
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	29%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	29%
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	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Walters, Rachel	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader who is responsible for the safety of the school and the academic progress of all students. Engages stakeholders in school improvement efforts through regular collaboration.
Tompkins, Jerome	Assistant Principal	Serves as curricular resource for middle school teachers
Hutcherson, Justin	Assistant Principal	Serves as curriculum leader for elementary teachers
Kaufman, Tawny	Teacher, K-12	Serves as SAC chairperson and serves on instructional leadership team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Rachel Walters

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

603

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	49	85	75	75	60	87	48	54	46	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	4	9	5	8	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	7	10	1	9	5	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	7	8	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	6	4	4	2	2	1	9	5	0	0	0	0	33

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Saturday 8/27/2022

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	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	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	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	

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	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		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	71%	51%	55%				66%	57%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						60%	56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						36%	52%	54%
Math Achievement	81%	41%	42%				68%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	73%						62%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						35%	49%	52%
Science Achievement	67%	48%	54%				73%	50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	57%	59%				81%	77%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	52%	21%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	55%	9%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
06	2022					
	2019	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
07	2022					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	52%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2022					
	2019	75%	53%	22%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	64%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
06	2022					
	2019	63%	49%	14%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
07	2022					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2022					
	2019	39%	31%	8%	46%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	74%	47%	27%	48%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	81%	67%	14%	71%	10%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	63%	37%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	45	46	23	57	62	47					
BLK	62	50		70	73						
HSP	63	49	38	75	74	64	56				
MUL	81	65		81	71						
WHT	75	65	33	86	73	35	76	89	100		
FRL	68	57	40	84	77	50	56				
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		
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			

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
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	607
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	64
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	60
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	75
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	70
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The most growth occurred with the ESE sub group. The group made adequate progress for the year. Proficiency increased across all subject areas for the year placing the school either first or second in proficiency when compared to the other nine K-8 schools receiving grades in Hillsborough County.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement based on progress monitoring is for gains with students scoring in the bottom quartile for ELA. Only 29% of those students made gains compared to over 55% in math. When compared to K-8 schools in the district, Tinker ranks eight or ninth when it comes to gains of the bottom quartile both in ELA and math.

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

The lower gains could possibly be attributed in a change in providing interventions for our identified students. The previous year, the school utilized three site based subs to provide coverage for teachers and to also targeted interventions for identified students.

This year, the school will offer before school intensive ELA and math lessons for identified students starting at the beginning of the second nine weeks.

The leadership team will also conduct weekly lunch data chats with students identified as performing in the bottom quartile.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Greatest growth came in 5th grade ELA and Math proficiency. This growth can be attributed to the teachers "looping" up with their class and teaching the majority of their same students from the previous year.

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

This growth can be attributed to the teachers "looping" up with their class and teaching the majority of their same students from the previous year.

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

Strategies to accelerate learning include the instructional focus on differentiated learning, small group instruction, and student ownership in the classroom.

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.

Professional development planned includes the following: how to utilize data from new progress monitoring system to drive instruction, utilizing grade level formative assessments to create small groups. Implementing the Leader In Me program to support student ownership in the classroom.

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

The leadership team will be restructured to utilized action teams to align the work of all divisions of the school with the instructional priorities of the school. Teacher led action teams will include: Curriculum and instruction, Professional Development, Climate and Culture, Family and Community, Technology, and Administration.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Differentiation is needed for students to make gains toward mastery of state standards. This is a critical need as only 29% of students identified in the bottom quartile made a year's worth of growth the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

As measured by the school created walkthrough form, K-8 teachers' use of differentiated instruction during core content instruction will increase from 60 % in spring 2022 to at least 90% in spring 2022. This will result in 75% of students in the bottom quartile showing gains as measured by performance on PM1 to PM3 in core content areas.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will collect data using the school walkthrough form and analyze the data bi-weekly during administrative meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Walters (rachel.walters@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiated instruction is defined as factoring students' individual learning styles and levels of readiness first before designing a lesson plan. Research shows this method benefits a wide range of students, from those with learning disabilities to those who are high ability. Differentiating instruction may mean teaching the same material to all students using a variety of instructional strategies, or it may require the teacher to deliver lessons at varying levels of difficulty based on the ability of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The Effect size for RTI is 1.29 according to Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Tinker implements the Leader In Me program to build a positive school culture for all students and adults. All members of the Tinker community are taught and encouraged to utilize Stephen Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective People. The program encourages people to put others first and to seek to understand the other person's perspective.

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

Dawn Davis and Renelle Bucelato are the teacher leaders for the Climate and Culture team. The team will consist of staff members who self select the team at a faculty meeting in early September.

A student leadership team will be formed under the umbrella of the Climate and Culture team to make sure positive shout outs are given and students have a voice in events happening at school.

The Anchored4Life teams have been established to accelerate the sense of belonging for students who are new to the school. Student ambassadors at each great level are nominated by teachers and then act as buddies for new students. They also provide support to any student facing a service members deployment and a special ceremony when students leave school for a new duty station.