

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Plant City High 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Plant City High School

1 RAIDER PL, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Traci Durrance

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2015

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	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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	17

Plant City High School

1 RAIDER PL, Plant City, FL 33563

[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)
High School 9-12	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	63%

School Grades History

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

We are committed to working together to provide opportunities for our students to grow academically and socially to prepare them for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride, Accountability, Respect

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
Sullivan, Susan	Principal	
Leeseburg, Timothy	Assistant Principal	
Smith, Lana	Assistant Principal	
Young, Jessica	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/9/2015, Traci Durrance

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.*

3

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

107

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	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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	666	628	530	568	2392	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254	200	205	201	860	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3	17	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	0	0	0	0	209	186	131	109	635	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	123	19	24	317	

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	28	73	53	31	185

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	22	0	0	2	24	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	4	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/1/2020

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	545	585	596	533	2259	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	131	104	101	456	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	71	58	37	262	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	233	159	152	700	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	90	88	74	336	

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	99	121	123	107	450

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	130	118	139	99	486
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	15	10	57

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	545	585	596	533	2259
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	131	104	101	456
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	71	58	37	262
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156	233	159	152	700
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	90	88	74	336

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	99	121	123	107	450

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	130	118	139	99	486
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	15	10	57

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	47%	56%	56%	36%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	54%	51%	43%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	41%	42%	38%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	56%	49%	51%	51%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	64%	48%	48%	52%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	45%	45%	42%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	59%	69%	68%	63%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	75%	73%	70%	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	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
	2018	40%	53%	-13%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

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	58%	66%	-8%	67%	-9%
2018	59%	62%	-3%	65%	-6%
Compare		-1%			
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	72%	73%	-1%	70%	2%
2018	65%	70%	-5%	68%	-3%
Compare		7%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	63%	-15%	61%	-13%
2018	49%	63%	-14%	62%	-13%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	57%	5%	57%	5%
2018	62%	56%	6%	56%	6%
Compare		0%			

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	15	32	24	32	39	43	35	45		89	23
ELL	17	41	39	40	65	83	32	49		86	37
ASN	73	93								100	73
BLK	23	39	33	35	36		22	54		92	30
HSP	40	51	41	51	68	71	55	69		92	51
MUL	55	50		77	73		73			100	50
WHT	60	59	41	66	64	64	71	80		94	48
FRL	41	51	41	52	62	65	53	67		92	45
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	18	40	31	37	57		41	33		79	17
ELL	17	40	35	45	58	56	42	34		78	23
ASN	90	60									
BLK	25	38	31	40	58	42	49	53		88	20
HSP	38	55	41	59	67	69	57	56		88	38
MUL	38	38		64			55			93	38
WHT	56	56	45	73	76	65	71	80		95	52
FRL	35	49	39	56	66	61	57	57		89	32

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	8	33	39	32	48	43	33	35		70	26
ELL	7	32	36	35	49	54	36	53		69	38
ASN	80	80		77	58						
BLK	24	41	34	36	39	24	52	53		77	22
HSP	25	35	36	43	51	48	57	66		85	49
MUL	50	67		63	57			77		85	27
WHT	50	51	47	61	56	42	71	77		90	59
FRL	27	38	38	45	49	38	55	65		82	40

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	60
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	665
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	51
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	85
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	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	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	68
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	65
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	58
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.

SWD students scored lowest in ELA. Contributing factors are a lack of reading and writing skills, using a computer with lack of practice time with an electronic device.

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

Both Biology and Algebra EOC scores are down by 1%. There are no specific factors in this case. A 1% change could be due to scheduling, testing discrepancies or population of students.

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.

The Algebra 1 EOC has the greatest gap when compared to the state average, -13%. The trend seen here relates to the ESSA data showing that the SWD and Black students scores were the lowest and dropped by 5 from the prior year. The main factor that contributed to these results was a higher number of absences. The overall attendance rate for these students dropped from the prior year.

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

History EOC scores are up by 7%. There are several factors that contribute to this increase. Veteran teachers familiar with content as well as appropriate placement based on levels impacted the increase. Students with low FSA scores as well as the ELL student population were targeted for tutoring. Parents were notified and communicated with frequently regarding these prep/tutor sessions. Our ELL program also had student and teacher aides that were available to help facilitate in these classes. Teachers implemented more vocabulary and document work within daily lessons. PLCs were strong utilizing data from formative common assessments to drive instruction.

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

Course failures in ELA and/or Math are a concern and should be targeted. A focus on improving attendance rates also needs to be addressed.

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

1. Literacy across all content areas
2. Bottom quartile Math and ELA gains
3. Maintaining/Increasing Level 3 and higher learning gains
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students scored below the District and State average in all content areas; ELA, Math, Science and History. Improvement of instructional practice will directly impact student engagement which will contribute to learning gains and increased test scores in those content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to improve Algebra 1 EOC scores to 62%, ELA scores to 53%, Biology EOC scores to 62%, History EOC scores to 70% and increase Acceleration to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use classroom discussions as an engagement strategy to meet our goals. Classroom discussion is a method of teaching that allows students to discuss important issues and share opinions. This allows the teacher to assess what concepts students know and understand as well as improve student's communication skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom discussions (formal, debate, think-pair-share, socratic, etc.) have an effect size of .82 which is double a years influence on student achievement according John Hattie's research in Visible Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development
 2. Creating a culture of student based learning
 3. Standards based and data driven planning
 4. Instructional Coach support for students and staff
 5. ESSA DATA (SWD & Black Students) Plan: over the course of the year, we will be creating and observing lesson plans and strategies used with our SWD and black student population. We will be working with teachers to create lesson plans using SWD strategies/engagement strategies from the following steps.
 - A. PLCs will be creating lists of strategies that they currently use/plan to use in lessons.
 - B. Professional development will be offered to teachers to develop/incorporate the use of strategies.
 - C. Teachers will use at least 3 of these strategies in lesson plans.
- Sample Strategies: Tutoring/Mentoring by teachers/peers, Chunking, Learning Targets on posted posters, Scaffolding Lessons, Study Guides/Notes, Teacher IEP Training, Teacher led PD-Demo Classrooms, Text marking & Notetaking, WICOR/AVID strategies, & Test Taking Skills

Person Responsible Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

College and Career Readiness:

Increasing acceleration through industry certifications, dual enrollment and AP courses.
Workforce Development through the Career Academy and Tech Programs Offered
Student enrolled in AVID

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.

Our school works hard to include all Stakeholders, there are Parent Night for each grade level to relay information, share opportunities for involvement and help get families connected with our school and community. We have a Business Advisory Board that is made up of community members, business affiliates and school staff that contributes to our Career Academy and whole school. This working relationship is intended to help our students during their high school years and beyond graduation that in turn benefits the community as a whole.

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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00