

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tinker K 8 School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Tinker K 8 School

8207 TINKER ST, MACDILL AFB, Tampa, FL 33621

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rachel Walters

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	29%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Tinker K 8 School

8207 TINKER ST, MACDILL AFB, Tampa, FL 33621

[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 KG-8	No	30%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will educate our children in academic, social, and physical skills to reach their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our students will become leaders who remember Tinker K-8 as their best school experience.

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
Walters, Rachel	Principal	Responsible for leading Tinker K-8 in curriculum & instruction, discipline and stakeholder communication.
Rowehl, Jaclyn	Assistant Principal	Responsible for leading Tinker K-8 in curriculum & instruction, discipline and stakeholder communication.
Hutcherson, Justin	Assistant Principal	Responsible for leading Tinker K-8 in curriculum & instruction, discipline and stakeholder communication.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Rachel Walters

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	29%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	67	61	60	69	43	63	38	49	40	0	0	0	0	490
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	10	4	4	3	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	6	4	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	60	75	83	63	66	62	61	54	45	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	7	12	4	6	3	5	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	14	21	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	105

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	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	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

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	60	75	83	63	66	62	61	54	45	0	0	0	0	569
Attendance below 90 percent	7	12	4	6	3	5	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	14	21	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	105

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	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	66%	57%	61%	70%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	59%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	52%	54%	53%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	68%	55%	62%	70%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	62%	57%	59%	54%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	49%	52%	44%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	50%	56%	66%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	77%	78%	86%	78%	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	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%
	2018	75%	53%	22%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	55%	9%	58%	6%
	2018	75%	55%	20%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	68%	51%	17%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
	2018	70%	52%	18%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
07	2019	61%	54%	7%	52%	9%
	2018	67%	52%	15%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	75%	53%	22%	56%	19%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	54%	19%	62%	11%
	2018	81%	55%	26%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	57%	16%	64%	9%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	62%	14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
	2018	71%	54%	17%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
06	2019	63%	49%	14%	55%	8%
	2018	61%	48%	13%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
07	2019	68%	62%	6%	54%	14%
	2018	66%	61%	5%	54%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	39%	31%	8%	46%	-7%
	2018	50%	29%	21%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%
	2018	65%	52%	13%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	74%	47%	27%	48%	26%
	2018	62%	48%	14%	50%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

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	81%	67%	14%	71%	10%
2018	91%	65%	26%	71%	20%
Compare		-10%			

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	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
2018	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
Compare		11%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	29	39	24	26	32	30	33				
ELL	59			65							
BLK	60	53	55	60	63	25	50				
HSP	66	63	40	68	65	27	78	86	100		
MUL	64	65		62	57		81	82			
WHT	69	60	33	73	61	43	74	78	91		
FRL	53	54	33	58	52	34	59	71			
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	30	31	35	30	29	19	18	91			
ELL	43			64							
BLK	60	61	50	69	63	57	53	70			
HSP	72	56	35	73	55	30	69	96			
MUL	77	61		71	53		45				
WHT	77	62	50	75	64	44	67	95	85		
FRL	68	56	35	62	46	28	76	85			
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	25	44	43	26	41	33	18				
BLK	54	69	75	58	62		47				

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
HSP	71	67	50	66	56	59	74	77			
MUL	77	54		68	60		92				
WHT	73	66	46	76	50	30	65	93	100		
FRL	65	64	67	69	55	53	63	80			

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	578
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

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	52
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	66
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	69
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	65
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 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.

Bottom quartile showed the lowest performance in learning gains for ELA and Math. The main contributing factor is the mobile population resulting from the nature of military family movement.

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

Civics End of Course Exam achievement had a decrease of 10% from prior year results from 91% to 81%. We did not maximize instruction.

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.

ELA lowest 25% quartile had the greatest gap compared to the state average of 18% points. The main contributing factor is the mobile population resulting from the nature of military family movement.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement with an increase compared to prior years of 9%. Saturday review sessions reviewing prior year science standards.

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

Two potential areas of concern are attendance and course assessments.

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

1. Bottom quartile for Math
2. Bottom quartile for ELA
3. SWD for Math
4. SWD for ELA
5. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement and learning gains for Tinker K-8 students with disabilities below 41% in consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome: Focusing specifically on design instruction for students with disabilities and assisting teachers in academically reaching our students with disabilities to a personalized level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rachel Walters (rachel.walters@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Multi-Tiered System of Support

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students with intensive support to master the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student identification
2. Small group lessons based on needs.
3. Progress Monitoring
4. Monthly monitoring meetings with stakeholders.

Person Responsible Rachel Walters (rachel.walters@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Team will track data among students identified and will put interventions in place to meet the needs of the students and set goals for improvement. Team will monitor interventions to ensure effectiveness.

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.

Leader in Me.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00