

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Plant High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Plant High School

2415 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kimi Hellenberg

Start Date for this Principal: 7/6/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 17% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (69%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

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) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| High School 9-12 | No | 15% |
| 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 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | 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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Deorio, John | Reading Coach | Provides instructional coaching for cross-curricular disciplines; develops and implements professional development for the school; demonstrates a strong working knowledge of best literacy practices. |
| Gorman, Jenise | Other | Works with staff and stakeholders in leading effective implementation & continuous improvement a schoolwide program designed to improve the climate & culture. Works proactively & collaboratively to improve the behavior in the school by using restorative practices. Create and monitor effective student-centered behavior systems. |
| Bush, Johnny | Principal | Oversees the operational, administrative, and instructional leadership throughout the school. Organizes and cooperatively works with stakeholders to design, implement, and monitor ways to reach the mission and vision of the school. |
| Hellenberg, Kimi | Assistant Principal | Uses data to implement and monitor curriculum and instructional supervision; organizes and manages testing schedules and teacher schedules |
| Webb, David | Assistant Principal | Oversees student discipline for a designated alpha; manages the COVID-19 procedures and quarantines for the school. |
| Cowart, Shay | Teacher, K-12 | Designs and implements best practices, standard-based instruction, and rigorous instruction; creates an environment that is conducive to learning. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/6/2017, 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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

107

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,522

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

4

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

11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 639 | 596 | 647 | 640 | 2522 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 122 | 135 | 149 | 512 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 18 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 39 | 58 | 19 | 179 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 14 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/15/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | |
| Course failure in Math | 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 | 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 | | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 579 | 612 | 635 | 605 | 2431 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 115 | 144 | 147 | 468 |
| 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 | |
| Course failure in Math | 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 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 14 |

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 Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 80% | 56% | 56% | 77% | 54% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66% | 54% | 51% | 58% | 53% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 41% | 42% | 45% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 73% | 49% | 51% | 70% | 48% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 56% | 48% | 48% | 52% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 54% | 45% | 45% | 53% | 45% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 83% | 69% | 68% | 81% | 65% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 90% | 75% | 73% | 89% | 73% | 71% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 55% | 24% | 55% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 53% | 26% | 53% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -79% | | | | |

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

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

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 83% | 66% | 17% | 67% | 16% |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 90% | 73% | 17% | 70% | 20% |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 38% | 63% | -25% | 61% | -23% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 57% | 21% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

English: Achieve 3000 (AP1: Fall, AP2: Winter, and AP3: Spring)

Baseline: math, science, and history (Fall and Winter)

EOC: math, science, and history (Spring)

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 53.11% | 63.56% | 67.92% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43.84% | 54.54% | 52.7% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 75.54% | 85.33% | 84.67% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 62.3% | 63.96% | 79% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56% | 64.02% | 63% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 73.3% | 73.6% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | 19.3% | 31.8% | 100% |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 65.10% | 68.09% | 82% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 54.85% | 50.85% | 71% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 75.5% | 78.46% | 55% |
| | English Language Learners | 37.3% | 38.16% | 100% |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 0% |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 58.26% | 64.4% | 66.31% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43.69% | 51.59% | 59.3% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 76.8% | 76.92% | 79.77% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 38.10% | 38.10% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 40.2% | 51.44% | 51% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26.15% | 18.01% | 25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 42.6% | 47.46% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 58.95% | 66.14% | 69% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 61.4% | 24.79% | 25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29.85% | 18.05% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | 22.4% | 9.63% | 0% |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 99.2% | 44.14% | 100% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 0% |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 19.4% | 15.54% | 17.54% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0% | 9.43% | 11.83% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14.55% | 20.37% | 19.4% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18.10% | 44.98% | 0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18.10% | 55.28% | 9% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14% | 63.56% | 38% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 81.5% | 59.35% | 0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27.2% | 68.09% | 0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 0% |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 57.5% | 28.97% | 94% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34.4% | 20.07% | 76% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 71.4% | 25.25% | 70% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 100% |

| Grade 12 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28.84% | 21.64% | 20.36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | 0% | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12.30% | 28.02% | 25% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14% | 98.81% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 70.75% | 22.44% | 40% |
| | English Language Learners | 2.10% | 18.23% | 0% |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 55.07% | 56.18% | 100% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | 91.4% | 91.8% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 17.8% | n/a | 0% |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 53.5% | 31.27% | 89% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | 20.07% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | 37.74% | 100% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | 0% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 39 | 44 | 36 | 33 | 35 | 37 | 45 | 55 | | 89 | 24 |
| ELL | 25 | 39 | 40 | 24 | 29 | | 33 | 59 | | 89 | 46 |
| ASN | 81 | 62 | | 81 | 60 | | 71 | 96 | | 100 | 70 |
| BLK | 36 | 44 | 41 | 33 | 33 | 23 | 59 | 63 | | 94 | 28 |
| HSP | 67 | 54 | 42 | 58 | 52 | 58 | 73 | 77 | | 95 | 58 |

