

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Plant High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>19</b> |

# Plant High School

2415 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Kimi Hellenberg**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/11/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 17%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (72%)<br>2017-18: A (69%)<br>2016-17: A (69%)<br>2015-16: A (64%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>19</b> |

# Plant High School

2415 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School<br/>9-12</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>        | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">31%</p>               |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | A              | A              | A              | A              |

## 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.**

Plant High School will provide challenging learning opportunities in a safe and supportive environment in which high expectations are established. In partnership with families and community, our goal is to create relevant learning opportunities for students to acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to become lifelong learners who responsibly and productively influence our school community and our world.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to forge strong, positive connections with students so they can achieve independence, build confidence, and gain academic knowledge. Plant High School constructs a pathway to help our students achieve their educational and personal goals, leading to a fulfilling future within the greater community.

### 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   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Bush, Johnny     | Principal           | <p>The principal, Mr. Johnny Bush, provides leadership which motivates instructional and supporting personnel to strive for superior performance so as to provide the best possible opportunities for student growth and development, both educationally and personally.</p> <p>Mr. Bush plays an essential role promoting the community school vision and making sure strategies go according to plan. He does this by making sure Plant High goals and outcomes satisfy local needs, align with the school's academic mission, and empower family and community voices.</p>   |
| Hellenberg, Kimi | Assistant Principal | <p>The Plant High School Assistant Principal of Curriculum, Kimi Hellenberg, is an effective manager responsible for helping teachers and students realize their full potential, providing feedback to teachers so that they develop their skills to help implement the school's mission and vision. Ms. Hellenberg ensures teachers design and execute an instructional program that develops mastery and skills above grade level expectations and meets the individual needs of each student. She works collaboratively with the school leadership team to develop a school-wide culture of respect and achievement and a team culture grounded in common goals, mutual respect, empathy towards others, and an appreciation of diversity.</p> |
| Coward, Shay     | Teacher, K-12       | <p>Ms. Cowart designs and guides students through engaging learning opportunities so that her students are passionate participants in the educational process and take responsibility for their learning. As an English teacher at Plant, she works with individual students and pushes them to improve their critical thinking abilities so that they feel both comfortable and challenged, and are prepared for their EOC or AP Exam at the end of the school year.</p>   |
| Gorman, Jenise   | Instructional Coach | Literacy Coach and teacher  |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Thursday 6/11/2020, Kimi Hellenberg

**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.*

2

**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.*

97

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

125



**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | High School<br>9-12  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 17%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (72%)<br>2017-18: A (69%)<br>2016-17: A (69%)<br>2015-16: A (64%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

**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 | 579 | 612 | 635 | 605   | 2431 |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77  | 102 | 122 | 143   | 444  |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5   | 4   | 7   | 2     | 18   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 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   | 0     | 0    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 181 | 123 | 106   | 617  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 31  | 23  | 12    | 81   |

**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 | 1  | 0  | 4  | 1     | 6 |

**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 | 4  | 0  | 0  | 3     | 7 |
| 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**

Thursday 10/29/2020

**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 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0     | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0 | 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 | 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  | 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 | 47 | 58 | 36 | 2  | 143   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 30 | 21 | 1  | 70    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 27 | 19 | 2  | 76    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 36 | 34 | 2  | 117   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 58 | 36 | 2  | 143   |

**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 | 4 | 0  | 0  | 3  | 7     |
| 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             | 80%    | 56%      | 56%   | 74%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 66%    | 54%      | 51%   | 58%    | 50%      | 49%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 55%    | 41%      | 42%   | 47%    | 39%      | 41%   |
| Math Achievement            | 73%    | 49%      | 51%   | 73%    | 51%      | 49%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 56%    | 48%      | 48%   | 52%    | 47%      | 44%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    | 45%      | 45%   | 51%    | 38%      | 39%   |
| Science Achievement         | 83%    | 69%      | 68%   | 85%    | 62%      | 65%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 90%    | 75%      | 73%   | 91%    | 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 | 79%    | 55%      | 24%                        | 55%   | 24%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 78%    | 53%      | 25%                        | 53%   | 25%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 10                    | 2019 | 79%    | 53%      | 26%                        | 53%   | 26%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 73%    | 52%      | 21%                        | 53%   | 20%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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        | 83%    | 66%      | 17%                   | 67%   | 16%                |
| 2018        | 80%    | 62%      | 18%                   | 65%   | 15%                |
| Compare     |        | 3%       |                       |       |                    |

