
Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Tyndall Academy

7800 TYNDALL PKWY, Tyndall Afb, FL 32403

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kara Mulkusky

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2018

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 41% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (68%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Tyndall Academy

7800 TYNDALL PKWY, Tyndall Afb, FL 32403

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Combination School PK-8 | No | 35% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 43% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
| Grade | A | A | B | A |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Our mission at Tyndall Academy is to instill in our students a love of learning by challenging, nurturing and guiding them to achieve their maximum potential as critical thinkers, lifelong learners, and model citizens.

Our motto is "Soaring Above!"

Provide the school's vision statement.

Employees of Tyndall Academy envision a school where all stakeholders work together to ensure success of all students. The faculty and staff are supportive and respectful of each other and hold high expectations for themselves and students.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Kirkman, Kimberly | Principal | |
| Dehner, Carolyn | Assistant Principal | |
| Whiting, Wendy | Instructional Media | |
| Kevern, Rebecca | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Overway, Marisah | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Waller, Jacqueline | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Piddington, Heather | Teacher, K-12 | 2nd Grade teacher and Chair/Leader of PLC |
| Yarnell, Cynthia | Teacher, K-12 | Teacher and Grade Chair of 4th Grade/PLC Leader |
| Myatt, Ashley | Teacher, K-12 | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/31/2018, Kara Mulkusky

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.*

4

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 41% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (68%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 68 | 62 | 46 | 43 | 40 | 45 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 353 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

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 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 46 | 30 | 34 | 38 | 37 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 46 | 30 | 34 | 38 | 37 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 62% | 73% | 61% | 70% | 67% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 65% | 64% | 59% | 55% | 61% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 45% | 58% | 54% | 51% | 56% | 51% |
| Math Achievement | 79% | 70% | 62% | 79% | 68% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 82% | 57% | 59% | 72% | 59% | 56% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | 56% | 52% | 57% | 58% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 76% | 65% | 56% | 60% | 67% | 53% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 0% | 86% | 78% | 0% | 79% | 75% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 62% | 61% | 1% | 58% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 72% | 57% | 15% | 57% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 65% | 58% | 7% | 58% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 51% | 7% | 56% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 71% | 56% | 15% | 56% | 15% |
| | 2018 | 63% | 50% | 13% | 55% | 8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 69% | 62% | 7% | 62% | 7% |
| | 2018 | 81% | 63% | 18% | 62% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 84% | 59% | 25% | 64% | 20% |
| | 2018 | 71% | 59% | 12% | 62% | 9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 81% | 54% | 27% | 60% | 21% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 61% | 17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -78% | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 81% | 54% | 27% | 53% | 28% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 54% | 13% | 55% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | | | | | |
| | 2018 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 25 | 36 | | 45 | 57 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | 40 | | 71 | 70 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | | | 75 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 76 | 73 | | 88 | 100 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 72 | | 80 | 72 | | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 53 | 40 | 69 | 83 | 60 | 65 | | | | |

| 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 | 42 | 45 | 33 | 50 | 59 | 45 | 53 | | | | |
| BLK | 56 | 60 | 30 | 73 | 77 | 83 | | | | | |
| HSP | 76 | 63 | | 74 | 67 | | 83 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 57 | | 79 | 78 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 51 | 33 | 82 | 66 | 40 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 65 | 54 | 42 | 74 | 62 | 43 | 74 | | | | |

| 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 44 | 38 | 45 | 63 | 71 | 54 | | | | | |
| ASN | 91 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | 40 | | 61 | 50 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 66 | 67 | | 82 | 63 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 78 | 54 | | 81 | 77 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 53 | 46 | 82 | 74 | 68 | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 46 | 41 | 72 | 72 | 59 | 34 | | | | |

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 68 |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 473 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 97% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 62 |
| 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 | 69 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 84 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 72 |
| 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 | 60 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

As a school, Tyndall Elem scored lower in ELA vs Math using data from 2018/19. We have also noticed that SWD are the lowest scoring subgroup in ELA/Math Achievement as well as ELA/Math Learning Gains.

Contributing factors would be that students missed over a month of instruction due to Hurricane Michael and were not able to make the needed gains that students without disabilities were able to attain. Tyndall students also moved from our original school location for a month and joined another school for the 2018-19 school year. These disruptions were especially difficult on our students with disabilities. Due to a large loss of our military students, several teachers had to be moved to other schools which made an impact on students.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year would be ELA learning gains with our students with disabilities. This subgroup saw a 19 percent drop from the previous year.

Contributing factors would be that students missed over a month of instruction due to Hurricane Michael and were not able to make the needed gains that students without disabilities were able to attain. Tyndall students also moved from our original school location for a month and joined another school for the 2018-19 school year. These disruptions were especially difficult on our students with disabilities. Due to a large loss of our military students, several teachers had to be moved to other schools which made an impact on students and scheduling.

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.

Tyndall Elementary out-performed the state average in every tested/reported component. However, the group that had the lowest growth compared to the state and the past year would be 3rd grade ELA.

The factors that may have contributed to this area of lowest growth could be that students missed over a month of instruction due to Hurricane Michael and were not able to make the needed gains that students in 3rd grade had made in prior years. Tyndall students also moved from our original school location for a month and joined another school. Due to a large loss of our military students, several teachers had to be moved to other schools which made an impact on students. Third grade lost 3 teachers from the original 7 after the hurricane. Our school demographics also changed when we lost over 500 military families.

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

For the 2018/19 school year, Tyndall saw the most improvement in learning gains in ELA/Math and Learning Gains in the lowest quartile in both ELA and Math. Our school worked diligently with students in small group settings including students with disabilities as well as students that were struggling on specific standards. Data chats were made personal as we discussed individual students and their progress. All students were closely monitored and were provided needed interventions in all subjects. Parents were also contacted and given resources to use at home with students. As a school, we focused on Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and worked to increase rigor in these tasks and standards. This focus helped our students achieve the growth in every content area.

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

One potential area of concern would be our student attendance rate. With many of our students losing their housing due to Hurricane Michael, we had less than 70 students in our home zone during the remainder of school year 2018-19. Most students were traveling between 20-40 miles to attend Tyndall. We will focus on attendance again in the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school year. We will look for ways to reward students for meeting attendance goals and provide positive supports to families. We will daily contact any student that has missed 2 consecutive days of school without a parent communicating the absence to the school and contact those that are habitually absent each day they are not in school. We will also utilize both our Promise Para and Mental Health Triad to assist with student truancy and interventions for students and parents. We also want to actively work to decrease the number of days students are suspended both in and out of school. Tyndall dropped from Gold Level to Bronze Level in 2019/2020 in Model School Status due to the number of days that students were suspended (particularly male students with disabilities).

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

1. ELA school-wide achievement
2. ELA Learning Gains
3. ELA Learning Gains Lowest Quartile
4. Attendance/Suspension both in and out of school

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a trend, students at TES have scored lower in ELA than math specifically in the area of learning gains and learning gains in the lowest quartile. In 2018/19 Tyndall students scored 3 percent lower than the prior year in ELA achievement which was the only area that Tyndall had a decrease from the prior year. When looking at reporting categories, two grade levels were lowest in the category of Integration of Knowledge and Ideas.

