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 25 | 36 | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 38 | 40 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 37 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 45 | 45 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 30 | 30 | 0 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42 | 45 | 48 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32 | 33 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 47 | 44 | 47 |
| | English Language Learners | 16 | 14 | 14 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26 | 42 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 25 | 41 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 39 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 25 | 33 | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 30 | 29 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 29 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 28 | 30 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 27 | 28 | 0 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0 | 35 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 47 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 16 | 18 | 20 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 11 | 12 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15 | 17 | 17 |
| | English Language Learners | 12 | 10 | 10 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24 | 36 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24 | 36 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 24 | 38 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 27 | 34 | 0 |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29 | 33 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 28 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 30 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 31 | 0 |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 33 | 40 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 37 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 34 | 37 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 30 | 31 | 0 |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 26 | 43 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 43 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30 | 48 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 23 | 32 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 34 | 35 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 37 | 35 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 32 | 27 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 41 | 24 | 0 |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 29 | 34 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 42 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 28 | 36 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 27 | 43 | 0 |
| | | | | |

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 | 15 | 30 | 35 | 21 | 35 | 40 | 33 | 43 | | 88 | 32 |
| ELL | 18 | 40 | 40 | 27 | 41 | 41 | 33 | 63 | | 95 | 57 |
| ASN | 70 | 68 | | 50 | 58 | | 69 | 100 | | 100 | 81 |
| BLK | 37 | 43 | 40 | 22 | 26 | 28 | 50 | 58 | | 94 | 38 |
| HSP | 47 | 43 | 40 | 32 | 28 | 36 | 56 | 77 | | 95 | 65 |

| 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 |
| MUL | 55 | 59 | 57 | 43 | 24 | 18 | 56 | 89 | | 100 | 73 |
| WHT | 60 | 51 | 45 | 49 | 31 | 40 | 75 | 78 | | 98 | 65 |
| FRL | 41 | 43 | 40 | 32 | 29 | 32 | 55 | 69 | | 93 | 51 |
| 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 |

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) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 53 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 588 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 91% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 75 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 44 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 57 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 59 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 49 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

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?

Although learning gains decreased, ELA and Math achievement increased.
ELL Biology showed a decrease in proficiency over the school year.
Math and US History showed the greatest growth from fall to winter scores.

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

ELL students in content areas besides math need improvement.
11th and 12th grade students in English need improvement.

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

Contributing factors could be attendance, gaps in learning, and student apathy as shown in the numbers of D's and F's, especially in English class.

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

Math scores in all grades improved.

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

Spiraling teaching and checks for understanding used in math classrooms.

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

Tiered lesson plans to ensure differentiation and fill in gaps.
Student-centered classrooms

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.

Student-centered classrooms, tiered lesson plans, and facilitating PLC's.

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

Professional development cycles, instructional learning walks and Sherpa Coaching with Admin and TTD's.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: PLC's will create and use common assessments to accelerate learning.

Measurable Outcome: Students will increase proficiency in all academic areas by 3%:
 ELA- 60%
 Biology - 84%
 History - 78%
 Algebra - 52%
 Geometry - 62%

Monitoring: Monitored through TTD's and Department Heads.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Common assessments to ensure differentiation and accelerating unfinished learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy was chosen so that teachers have data to use to drive their instruction in terms of accelerating learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of common assessment data to drive instruction - teachers

Person Responsible Brian Spiro (brian.spiro@hcps.net)

POST SECONDARY READINESS: 53% of students in reading 294/559 ready for post secondary
 37% of students in math 191/559 ready for post secondary

We will use AVID strategies school-wide along with PSAT/SAT/ACT practice in all content areas with a goal of increasing reading to 58% and math to 42%.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Plan student-centered lessons to maximize student engagement and to support teachers with accelerating unfinished learning. |
| Measurable Outcome: | All content area students will increase achievement gains by 3% resulting in the following increases: Math - 60% ELA - 61% Social Studies - 80% Science - 87% |
| Monitoring: | Administrative learning walk-throughs with specific feedback given for student-centered classrooms. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Brian Spiro (brian.spiro@hcps.net) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Student-centered classrooms have most of the work being done by the student and the teacher is the facilitator or guide. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | Faculty examined data and came up with a need for changing the instructional focus. |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff participating in professional development for student-centered classrooms
2. Admin and TTD walk throughs
3. Feedback to teachers

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

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.

Riverview ranks lower than the state on incidents per 100 students at 2.6 compared to 3.3 for the state.

However, Riverview ranks higher with 18.8 per 100 students for suspensions compared to the state at 13.5 per 100.

One primary area of concern is violent offenses and we will create more events for students to take ownership of the school (SGA, Campus Beautification Events, See Something, Say Something, peer mediation, etc).

Goals:

Students taking leadership roles and becoming positive role models.

Teachers will form strong relationships with students.

MTSS Behavior Committee will monitor discipline data and actively implement interventions when necessary..

Climate and Culture Resource teacher will use several data bases to monitor discipline data and implement interventions with students and report back to ILT or MTSS or PSLT.

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.

Use of results from Panorama SEL survey of teachers and based on results, providing resources for teachers including professional development on their needs.

Small tokens of appreciation for faculty members including lunches, dinners, and treats.

Avenues of open communication to administration and administrative supports available.

Form committees and clubs that support positive culture on campus (ex: Sunshine Committee).

ASQI and based on what is seen in walk throughs will allow for planning of what teachers need.

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

Mr. Bradford : Climate and Culture Resource teacher - plans PD, provides supports resources for teachers and staff, and open for support.

Teachers : Building with relationships with colleagues and students and give feedback on needs.

Administration : Set high expectations for a positive climate. Provide supports and resources to teachers and staff, empower teachers.

Students: Take on leadership roles on campus and serve as positive models for other students.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |