

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	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	17
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: Johnny Bush

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White 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	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]

* 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.

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
Deorio, John	Instructional Coach	
Gorman, Jenise		
Bush, Johnny	Principal	
Hellenberg, Kimi	Assistant Principal	
Webb, David	Assistant Principal	
Cowart, Shay	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/6/2017, Johnny Bush

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	0	639	596	647	640	2522
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	6	7	3	2	18
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	26	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

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	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	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	579	612	635	605	2431
Attendance below 90 percent	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	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	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	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	76%			80%	56%	56%	77%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%			66%	54%	51%	58%	53%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%			55%	41%	42%	45%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	67%			73%	49%	51%	70%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains	44%			56%	48%	48%	52%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%			54%	45%	45%	53%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	80%			83%	69%	68%	81%	65%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	88%			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.

FSA
EOC

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			78%
	Economically Disadvantaged			63%
	Students With Disabilities			42%
	English Language Learners			0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students			79%
	Economically Disadvantaged			63%
	Students With Disabilities			50%
	English Language Learners			100%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Biology	All Students			82%
	Economically Disadvantaged			71%
	Students With Disabilities			55%
	English Language Learners			100%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
US History	All Students			0%
	Economically Disadvantaged			0%
	Students With Disabilities			0%
	English Language Learners			0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			81%
	Economically Disadvantaged			56%
	Students With Disabilities			52%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			51%
	Economically Disadvantaged			25%
	Students With Disabilities			33%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			69%
	Economically Disadvantaged			25%
	Students With Disabilities			50%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			100%
	Economically Disadvantaged			0%
	Students With Disabilities			0%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 11				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			0%
	Economically Disadvantaged			0%
	Students With Disabilities			0%
	English Language Learners			0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students			0%
	Economically Disadvantaged			9%
	Students With Disabilities			38%
	English Language Learners			0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
Biology	All Students			0%
	Economically Disadvantaged			0%
	Students With Disabilities			0%
	English Language Learners			0%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter
US History	All Students			94%
	Economically Disadvantaged			76%
	Students With Disabilities			70%
	English Language Learners			100%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter

Grade 12				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			100%
	Economically Disadvantaged			0%
	Students With Disabilities			0%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			25%
	Economically Disadvantaged			50%
	Students With Disabilities			40%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			100%
	Economically Disadvantaged			0%
	Students With Disabilities			0%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			89%
	Economically Disadvantaged			50%
	Students With Disabilities			100%
	English Language Learners			0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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)	[not available]
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	71
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.
---	--

Measureable Outcome:

Monitoring:

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00