

Duval County Public Schools

Hendricks Avenue Elementary 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Hendricks Avenue Elementary School

3400 HENDRICKS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

Demographics

Principal: Darrell Edmunds

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners 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%)
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 is pending approval by the Duval 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	19

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	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	32%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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 lead with compassion, creativity, and curiosity. We are HAE!

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
McLendon, Mindy	Principal	Principal
Katsikas, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Leadership Team Facilitator
McClain, Tiffanie	Assistant Principal	Oversee the RTI/MT Process, Leader of Discipline/PBIS Culture Model
Kibler, Terrye	Teacher, K-12	Chair for our Academic Action Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Darrell Edmunds

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.*

3

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners 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%)
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 .	

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	97	103	105	112	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
Attendance below 90 percent	7	4	2	4	8	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	21	34	32	11	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	32	45	53	31	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186

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	23	29	29	10	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/11/2020

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	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

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	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	

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	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

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	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	

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	
	(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	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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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%	0
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%	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	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	74
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	79
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	54
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.

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, ELL students, and general education students. Due to Covid 19, we were unable to see whether these reporting categories improved in the 2020 school year, but I believe with the distance learning the last nine weeks we should continue to monitor these students intensely moving forward due to possible regression in addition to their achievement on the 2019 testing results.

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

There were no declines in FSA data from 2018 to 2019. We 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. In addition to the already identified low scores in 2019, we also have to recognize the possible regression and gap that happened due to Covid 19.

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, ELL 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?

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. Another potential area of concern is the learning regression that may have taken place the last nine weeks due to distance learning from Covid 19.

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 and identify possible regression from the distance learning that took place the last nine weeks.
2. Ensure that we are able to balance mental health needs and academic needs in order to maximize student learning.
2. Ensure that we are engaging and moving all students on all levels.
3. Our subgroup data for SWD and ELL is concerning. 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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. In addition, when conducting walk throughs in 2019-2020, the data indicated that task alignment could be improved during small groups, 1:1 instruction, and centers. Therefore, after analyzing data our first goal should be focused on intentional and strategic ways to meet the needs of all students. We also chose this area based on our 5E data. Our data indicated that our school needs to improve in collaborative teachers under collaborative practices. Although we were in the green, when we drilled down into this category we had an overall score of yellow at 47. Our teachers would benefit from working together, evaluating data, and then moving into collaborating to create plans/tasks that align to standards based instruction and student needs.

In addition, in light of Covid 19 measures, it is imperative that we continue to put differentiation as a priority and find ways to strategically differentiate reading instruction for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

If differentiated instruction (small groups, tasks alignment, interventions) are designed to meet the individual needs of students and are aligned with standards based instruction, then students will demonstrate a year's worth of growth evidenced by their gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

All instructional personnel will engage in focused planning sessions in which they will evaluate current student data, review student task alignment, and create lesson plans based on student needs in order to access and leverage standards based instruction in a more effective way.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

This strategy is needed based on 2019 student data, walk through data, and the possible data associated with regression or learning gaps from Covid 19 Distance learning measures. This data indicates that there are opportunities for growth in this area. The data also indicates that we need to align activities and instruction to meet the needs of students and address possible learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional personnel will work with administration during common planning to analyze data, identify interventions, and develop tasks/activities to remediate/pre-teach students' instructional areas of weaknesses. In addition, we will look at the website what works for some evidenced based programs that work to support literacy and math interventions in the classroom.

<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/FWW/Results?filters=,Literacy>

Person Responsible

Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

2. Instructional personnel will participate in professional development to review standards based task alignment training as well as some equity resources. One website we will reference is the Education Trust and specifically look at an article titled, "SEAD, through a race equity lens" This article addresses-Social, emotional, and academic development (SEAD), is a holistic approach to supporting students that is gaining momentum across the country.

Person Responsible

Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

3. Use beginning of the year diagnostic data, to identify trends and possible learning gaps due to Covid 19 crisis as well as previously low achievement scores. Create standards based lesson plans and tasks that

will help students close the gaps of possible regression during distance learning and remediate during the first nine weeks.

Person Responsible Tiffanie McClain (mcclaint@duvalschools.org)

4. Students will create student leadership notebooks that will track their data and learning goals over the year. Instructional personnel will help students track their learning and goals to ensure they are making gains towards one year of growth.

Person Responsible Terrye Kibler (kiblert1@duvalschools.org)

5. Administration will conduct weekly walk throughs to collect data on student improvement aligned to tasks alignment.

Person Responsible Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

6. Walk through data will be shared through common planning sessions. In these sessions, we will work to create various samples of tasks associated to standards for teachers to use with students.

Person Responsible Tiffanie McClain (mcclaint@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus	Building positive school culture with Student Leadership/Social Emotional Programming
Description and Rationale:	Based on our data, our behavior goal continue to focus on building a culture of students that strive for their personal best in the areas of leadership and academic ownership. Discipline data, as well as the Chicago Impact data reveals that our entire student body could grow in the area of challenging themselves in all areas of student leadership.
Measurable Outcome:	If we develop great educators and leaders through implementation of a positive student 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 Steps to Implement

1. Leadership lessons will be a dedicated resource and taught 1 out of every 6 days.

Person Responsible Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

2. Class meetings will be held every Monday Morning to ensure classrooms are building positive relationships and establishing trust.

Person Responsible Mindy McLendon (mclendonm@duvalschools.org)

3. Leader in Me Workbooks will be utilized during leadership lesson to ensure students have visuals to help support their learning.

Person Responsible Tiffanie McClain (mcclaint@duvalschools.org)

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.

Person Responsible Terrye Kibler (kiblert1@duvalschools.org)

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

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

We will address these needs through our lighthouse leadership team and discuss ways to improve throughout the year. Our lighthouse team meets the third Monday of each month. We work collaboratively with our three action teams to continuously improve the school throughout the year.

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.

At Hendricks Avenue Elementary we believe that our stakeholders are the key to a positive school culture and environment. We have multiple layers of support starting with our Staff Lighthouse Team. This team includes leadership from all grade levels and support levels as well as a parent and student team member. This team helps guide our school based decisions and implement our school improvement plan throughout the year. In addition to this team we also have action teams. The action teams lead three important school areas- Academic, Culture, and Leadership. Through these action teams the school is able to implement and plan various school wide events to support our positive school culture. In addition we have our SAC, PTA Board, PTA, and FOH organizations. Our SAC team meets the first Monday of every month to discuss school improvement data, academic and culture needs as well as updates from all stakeholders. Our PTA board meets once a month with the administration to get a brief principals report and provide feedback/support in areas of school improvement. We also have FOH (Friends of Hendricks). This is a non profit organization that helps support our school in the areas of funding and volunteers. Friends of Hendricks allows our teachers to write grants and receive funding for classroom based initiatives that aren't funded by the school based budget. Finally we have a faith based partnership with Southside United Methodist Church. Our faith based partners help our students in need with clothes, food, and basic needs throughout the year. They encourage and support our teachers and staff with quarterly luncheons and gatherings. They also provide an after school tutoring program for our students in need. The school improvement plan is reviewed by all of these stakeholder groups and they provide input/suggestions to add to the plan. In addition these stakeholders help monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan throughout the year. They help our administration with additional ways in the area of school improvement through our monthly meetings and discussion.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00