

Duval County Public Schools

Hendricks Avenue Elementary 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
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: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	17
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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	23%
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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Edmunds, Darrell	Principal	Student achievement: vision and mission; progress monitoring, data analysis, intervention Teacher efficacy: development, common planning
Daniel, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Student achievement; RTI/MT Process, Leader of Discipline/PBIS Culture Model
Jean-Marie, Sharrell	School Counselor	MTSS and MRT; 504s and Gifted staffing; Tier 1-3 wellness interventions
Duva, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Student achievement through data analysis and intervention; teacher support in professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, 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

30

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.

4

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	83	108	116	95	101	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	15	15	6	11	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	2	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	8	5	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	6	1	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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 7/30/2021

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	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

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	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

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				78%	50%	57%	75%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	56%	58%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	26%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				81%	62%	63%	78%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	63%	62%	64%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	52%	51%	30%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	48%	53%	76%	55%	55%

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	77%	51%	26%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	52%	28%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	50%	25%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	83%	61%	22%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	60%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	78%	49%	29%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

District Progress Monitoring Assessments: K-2 i-Ready Diagnostics; 3-5 Progress Monitoring Assessments

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	70	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	32	57
	Students With Disabilities	18	42	82
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29	55	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	14	54
	Students With Disabilities	27	25	80
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	63	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	32	60
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	71
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	56	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	29	56
	Students With Disabilities	0	40	71
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	72	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	44	50
	Students With Disabilities	43	43	53
	English Language Learners	50	33	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	69	76	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	52	41
	Students With Disabilities	21	36	36
	English Language Learners	17	50	33

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77	73	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	43	60
	Students With Disabilities	31	19	38
	English Language Learners	33	67	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77	82	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	61	52
	Students With Disabilities	25	38	25
	English Language Learners	33	67	33
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78	69	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	45	52
	Students With Disabilities	48	43	52
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72	66	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	29	24
	Students With Disabilities	38	43	33
	English Language Learners	25	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	78	73	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	52	47
	Students With Disabilities	67	52	55
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	34	50	56	34	55	42	43				
ELL	33			33							
ASN	53			60							
BLK	47	46		39	31		47				
HSP	87			73							
MUL	76			71							
WHT	78	69	59	80	72	41	73				
FRL	47	37	31	39	30	25	41				
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				

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	435
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	57
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	42
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	80
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	
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	67
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

In 2021, most grade levels and subgroups saw a decline in progress monitoring performance data due to effects from the Covid pandemic.

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

In our overall 2020 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.

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

(from 2020)

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.

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

(from 2020)

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.

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

Contributing factors to this improvement include 4-step process of identifying students whose growth can most impact overall achievement levels.

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

In order to accelerate learning in 2021, we will need to continue with the 4-step process of setting goals and identifying students who most impact movement toward those goals.

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.

Teachers will be provided opportunities for development in standards-based differentiated instruction as well as MTSS protocols for problem-solving.

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

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 Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Based on 2021 data, our percentage of students in the lowest performing quartile with gains showed the lowest data indicator in our school grade reporting - specifically, in math. In addition, when conducting walk throughs in 2020-2021, 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 28 (down from 47 the year before). 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 and math 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.

Monitoring:

Area of focus will be monitored through quarterly Progress Monitoring Assessments;

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@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 2021 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

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.

Person Responsible Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@duvalschools.org)

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 Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@duvalschools.org)

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 Jessica Daniel (atkinsonj1@duvalschools.org)

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)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Building positive school culture with Student Leadership/Social Emotional Programming 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 5 Essentials 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 continue to decrease the amount of discipline incidents and increase academic achievement.
Monitoring:	Discipline incidents/referrals;
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of the Leader in Me Program. While our discipline data still indicates low incidents of misbehavior, we can
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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

Leadership lessons will be provided during the first 8 days of school and early dismissal Wednesdays. Leader in Me Workbooks will be utilized during leadership lesson to ensure students have visuals to help support their learning.

Person Responsible Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@duvalschools.org)

Leadership launch assemblies will set expectations for the year.

Person Responsible Jessica Duva (duvaj@duvalschools.org)

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)

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

Person Responsible Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@duvalschools.org)

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

Jessica Daniel (atkinsonj1@duvalschools.org)

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.

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.

Hendricks Avenue Elementary is a FranklinCovey Leader In Me Lighthouse school. As a Leader in Me School, we have 5 Core Paradigms that drive our decisions, behaviors, and results (Covey). A paradigm is simply the way we “see” things. These 5 Core Paradigms include: • Everyone can be a leader. • Everyone has genius. • Change starts with me. • Empower students to lead their own learning. • Educators and families partner to develop the whole person.

These paradigms or “the way we see things” at our school drive our everyday interaction with not only your student, but ourselves too. A partnership with families supports our ability for students to lead their own educational journey—empowering them to be responsible, reflective, and active in their learning experiences.

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

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.