| 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         | 90%    | 73%      | 17%                   | 70%   | 20%                |
| 2018         | 88%    | 70%      | 18%                   | 68%   | 20%                |
| Compare      |        | 2%       |                       |       |                    |
| ALGEBRA EOC  |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 38%    | 63%      | -25%                  | 61%   | -23%               |
| 2018         | 58%    | 63%      | -5%                   | 62%   | -4%                |
| Compare      |        | -20%     |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 78%    | 57%      | 21%                   | 57%   | 21%                |
| 2018         | 72%    | 56%      | 16%                   | 56%   | 16%                |
| Compare      |        | 6%       |                       |       |                    |

**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                                       | 36       | 43     | 47          | 43        | 50      | 36           | 41       | 61      |           | 89                | 30                  |
| ELL                                       | 41       | 56     | 41          | 26        | 50      | 36           | 53       | 44      |           | 84                | 48                  |
| ASN                                       | 92       | 63     |             | 83        | 53      |              | 96       | 96      |           | 100               | 82                  |
| BLK                                       | 42       | 54     | 44          | 35        | 41      | 39           | 54       | 67      |           | 90                | 36                  |
| HSP                                       | 71       | 61     | 50          | 60        | 50      | 47           | 72       | 77      |           | 94                | 60                  |
| MUL                                       | 79       | 74     | 73          | 85        | 69      |              | 81       | 100     |           | 91                | 65                  |
| WHT                                       | 84       | 68     | 59          | 80        | 59      | 60           | 88       | 95      |           | 98                | 78                  |
| FRL                                       | 56       | 56     | 49          | 46        | 49      | 43           | 61       | 75      |           | 89                | 47                  |
| 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                                       | 41       | 38     | 27          | 33        | 58      | 58           | 26       | 64      |           | 76                | 31                  |
| ELL                                       | 22       | 45     | 39          | 33        | 58      |              | 33       | 50      |           | 93                | 48                  |
| ASN                                       | 89       | 67     |             | 79        | 69      |              | 86       | 94      |           | 95                | 70                  |
| BLK                                       | 35       | 41     | 37          | 20        | 36      | 43           | 44       | 54      |           | 90                | 29                  |
| HSP                                       | 66       | 50     | 39          | 61        | 53      | 65           | 74       | 87      |           | 92                | 65                  |
| MUL                                       | 71       | 50     | 50          | 81        | 59      |              | 75       | 91      |           | 96                | 65                  |
| WHT                                       | 83       | 62     | 50          | 80        | 52      | 52           | 87       | 95      |           | 96                | 73                  |
| FRL                                       | 54       | 43     | 32          | 46        | 52      | 52           | 61       | 70      |           | 85                | 44                  |

| 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                                       | 30       | 32     | 32          | 38        | 41      | 38           | 43       | 76      |           | 86                | 47                  |
| ELL                                       | 14       | 30     | 30          | 32        | 35      | 27           | 8        | 73      |           | 88                | 59                  |
| ASN                                       | 88       | 72     |             | 93        | 71      |              | 90       | 100     |           | 89                | 94                  |
| BLK                                       | 24       | 28     | 25          | 33        | 35      | 35           | 54       | 70      |           | 82                | 34                  |
| HSP                                       | 67       | 57     | 45          | 63        | 49      | 49           | 71       | 88      |           | 98                | 58                  |
| MUL                                       | 63       | 58     | 45          | 47        | 38      |              | 73       | 77      |           | 93                | 50                  |
| WHT                                       | 82       | 61     | 58          | 80        | 54      | 57           | 90       | 94      |           | 97                | 69                  |
| FRL                                       | 47       | 47     | 38          | 56        | 51      | 56           | 65       | 76      |           | 91                | 45                  |

**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  | 71  |
| 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 | 59  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 783 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 11  |
| Percent Tested  | 99% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 48  |
| 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   |

| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 83  |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                    | 50  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 63  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 80  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <b>White Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 77  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| <b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>   |     |
| 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.**

In the reading component of the FSA, 9th grade scored low in the category of Key Ideas & Details at 59%. While our 9th graders scored well in the district (#1), they still need improvement in this area. On the other hand, our 10th graders scored low in three areas of reading: Key Ideas & Details (60%), Integration of Knowledge & Ideas (59%), and Craft & Structure (59%). The digital literacy component of the FSA might be challenging for students as they adjust from completing assessments on papers to the computer. Moreover, students do not have access to digital literacy during the school day due to the lack of resources at our school.

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

As a school, we improved in all areas. This was a school-wide effort, which stresses the importance of the support staff at our school-site, such as our Instructional Leadership Team, literacy coach and teacher-talent developers

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Our school did not show massive gaps between the school and state data. We were consistent with the state average, slightly below, or above average.

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

The 25% bottom quartile showed great gains from 2018 to 2019. They had a 10% increase from the year prior and above the state by 24%. The literacy coach initiated and managed a tailored pull-out program for our bottom quartile students. Students received differentiated instruction to improve their literacy skills.

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

Math bottom quartile could improve more this year.

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

1. Our instructional Leadership Team will collaborate to create professional development opportunities for our staff so that we can reach optimum student achievement on the Florida State assessment and other high stakes tests and provide rigorous, relevant instruction for all students aligned to the standards. These PD opportunities will align with the needs of the teachers, as the 2020-2021 school year is fluid.

2. Teachers will utilize various digital platforms to improve digital literacy for both students and teachers in order to prepare students for success on online assessments.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In the current environment, many students and teachers are adapting to a new way of learning. Currently, education is transitioning to digital platforms and it is necessary for students and teachers to build digital literacy skills in order to meet the current educational needs of students and requirements of teachers.

**Measurable Outcome:** 100% of teachers will engage with all students using at least one digital platform.  
80% of teachers will engage with all students using two digital platforms.  
60% of teachers will engage with all students using three digital platforms.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Johnny Bush (johnny.bush@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** A survey will be sent out in which the teachers will list the digital platforms they are currently using in the classroom and describe how they are implementing these platforms. Teachers will discuss the various platforms in their grade-level PLCs, and share digital strategies and best practices to enhance student engagement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The immediate and uncertain climate of education determines the rationale for these strategies. By implementing and sharing the digital platforms, teachers are able to learn from one another to achieve success in their own classroom so that student engagement is enhanced.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers identify digital platforms that work for their courses and teaching style and implement these platforms.
2. Professional Learning Communities meet to ensure opportunities for collaboration.
3. Principal checks for accountability.

**Person Responsible** Johnny Bush (johnny.bush@hcps.net)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The goal of Plant High School is to address our student needs, both brick and mortar or e-learning, by reviewing class room data and identifying and teaching to the Florida standards to inform course curriculum. Teachers will meet on a monthly basis to review the data and collaborate to determine instructional practices around the Florida standards.**

## 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.

In order to satisfy the requirements of ESSA and promote school unity, our school uses three very supportive groups to support Plant high both emotionally and financially: Academic Foundation. Athletic Foundation, and PTSA.

Through Panther TV, PAWS incentives, Social Media shout outs, and Kudos from Mr. Bush, we work to promote school spirit and create an environment that is conducive to helping students achieve, both emotionally and academically.

Plant students, specifically, have opportunities to obtain scholarships for post-secondary institutions from multiple Plant endowments.

Many teachers use the REMIND app with their students to provide updated classroom information, beyond Canvas announcements.

Unity Day incorporates a platform for diverse students to share experiences that allow for connections among Plant students to develop.

PFEP:  
Plant Academic Foundation  
Plant Athletic Foundation  
both support our community, teachers, and students.

Please see the link for more details: <https://hillsboroughschools.org/doc/71/athletics/about/athletics/>

### **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        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:                        | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |