Hillsborough County Public Schools

Plant High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Plant High School

2415 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33629

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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 the 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.

Plant High's faculty, staff, parents, and community work together to provide our students with the best possible educational experience.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hellenberg, Kimi	Principal	Ms. Hellenberg oversees the school's operational, administrative, and instructional leadership. She organizes and collaboratively works with stakeholders to lead the school. In addition, she is in the way we (the team) design, implement, and monitor ways to reach the mission and vision of Plant High.
Gorman, Jenise	Teacher, K-12	Dr. Gorman works with staff and stakeholders in leading effective and continuous improvement by building an environment that is conducive to learning and success at every level. She works proactively and collaboratively to create school-wide systems and incentives to improve student behavior, course comprehension, and attendance. In addition, she creates and provides instructional coaching for cross-curricular disciplines; develops and implements professional development for the school; and demonstrates a strong working knowledge of data and best literacy practices.
Keen, Daniel	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Keen is an English teacher who teaches honors and AICE courses. He also sponsors a service club on campus, the Key Club. In addition, he is our school's HCTA representative and assists teachers with contractual needs.
Fuchs, Valerie	Assistant Principal	Dr. Fuchs leads the Instructional Leadership Team on campus with another teacher, Kristen Phillips. Dr. Fuchs is responsible for teacher duties and assists with curriculum needs. In addition, she also oversees discipline and attendance for her designated alphabet.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our SAC comprises various stakeholders, including community members, parents, student leadership, and staff. After looking at the school data (school survey-TELP; observations; and discussions with stakeholders), as a team, we created a SIP that reflected these imperative results to continue the great work we are doing at Plant High.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Every month, our SAC Chair, Dr. Jenise Gorman, will host a monthly meeting to monitor the action plan included in the SIP to monitor our school's progress with our plan to ensure the team is making adjustments as needed while facilitating the plan that was voted upon from our SAC members and staff.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	31%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A

	2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	69	51	50	73	52	51	76		
ELA Learning Gains				59			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			47		
Math Achievement*	70	42	38	70	39	38	67		
Math Learning Gains				50			44		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44			46		
Science Achievement*	83	64	64	81	46	40	80		
Social Studies Achievement*	93	69	66	87	49	48	88		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	96	89	89	97	64	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	75	62	65	73	72	67	72		
ELP Progress		39	45				47		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	681
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	97

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	50			
ELL	69			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	52			
HSP	77			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	84			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	63			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	46			
HSP	62			
MUL	73			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	69			70			83	93		96	75	
SWD	18			37			44	73		34	6	
ELL	31			68			65	82		76	6	
AMI												
ASN	83			75			93	100		96	6	
BLK	26			37			43	65		50	6	
HSP	64			68			77	90		67	6	
MUL	77			81			81	95		72	6	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	72			73			88	94		78	6	
FRL	46			51			58	83		53	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	73	59	47	70	50	44	81	87		97	73	
SWD	26	40	38	32	32	32	51	63		90	32	
ELL	38	56	56	50	43		46	60		86	56	
AMI												
ASN	74	62	54	79	53		92	92		100	87	
BLK	35	41	30	45	41	33	33	67		92	39	
HSP	67	54	45	61	42	38	74	80		95	59	
MUL	78	57		71	43		90	92		96	55	
PAC												
WHT	76	61	49	75	54	49	83	90		98	79	
FRL	52	45	42	49	41	42	63	73		91	47	

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	76	58	47	67	44	46	80	88		97	72	47
SWD	39	44	36	33	35	37	45	55		89	24	
ELL	25	39	40	24	29		33	59		89	46	47
AMI												
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	
MUL	76	55	30	59	36		88	81		89	82	
PAC												
WHT	80	60	51	73	43	44	83	92		98	81	
FRL	54	44	34	42	37	38	65	67		90	52	45

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	70%	50%	20%	50%	20%
09	2023 - Spring	70%	48%	22%	48%	22%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	58%	55%	3%	50%	8%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	49%	27%	48%	28%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	62%	21%	63%	20%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	65%	27%	63%	29%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

2021-2022 Achievement: 73; 2022-2023 Achievement: 70.6
Plant 70% Level 3+ (State & District 49%)
Ranked 2nd in the District
12% increase from PM2 (State 10% & District 9%)

The 10th-grade students showed greater gains on PM3 than did the 9th-grade students, although 9th grade still did make significant gains. Beginning in the second semester, our school reorganized our PLC structure to focus on students in state-assessed classes. We offered a professional development opportunity to teachers so that they could dig deeper into the benchmarks, data, and instructional strategies that would support the benchmarks that tested the weakest on PM2. Our new ELA 9th and 10th grade PLCs then strategized ways to teach those identified benchmarks, agreed upon an assessment to determine the success of the strategies, and offered reteaching moments leading up to the PM3.

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

2021-2022 Achievement: 73; 2022-2023 Achievement: 70.6
Plant 70% Level 3+ (State & District 49%)
Ranked 2nd in the District
12% increase from PM2 (State 10% & District 9%)

This assessment was new to our district. Students and teachers are learning how to navigate a new digital assessment. Since the assessment is new to the students and unlike what they have previously experienced from the last few years of their education, it may have been challenging, especially when it comes to testing endurance and the lack of knowledge in navigating a new digital platform. In addition, with many recent changes in curriculum and assessment, both teachers and students need time and support to adjust. Moreover, this past year, proficiency was the focus and not gains, which skews the data, Lastly, support is needed at our school. Plant no longer has a full-time literacy coach or Teacher Talent Developer. For our school's ELA Achievement score (out of 100), our 10th grade ELA scored an 80 in 2019 when our school had a full-time literacy coach, and we have dropped 10 points in the last 3 years.

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.

US History EOC
92% Level 3+ (State 62% & District 65%)
Ranked 1st in the District
Plant US History EOC scores went up 5% from 2022

Continuous collaboration within the department and at PLCs. Strategic standard-based learning while differentiating instruction. ELP and Saturday tutoring sessions. In addition, tutoring with our BETA tutors (honor society with our student tutors). These students were possibly more motivated to do well to earn their graduation benchmark.

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

US History EOC
92% Level 3+ (State 62% & District 65%)
Ranked 1st in the District
Plant US History EOC scores went up 5% from 2022

Our school's PLC focus was "Culture for Learning," and we spent a lot of time executing a plan for our school improvement in all content areas. PLC grouping was based on department and content areas to make the time spent meaningful and beneficial for teachers. Strategic standard-based learning while differentiating instruction. ELP and Saturday tutoring sessions. In addition, tutoring with our BETA tutors (honor society with our student tutors).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

ELA 10th
Math: Geometry

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

1. Meaningful and impactful PLC
2. Attendance
3. District support

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our school will continue to build upon the culture of learning in our PLC groups. Each PLC has an ILT member who is a strong leader in their grade level/content area. These groups will define rigor in their classroom and collectively implement best practices to ensure success for all students. The subgroups that need extra support are 10th-grade ELA and Geometry.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

In our PLC groups, each content area has different common assessments, and as a content area and department, we are creating SMART goals for the year. In addition, each core assessment will increase by 2%.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The administration is monitoring the action plan associated with each department and content area's SMART goal while providing support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Valerie Fuchs (valerie.fuchs@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The structure and systems that our school is using for our PLC groups this year are influenced by the reputable book, "Focus" by Mike Schmoker. Schmoker (2018) states, "Since the first edition, the case for the evidence-based elements has grown prodigiously" (p xii). Based on the needs of each PLC, they will choose the appropriate intervention for their students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Developing relationships within a classroom is incredibly important for student success, and teachers at Plant will continue to work to build trust within their classrooms. while providing rigorous standard-based learning.
Understanding what motivates students helps to foster positive relationships within the class to foster student success.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Student readiness for the public postsecondary level is accomplished as Plant High School guides students to be critical thinkers and well-rounded in all areas of their lives. By having more purposeful PLCs, Plant is able to actively achieve this goal.

Person Responsible: Valerie Fuchs (valerie.fuchs@hcps.net)

By When: End of the 2023-2024 school year

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Tardies and attendance are a challenge for all students on our campus. We want to make sure students are in class on time and not missing excessive days.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our school plans to decrease the number of overall tardiness and excessive absences by revamping and implementing our school policies. As a school, we plan to increase the percentage of students with a 90% rate by 2% per grading period. In addition, our goal is to decrease the average cumulative tardiness by 2% per grading period.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The KPI and Power BI data will be pulled and analyzed monthly. The behavior team at our school will collaboratively create possible solutions and incentives to reduce the number of tardies and excessive absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jenise Gorman (jenise.gorman@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Graduation Rate Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
Tier-1 Behavior Plan

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

KPI is a reputable and reliable tool to collect evidence on students who are labeled at risk for 3 different categories (1) A: attendance; (B): behavior; and (C) course performance. Students who are chronically absent or tardy will be identified using the KPI system, so the behavior team can create an intervention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Student readiness for the public postsecondary level is accomplished as Plant High School guides students to be punctual and prepared for life after Plant. As a school, we plan to utilize KPI data to monitor attendance and tardies.

Interventions:
Mentoring Program

Interventions and incentives created and monitored by the behavior team
Monitoring the current tardy and attendance policy
Tardy sweeps

Person Responsible: Jenise Gorman (jenise.gorman@hcps.net)

By When: monthly