

Duval County Public Schools

Hendricks Avenue Elementary School



2022-23 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 | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 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: 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 |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 39% |
| 2021-22 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 | 2021-22: A (76%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: B (58%) |
| 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 | 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) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School KG-5 | No | 39% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 36% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | | A | 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

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Edmunds, Darrell | Principal | Student achievement; instructional leadership; school safety and security; culture and climate; professional development |
| Daniel, Jessica | Assistant Principal | Academic achievement; instructional leadership; professional development; school safety and security; scheduling; school procedures i.e. arrival/dismissal; school building maintenance and upkeep |
| Duva, Jessica | Instructional Coach | Duties include instructional support of teachers, planning and facilitation of PLCs; academic intervention with differentiated small groups of students. |
| Jean-Marie, Sharrell | School Counselor | Student services including wellness and mental health support; compliance with IEP/504 policy; facilitation of trainings for teachers |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Darrell Edmunds

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

625

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

1

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

1

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 | 101 | 107 | 107 | 105 | 89 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 609 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 22 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 6 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |

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 | 8 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

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 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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

Monday 8/22/2022

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 | 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 | |

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 | 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 | |

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 | 83% | 50% | 56% | | | | 78% | 50% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 72% | | | | | | 70% | 56% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | | | | | | 49% | 50% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 83% | 48% | 50% | | | | 81% | 62% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 78% | | | | | | 75% | 63% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 73% | | | | | | 47% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 78% | 59% | 59% | | | | 77% | 48% | 53% |

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 | 77% | 51% | 26% | 58% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 52% | 28% | 58% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -77% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 50% | 25% | 56% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -80% | | | | |

| 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 | 83% | 61% | 22% | 62% | 21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 64% | 17% | 64% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -83% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 57% | 21% | 60% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -81% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 49% | 29% | 53% | 25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

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 | 50 | 52 | 50 | 50 | 66 | 64 | 36 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 70 | | 42 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | 77 | | 75 | 69 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 55 | 67 | 62 | 58 | 50 | 50 | | | | | |
| HSP | 95 | 75 | | 90 | 92 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 77 | 100 | | 77 | 91 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 88 | 69 | 59 | 88 | 80 | 83 | 82 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 60 | 50 | 65 | 72 | 61 | 65 | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

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 | 76 |
| 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 | 531 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 53 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 73 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 | 88 |
| 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 | 86 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 78 |
| 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?

Hendricks saw an increase in achievement across all grade levels compared to both the 2020-21 school year as well as the 2018-19 school year, pre-pandemic. FSA results reflect a 96-point increase in total score for a total of 534 (A) with math lowest-performing quartile gains increasing by 46 percentage points; iReady data also showed positive trends, with 74 percent of all K-2 students performing at or above grade level.

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

The lowest performing quartile in ELA showed an increase in gains but was the lowest area in our FSA result categories. Science proficiency was our lowest component of end-of-year state testing; ESE student subgroup demonstrated greatest need for improvement - while there were increases in multiple areas, ESE growth in math decreased.

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

We will continue to develop best practices for supporting students with IEPs. This will include PLCs dedicated to collaboration between gen-ed and ESE teachers as well as coaching on how to maximize inclusive practices and empower partnerships in the classroom.

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

As noted above, FSA math lowest performing quartile gains (73%) nearly doubled the results from 2020-21 (37%). We also saw double-digit increases in ELA LPQ (64 to 74), math proficiency (73 to 83%) and math gains (64 to 78%).

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. The development of our Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) - specifically, the Collaborative Problem-Solving Team (CPST) has improved identification of meaningful interventions for struggling students. All of the above protocols allowed us to identify students with intervention needs and provide them in a cohesive tutoring/small groups plan. We will continue these processes into the next school year.

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

In order to accelerate learning in 2022-23, we will need to continue with the 4-step process of setting goals and identifying students who most impact movement toward those goals. We will also need to make sure our teachers are supported with the implementation of the new BEST benchmarks and corresponding curricula. This means facilitating vertical articulation support from teachers in primary who have experience with the standards and materials.

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. As noted above, we will also emphasize collaboration and development of practices within our inclusion classrooms to best serve our students with IEPs.

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 Quartiles.
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. Continue to analyze data for subgroup needs including Students with Disabilities (SWD) and English Language Learners (ELLs). 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.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on 2021-22 data, our students with disabilities (SWD) in the lowest performing quartile showed the lowest data indicators in our school grade reporting. In addition, when conducting walk throughs 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 the shifting standards and curriculum in which centers will have a renewed emphasis.

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

If differentiated instruction (small groups, tasks alignment, interventions) are designed to meet the individual needs of students and are aligned with BEST benchmarks of instruction, then students will demonstrate at least one year's worth of growth as evidenced by their 2022-23 FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) proficiency.

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

Area of focus will be monitored through FAST and DCPS Progress Monitoring Assessments; quarterly/monthly performance checks in Renaissance STAR; small group progress monitoring through 4-step plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@duvalschools.org)

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

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 BEST standards based instruction in a more effective way.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This strategy is needed based on 2022 ESE student data, walk through data, and the implementation of new BEST standards with corresponding curriculum. 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

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.

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. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

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

Based on our data, our positive 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. Our most recent culture metric was a Spring 2022 FranklinCovey Measurable Results Survey or MRA. The lowest student data point (59/100) was in the area of student ownership - specifically, goal-setting and achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we emphasize student ownership of goals within our Leader in Me framework, we can support students to be better able to set their own academic goals and deadlines, as well as tracking their own progress and identifying steps they need to take to reach those goals.

Monitoring:

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

Students will regularly track and share their progress with an adult and reflect on their accomplishments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Implementation of the Leader in Me Program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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.

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 Daniel (atkinsonj1@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)

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.

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 school culture and environment.

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.