Measurable Outcome: Tyndall's intended outcome is to increase student performance in ELA in the reporting category of Integration of Knowledge and Ideas by 10% when assessed by FSA in 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Kirkman (kirkmkl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Tyndall Academy will utilize the EL Curriculum school-wide with integrity including both the content modules and skill/all block. During this time, a school-wide writing format (graphic organizer) will be used to give all students common vocabulary. The skills/all block will provide instruction on each individual students' independent level allowing differentiated instruction in the classroom in ELA/Reading. The ability to write shows true comprehension and ability to integrate knowledge and ideas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our District selected EL as our K-8 reading curriculum for the 2019-20 school year. Tyndall students showed great growth in the area of writing and integration of knowledge during this year. Due to the pandemic, state assessments were not conducted but we feel so strongly about the results we were seeing, we made the decision to continue using the EL Curriculum for the 2020/2021 school year in grades K-6th. EL offers specific differentiation in grades K-2 as well as dedicated time (60 minutes a day) to foundational reading skills in the K-2 Skills Block. The common graphic organizer was chosen to provide consistency for students in K-6th grade. By focusing on writing, our scores in the area of Integration of Knowledge and Ideas will increase. Teachers will also utilize Canvas as a means to communicate and deliver EL instruction to students that are currently on distance learning (Bay Link).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use EL Curriculum with integrity in grades K-6
2. Meet weekly as grade level PLCs to plan and prepare for EL and discuss student achievement and interventions
3. Incorporate the common writing graphic organizer K-6 and provide professional development to teachers during faculty meetings
4. Incorporate the process of writing: Plan, Draft, Confer, Revise, and Edit in all subject areas
5. Monitor both PLCs and classrooms for the incorporation of both EL and the writing graphic organizer
6. Increase admin knowledge of EL through Cord of 3 walks with embedded professional development
7. Utilize Literacy Coach/District/ELA Liaisons/Summer Think Tank Teachers in preparation/planning EL as well as related articles for integration
8. Participate in professional development regarding Canvas in order to provide appropriate and rigorous instruction for students in distance learning
9. Monitor student growth through MAP and EL Common Assessments
10. Use the District Walkthrough Form to gather data on teacher implementation school-wide

Person Responsible Kimberly Kirkman (kirkmkl@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In reviewing our 2019-2020 behavior data as a Florida PBIS school, it was noted that we had a risk ratio of 3.04 for the subgroup of students with disabilities with respect to out-of-school suspension. This exceeded the criteria of a 2.5 ratio and limited Tyndall Academy to Bronze level of Model School status. It was also noted that all of the students in that category were male.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, Tyndall Academy will reduce the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions by at least 10% with a specific focus on the subgroup of male students with disabilities. This in turn will reduce the amount of lost instructional time due to students not being in the classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carolyn Dehner (dehnecr@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Two research based strategies will be put in place along with other supporting practices: Check in/Check out and Restorative Discipline. At risk students' attendance, academic and behavior progress will be monitored during monthly data chats, monthly PBIS team meetings, and biweekly meetings w/ the mental health team.

At the first sign of concerns, preventive measures like check in/check out will be used along with the instructional programs of Zoo U, BDS 360, social emotional group lessons and techniques from WinWin Discipline. Involving targeted students in purposeful groups and extracurricular activities is intended to build pride and respect within the students for their school, for each other, and for themselves as another preventive measure. Such activities may include but are not limited to LEGO League, music groups, chess club, art club, intramural sports, Anchored 4 Life, flag presenters, and a PBIS student team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When consequences are needed, restorative practices will be employed when possible to preserve instructional time. If in-school or out-of-school suspension become an absolute necessity, use of the Canvas platform for distance learning will be employed so that students stay current with grade level peers.

In addition to administration and teachers, the following staff members will be employed to assist in these endeavors: Promise para, mental health triad team, SSO, guidance, Military Family Life Counselors, and where applicable after school staff from Boys & Girls Club and Bay Base.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Strategy #1 will focus on all students in ELA as well as subgroups. Strategy #2 will address our priority in discipline and attendance.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Tyndall Academy strives to provide a positive culture for our students, families and staff. This is accomplished by setting high expectations of all on campus. SOAR expectations are posted throughout campus and students and staff regularly revisit these expectations. Students and classes that show positive examples of the expectations are rewarded weekly. Tyndall is also working to re-establish the PTO program which also provides positive rewards and experiences for students and staff. Parents are treated as partners in education and are routinely involved in their students' education.

This year the district has secured a grant allowing Tyndall to hire a Volunteer//Business Liaison. This position will be able to contact outside agencies, mentors and volunteers to help around campus while contributing to the positive school atmosphere.

Social Media Posts as well as Weekly Staff Newsletters provide shout-outs to outstanding staff as well as being a vehicle to recognizing others in our school that are making a difference.

Tyndall Air Force Base also works hand in hand with the school through the School Liaison Officer. Tyndall Academy has 2 MFLCs that provide positive reinforcement and guidance to our military students. Staff was also recently gifted surprises from the Air Force Sergeants Association. Military members often ask to volunteer to clean up campus or to complete a project for the beautification of our school which makes the school environment inviting to all.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |