

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Tinker K 8 School



2021-22 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 | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 29% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Central |
| Regional Executive Director | Lucinda Thompson |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

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) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School KG-8 | No | 25% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 46% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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 | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Walters, Rachel | Principal | Responsible for leading, guiding and managing the health, safety, emotional and academic well-being of Tinker K-8. |
| Hutcherson, Justin | Assistant Principal | Responsible for supporting Mrs. Walters in the leading, guiding and management of the emotional, social and academic well-being of Tinker K-8. |

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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.

6

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 | 80 | 81 | 83 | 71 | 91 | 65 | 69 | 27 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 620 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |

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

Friday 1/1/2021

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 | 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 | |

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 | 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 | |

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 | | | | 66% | 57% | 61% | 73% | 59% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 60% | 56% | 59% | 60% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 52% | 54% | 45% | 49% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 68% | 55% | 62% | 73% | 57% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 57% | 59% | 60% | 53% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 35% | 49% | 52% | 43% | 47% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 73% | 50% | 56% | 64% | 51% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 81% | 77% | 78% | 91% | 79% | 77% |

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 |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 52% | 21% | 58% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 55% | 9% | 58% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 54% | 13% | 56% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 53% | 8% | 54% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 54% | 7% | 52% | 9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 75% | 53% | 22% | 56% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 54% | 19% | 62% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 57% | 16% | 64% | 9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 54% | 8% | 60% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 49% | 14% | 55% | 8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 62% | 6% | 54% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -63% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 31% | 8% | 46% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -68% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 51% | 21% | 53% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 47% | 27% | 48% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 81% | 67% | 14% | 71% | 10% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 63% | 37% | 61% | 39% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 0% | 57% | -57% | 57% | -57% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady for ELA and Math grades 1 -5

Achieve 3000 ELA 6-8

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 41 | 60 | 81 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41 | 61 | 82 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26 | 58 | 68 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 31 | 50 | 74 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 45 | 83 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 20 | 75 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 44 | 62 | 73 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 58 | 59 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 17 | 34 |
| | English Language Learners | 53 | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 28 | 58 | 74 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 32 | 57 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 20 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 41 | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 75 | 86 | 94 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 71 | 85 | 98 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 62 | 77 | 92 |
| | English Language Learners | 61 | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 31 | 54 | 80 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21 | 48 | 81 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 42 | 64 |
| | English Language Learners | 75 | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 75 | 76 | 89 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 73 | 79 | 91 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 74 | 78 | 89 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 48 | 62 | 82 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34 | 48 | 52 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 60 | 73 | 70 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 71 | 75 | 81 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 61 | 66 | 78 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 70 | 73 | 67 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 26 | 54 | 68 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 53 | 65 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 45 | 70 | 43 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | 62.3 | 68.3 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56.8 | 69.8 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 76.55 | 81.97 | |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| Grade 6 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 29 | 30 | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 | 13.4 | 21 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 55.90 | 47.82 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52.75 | 37.72 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 36.5 | 28.44 | |
| | English Language Learners | 31 | 10 | N/A |
| | | | | |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27 | 37 | 46 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 30 | 30 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 40.85 | 55.34 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 38.25 | 35.74 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 45.5 | 46.67 | |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 44.7 | 56.98 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 52.24 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 44.3 | 44.15 | |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 29 | 43 | 43 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 66.9 | 60.03 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 64.15 | 55.92 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 77.10 | 58.18 | |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 73 | 55.68 | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 36.8 | 35.48 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25.5 | 37.48 | |
| | English Language Learners | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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 | 35 | 64 | | 42 | 73 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 65 | 63 | | 65 | 56 | | 63 | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 60 | | 70 | 76 | | 56 | 92 | | | |
| MUL | 67 | 46 | | 71 | 69 | | 60 | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 53 | | 81 | 85 | | 78 | 88 | 93 | | |
| FRL | 54 | 47 | | 74 | 60 | | 50 | 71 | | | |
| 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 | | |

| 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 |
| 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 | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 69 |
| 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 | 621 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 54 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Native American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| 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% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 69 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 63 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 78 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 59 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Students tend to perform better in ELA across all grade levels and they show the largest gains in ELA according to progress monitoring.
Largest achievement gaps continue to be with students with disabilities across all subjects and grade levels.

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

The greatest need for improvement is for our students with disabilities, growth in ELA in middle school grades, and math proficiency.

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

Contributing factors include the 30% mobility rate and the fact that many students transfer from out of state where students are taught using different standards.

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

First grade showed the greatest growth as evidenced by progress monitoring data. We also had tremendous gains across the grade levels in math.

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

We focused on small group instruction to teach standards not yet mastered.

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

We will implement before school tutoring sessions and continue to emphasize small group instruction. Monthly data chats are held with grade levels to drive instruction.

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.

Teacher will have monthly PD sessions based upon individual needs. Teachers will also be encouraged to attend district led PD sessions for both math and ELA.

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

Before school tutoring sessions and Saturday camps in the spring will be utilized to teach unlearned standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based upon the progress monitoring data, differentiated instruction is needed to close the achievement gap with students with disabilities. |
| Measurable Outcome: | The level of proficiency on the FSA for SWD in ELA will increase from 35% to 50%. |
| Monitoring: | Student performance on iReady will be monitored for progress in ELA |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Justin Hutcherson (justin.hutcherson@sdhc.k12.fl.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers will group students for instruction, especially students with significant learning problems. Teachers will regularly assess for readiness. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The use of differentiation is listed as an important part of a successful literacy program by the IRIS Center. |

Action Steps to Implement

- Teachers administer baseline assessment
- Teachers group students based upon individual needs
- Teachers conduct small group instruction
- Teachers provide differentiated learning activities for students to demonstrate mastery.
- Teachers progress monitor using iReady.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school does not have significant discipline issues when compared to the district and the state. The school will continue to focus on social emotional learning by utilizing the Leader In Me curriculum and daily classroom meetings.

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.

The school uses the Leader In Me curriculum to build a positive school culture. School decisions are driven by the teacher leadership team and the student leadership team.

Community circles are used regularly by adults and students to build a sense of community and safety. The staff holds a community check-in every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Classes have designated time at the beginning of each day to have a classroom meeting and to explicitly teach the Leader In Me habits.

The school uses the Anchored 4 Life curriculum to onboard new students to create a sense of belonging as quickly as possible.

The school counselors use the Second Step curriculum in the middle school classes to help build a foundation of healthy social / emotional learning.

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

Members of SAC provide valuable insight into areas of concern off site which need to be addressed. The PTO provides regular volunteers to host incentive activities for students at all grade levels. Classroom teachers hold regular class meetings to develop a place where students feel safe to be themselves.

The teacher lighthouse team leads the school action team to create leadership events and a dynamic learning environment.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |