

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Plant 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

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

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

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

Plant High School

2415 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[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	No	18%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	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>
Cowart, 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

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579	612	635	605	2431	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	5	4	7	2	18	
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	207	181	123	106	617	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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	4	0	0	3	7	
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

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	

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	

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	

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	

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

Asian Students	
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
Black/African American Students	
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
Hispanic Students	
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
Multiracial Students	
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
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	77
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

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
Total:			\$0.00