

Duval County Public Schools

Hendricks Avenue Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hendricks Avenue Elementary School

3400 HENDRICKS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

<http://www.duvalschools.org/hendricks>

Demographics

Principal: Darrell Edmunds

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2018-19 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (72%) 2014-15: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Hendricks Avenue Elementary School

3400 HENDRICKS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

<http://www.duvalschools.org/hendricks>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	28%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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 are a school where all children realize their potential and are inspired to serve and lead in the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We lead with compassion, creativity, and curiosity. We are HAE!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McLendon, Mindy	Principal	
Katsikas, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Team Facilitator
McClain, Tiffanie	Assistant Principal	
Kibler, Terrye	Teacher, K-12	Chair for our Academic Action Team

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	121	99	101	108	110	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	664
Attendance below 90 percent	5	0	4	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

33

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	78%	50%	57%	82%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	56%	58%	79%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	68%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	62%	63%	86%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	63%	62%	81%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	51%	76%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	48%	53%	86%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	121 (0)	99 (0)	101 (0)	108 (0)	110 (0)	125 (0)	664 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ()	0 ()	4 ()	1 ()	2 ()	4 ()	16 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)	10 (0)	23 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	51%	26%	58%	19%
	2018	77%	50%	27%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	52%	28%	58%	22%
	2018	72%	49%	23%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	75%	50%	25%	56%	19%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
	2018	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	78%	57%	21%	60%	18%
	2018	77%	61%	16%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	78%	49%	29%	53%	25%
	2018	75%	56%	19%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	50	57	49	57	54	41	50				
ELL	29	50	40	38	71	64					
ASN	62	64		69	82						
BLK	43	50	42	43	38	25	47				
HSP	46	30		62	70						
MUL	81	73		69	73						
WHT	86	77	67	91	83	61	85				
FRL	56	59	46	58	56	40	56				
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	40	26	17	47	42	22	41				
ASN	87			87							
BLK	32	27	10	30	40	30	27				
HSP	75			75							
MUL	61	53		70	40		50				
WHT	84	63	40	88	71	39	85				

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
FRL	55	44	23	55	46	24	50				
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	52	67	61	61	67	59	54				
ASN	91	73		100	91						
BLK	38	60	50	48	50	54	70				
HSP	73			67							
MUL	67	50		81	81						
WHT	91	84	82	93	85	86	90				
FRL	57	63	52	68	75	70	64				

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	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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
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	52
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	74
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	79
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

In our overall data, the lowest performance category was in our Math and ELA Lowest Performing quartile. In Math it showed only 47% of our students made gains in the Lowest Performing quartile. In ELA, it showed only 49% of our students made gains in the Lowest Performing quartile. The students that are in this category range from students with disabilities to ELL students. Although we engaged them with multiple interventions, the data indicates that they still need more support.

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

There were actually no declines this year in any of the reporting categories. We actually went up in all overall categories. There was a decline between student subgroup data, but overall there was not a decline in category reporting.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap is the Lowest performing quartile in both math and reading. Our students in this quartile are lower level 1s on the FSA. They are two or more years behind grade level or they are identified as ELL students. They struggle with understanding the standards and content of grade levels.

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

Our overall gains showed the most improvement. We ensured that all support schedules were aligned to maximize instruction. This includes ESE, ESOL para support, Small group tutoring, a before school tutoring lab, and administration pull out groups.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The amount of level 1's in the fourth and fifth grade. About 10% of our 4th and 5th grade students earned a level 1 on the FSA assessment from 2019.

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

1. Continue to meet the needs of our Lowest Performing Quartile
2. Ensure that we are engaging and moving all students on all levels.
3. Our subgroup data for SWD and ELL is concerning and we want to continue to monitor these students and meet their needs with strategic instruction.
4. Continue to build school culture and engage students in the areas of service and student leadership/ownership of their learning.
5. Make sure that Professional Development is meeting the needs of the teachers and helping them to support our students at all levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Performing Quartile
Rationale	<p>Based on 2019 data, our percentage of gains for students in the lowest performing quartile was the lowest data indicator in our school grade reporting. Therefore, after analyzing data our first goal should be focused on intentional and strategic ways to meet the needs of this group of students.</p> <p>We chose this as our area of focus because it was the lowest reporting category identified on our school data. This area also impacts other reporting categories such as ELA proficiency and overall ELA gains.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If assigned learning tasks/activities are designed to meet the individual needs of students and are aligned with grade level expectations, then students will demonstrate a year's worth of growth evidenced by their gains in reading.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Allow time for instructional personnel to engage in focused planning sessions in which they will evaluate current student data and create small group plans based on student needs in order to access and leverage the whole group/small group instruction in a more effective way.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This strategy is needed based on student data, walk through data, and observation data from the 2018-2019 school year. This data indicated that there were opportunities for growth in this area to align activities in a more effective way to student needs and standard aligned work.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional personnel will work with administration during common planning to analyze data, identify interventions, and develop activities to remediate/pre-teach students' instructional areas of weakness. 2. Instructional personnel will participate in preplanning professional development to identify students in the lowest performing quartile and create preliminary individual plans for each of these students. 3. Instructional personnel will work with students during the first week of school to create data notebooks that address individual student learning goals based on previous/current data. Instructional personnel will work with students throughout the year to assist in helping them analyze their personal data in order to make learning decisions for continual improvement. 4. Administration will conduct weekly walk throughs to collect data on standards- based instruction matching student needs and standard requirements. 5. Walk through data will be used to drive planning for all common planning sessions and professional development throughout the year.
Person Responsible	Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Building Positive School Culture with Student Leadership/Social Emotional Programming
Rationale	Based on data, our behavior goal needs to focus on building a culture of students that strive for their personal best in the areas of leadership and academic ownership. The data shows that while we have minimal discipline referrals overall, our entire student body could improve in academic/personal growth by challenging themselves in all areas of student leadership.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we develop great educators and leaders through implementation of a positive leadership program, then we will decrease the amount of discipline incidents and increase academic achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of the Leader in Me Program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	While our discipline data still indicates low incidents of misbehavior, we can proactively teach students strategies and principles to help them make better choices throughout their day and improve their academic progression with a focus on learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leadership Lessons will be a dedicated resource and taught 1 out of every 6 days. 2. Class meetings will be held every Monday Morning to ensure classrooms are building positive relationships and establishing trust. 3. Leader in Me Workbooks will be utilized during leadership lessons to ensure students have visuals to help support their learning. 4. Students will use leadership notebooks to track personal and academic goals throughout the year. Teachers will conference with them to ensure students are implementing strategies to help them meet their goals. 5. Staff will participate in ongoing training in the Leader in Me program to strengthen their skills of implementing the program effectively.
Person Responsible	Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We will create another area of focus for building culture.