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| MUL | 76 | 55 | 30 | 59 | 36 | | 88 | 81 | | 89 | 82 |
| WHT | 80 | 60 | 51 | 73 | 43 | 44 | 83 | 92 | | 98 | 81 |
| FRL | 54 | 44 | 34 | 42 | 37 | 38 | 65 | 67 | | 90 | 52 |
| 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 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 66 |
| 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 | 47 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 722 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |
| Subgroup Data | |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 43 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 78 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 45 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 63 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 66 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| White Students | |
|--|----|
| Federal Index - White Students | 71 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 52 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Students who are struggling the most in ELA, Math, and Science Achievement are composed of our ELL, black, and SWD students.

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

ELA, Math, and Science Achievement.

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

ELP tutoring is essential to help students who are struggling.

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

When looking at subgroups as well as socioeconomic groups to determine what students are in our bottom quartile and need the most help. Students in the highest socioeconomic group presented the highest level of gains.

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

ELP tutoring for students who took advantage during school hours. Beta tutoring after school also helped to elevate scores and make these gains.

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

Continued availability of ELP and Beta tutoring, but more incentives to motivate the bottom quartile students to make improvements.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Through PLC's all staff members have an opportunity to engage in continuing conversations and development of strategies to enhance engagement and accelerated learning.

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

Learning walks will provide an opportunity for faculty and administration to work together and provide ongoing feedback on the learning strategies and school-wide focus on engagement.

Professional Learning Communities ensure the support and resources necessary to create a universal connection to the improvement goals.

ELP and BETA tutoring will provide the support needed for accelerated learning opportunities for students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

In order to reduce the number of referrals, positive rewards will be given as an incentive and motivate students to remain on track and make good choices.

Measurable Outcome:

As a school we will lower the amount of referrals by 50% by the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

Through the PBI app, the Climate and Culture Teacher, Jenise Gorman, will monitor the discipline dashboard to find areas of improvement and implement and execute action plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenise Gorman (jenise.gorman@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

PBIS and KPI dashboard

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The data presented through this platform will breakdown the details so that the stakeholders are able to effectively implement an action plan to meet our school goal.

Action Steps to Implement

Jenise Gorman, the CCRT, will provide KPI and PBIS data to our weekly staff meetings to discuss trends and patterns with the data. As a team, we will look at specific students who are currently struggling with behavior and creatively discuss an action plan for the success of each student. Students will be provided with incentives for improved behavior as well as weekly meetings with stakeholders. Lastly, students who fall under this umbrella of improvement, they will be connected with a mentor to help each student become more successful at Plant.

Person Responsible

Jenise Gorman (jenise.gorman@hcps.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to post-secondary readiness**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Based on our CTE data, we are working to prepare students for life post high school.

Measurable Outcome:

Each CTE class will have a pass rate above the district average.

Monitoring:

Teachers in each CTE class will monitor the completion rate for each student's CTE course online. In addition, each CTE teacher will ensure each student has at least a 80% on each practice test prior to the certification exam.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenise Gorman (jenise.gorman@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

CTE course, Gimkit, Kahoot, Quizlet

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

These resources provide many hands-on experiences for the students to be successful beyond the exam.

Action Steps to Implement

Each CTE teacher will ensure each student has at least a 80% on each practice test prior to the certification exam. In addition, all students will complete the required curriculum on the online platform for the course.

Person Responsible

Johnny Bush (johnny.bush@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In the 2020-2021 school year, 471 students were referred to guidance, and it was the highest indicator for our school's discipline. When compared to Florida's School Safety Dashboard, our school has a moderate risk, and out of 33 high schools, Plant is ranked 11, with 2.8 incidents reported per 100 students. This is less than the state, which is reported to be 3.3 incidents per 100 students. While this data is below the state average, it is evident this is a priority for our school.

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.

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/>

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

Jenise Gorman: Climate and Culture Resource Teacher

Tamara Phillips: Teacher Talent Developer

John Deorio: Teacher Talent Developer & Literacy Coach

Kat Roy: Instructional Leadership Facilitator

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|--|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Other: post-secondary readiness | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |