

Orange County Public Schools

Glenridge Middle



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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Glenridge Middle

2900 UPPER PARK RD, Orlando, FL 32814

<https://glenridgems.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Daniel Kempinger

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	80%
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: B (61%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Orange 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Glenridge Middle

2900 UPPER PARK RD, Orlando, FL 32814

<https://glenridgems.ocps.net/>

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

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
Kempinger, Daniel	Principal	Principal
Astone, Matthew	Instructional Coach	IB Coordinator
Bonomo, Steven	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist
Conti, Michael	Dean	Dean
Phelps, Christy	Assistant Principal	AP
Glenn, Michael	Dean	Dean
Ware, Valerie	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist
Weinstein Rojas, Lauren	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Vandegrift, Chelsea	School Counselor	Lead Guidance Counselor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/2/2021, Daniel Kempinger

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,128

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

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

13

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	347	333	403	0	0	0	0	1083
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	68	90	0	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	19	124	0	0	0	0	149
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	33	70	0	0	0	0	116
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	36	57	0	0	0	0	127
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	49	68	0	0	0	0	153
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	56	124	0	0	0	0	212

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	406	407	0	0	0	0	1200
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	65	72	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	23	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	141	148	0	0	0	0	312
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	71	98	0	0	0	0	211
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	56	77	0	0	0	0	180
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	65	68	0	0	0	0	192
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	120	134	0	0	0	0	317

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	406	407	0	0	0	0	1200	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	65	72	0	0	0	0	183	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	23	0	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	141	148	0	0	0	0	312	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	71	98	0	0	0	0	211	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	56	77	0	0	0	0	180	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	65	68	0	0	0	0	192	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	120	134	0	0	0	0	317	

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	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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				60%	52%	54%	63%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	52%	54%	57%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	45%	47%	44%	42%	47%
Math Achievement				63%	55%	58%	71%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains				59%	55%	57%	63%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	50%	51%	53%	44%	51%
Science Achievement				61%	51%	51%	61%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				68%	67%	72%	77%	68%	72%

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
06	2021					
	2019	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	52%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	37%	43%	-6%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	51%	36%	15%	46%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	59%	49%	10%	48%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	66%	-1%	71%	-6%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	84%	63%	21%	61%	23%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	53%	47%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Diagnostic and PMAs

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	56	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	46	52
	Students With Disabilities	6	9	13
	English Language Learners	24	28	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	50	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	39	40
	Students With Disabilities	3	7	6
	English Language Learners	18	22	24

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	50	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	33	31
	Students With Disabilities	14	16	17
	English Language Learners	27	20	19
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34	38	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	26	30
	Students With Disabilities	15	19	17
	English Language Learners	22	26	33
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	71	77	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	63	59
	Students With Disabilities	48	42	57
	English Language Learners	60	68	49

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	45	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	40	52
	Students With Disabilities	17	12	18
	English Language Learners	32	36	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	15	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	13	14
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	4
	English Language Learners	9	12	15
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	43	65
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	32	35	50
	Students With Disabilities	10	5	20
	English Language Learners	26	24	49
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45	43	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	35	50

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	15	34	31	18	31	26	21	39			
ELL	33	49	43	40	48	41	35	47	64		
ASN	84	77		84	63		79	90	91		
BLK	49	45	27	39	40	21	48	58	76		
HSP	46	46	35	45	39	37	44	53	67		
MUL	78	59		70	55			83			
WHT	71	60	44	74	58	46	69	77	86		
FRL	49	48	33	44	41	37	49	49	67		
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	23	40	29	25	46	46	20	36	71		
ELL	35	49	43	43	54	57	33	41	74		

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
ASN	73	65	53	88	76		77	76	96		
BLK	51	58	39	50	51	45	44	69	81		
HSP	48	50	38	50	52	57	47	52	79		
MUL	59	56		58	66		45	57	77		
WHT	72	62	51	76	65	55	76	85	89		
FRL	47	51	41	50	51	54	45	55	76		
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	19	40	34	28	48	42	21	45	75		
ELL	29	49	44	42	57	44	27	45	93		
ASN	81	68	37	90	80	60	87	89	94		
BLK	47	49	35	51	46	26	29	68	83		
HSP	48	49	41	56	59	52	46	64	84		
MUL	68	58	38	66	61	58	57	79	92		
WHT	73	62	54	84	67	62	73	87	95		
FRL	48	49	43	57	58	50	45	66	88		

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	81
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	45
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	46
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	69
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	65
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

ELA: There was steady growth in 6th and 8th grade while 7th grade regressed. There was a substantial gap between our students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.

Math: All three grade levels showed growth in iReady diagnostics throughout the year. However, there is a substantial gap between our students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers.

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

The greatest need Glenridge has for improvement is the performance of our students with disabilities. Those students scored significantly lower in achievement scores than their non-disabled peers. This gap is slightly smaller in our iReady diagnostic progress monitoring, but still ranks as our biggest deficit.

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

Distance learning impacted learning and attendance. Furthermore, when students were able to return to school, social distancing made it difficult to conduct small group instruction. Six additional instructional support teachers will be in place to support ELA and math small group instruction to include students with disabilities.

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

Most improvement occurred in 8th grade science overall and in regards to students with disabilities. Civics improved significantly from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3. Overall, 6th grade math improved by a large margin as well.

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

Science teachers had targeted acceleration opportunities based on prior assessments. Instructional coaches and ELA teachers supported science and Civics with reading strategies. District-wide coaches supported our Civics teachers and our reading coach supported one Civics teacher regularly at the end of the year.

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

We will need to implement more small group instruction. This will be supported by the hiring of tier-one teachers to work with our most struggling students.

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.

Instructional coaches will provide weekly mini professional development sessions based on teacher requests. Focused professional development will be on student engagement, differentiation and data analysis to inform instruction. This professional development will be differentiated based on administration's feedback.

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

Instructional coaches will be supporting our teachers in the classroom using the coaching cycle. Professional development will continue for new teachers and teachers that demonstrate support. Tutoring money will be set aside this year as well as in following years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Sixty-five percent of Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored "three or more grade levels below" on the end-of-year iReady diagnostic. According to the 2021 Winter iReady diagnostic assessment results, seventy-two percent of students with disabilities were "three or more grade levels below". This rationale supports narrowing achievement gaps.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve within this subgroup is to raise their achievement level to on the end-of-year iReady math and ela diagnostics to 30% on grade level.
Monitoring:	Leadership team will monitor iReady diagnostics as well as common assessments for progress monitoring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Phelps (christy.phelps@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities, along with other identified students based on state a district assessment results, will be scheduled with a team of teachers trained in differentiation and student engagement strategies. There will be a grade-level ESE teacher who will be pushing into core classes for instructional support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Within the class structure listed above, an ESE Support Facilitation teacher will be assigned to these classes to support both students and teachers. Furthermore, to optimize student learning and instructional resources, students will be scheduled with a team of teachers trained in differentiation and student engagement strategies. Students with disabilities require more direct instruction and support throughout the class period. Having multiple, highly qualified teachers in the classroom will allow for increased opportunities for accommodations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a support facilitation model that includes an ESE teacher that will support students assigned to specific teachers.
2. Coaching cycles, as needed, and data chats with students will take place during the school year. In addition, both formal and informal observations, and class walkthroughs will be conducted to provide actionable instructional feedback while observing and monitoring instructional trends.
3. Review student assessment information, i.e. I-Ready diagnostic, Beginning of Year (BOY), Middle of Year (MOY), End of Year (EOY), teacher-made common assessments, etc. to monitor student learning outcomes. Instructional coaches will use this data to move forward with MTSS processes and student support.
4. Establish and maintain parent communication based on student learning outcomes.
5. SELL components will be monitored through unit plan review, professional learning/common planning, and class observations and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Christy Phelps (christy.phelps@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

According to the 2021 FSA data, our lowest quartile students in math did not make adequate gains. Only 38% showed enough growth to qualify as a learning gain.

Measurable Outcome:

The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is increasing the learning gains of our lowest quartile of math students from 38% to 54%.

Monitoring:

Leadership team will monitor iReady diagnostics as well as common assessments for progress monitoring. Administrator will also monitor grade books quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

PLC instructional planning, with a focus on student learning outcomes, student support structures, both in the class and outside the class.
Reviewing student assessment information, i.e. district and teacher-made assessments, throughout the school year to ensure student learning needs are being met.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Based on early warning indicators, there is a correlation between students failing math (382) and scoring a level 1 on the 2019 state math assessments (392). In addition, based on I-Ready Diagnostic data, 346 students were projected to score a level 1 on the state assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure instructional common planning is in place for all math teachers to plan both horizontally and vertically.
2. Coordinate time to review student assessment information, both district and teacher-made assessments, through PLCs
3. Monitor early warning indicators to ensure the appropriate support structures and parent communications are in place. Feedback will be provided through both informal and formal observations as well as classroom observation walkthroughs. Teachers will receive instant feedback on each classroom walkthrough completed.
4. SELL components will be monitored through unit plan review, professional learning/common planning, and class observations and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to the 2021 FSA results, only 37% of our lowest quartile students qualified for a learning gain.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is increasing the learning gains of students in the lowest quartile from 37% to 53%.
Monitoring:	Leadership team will monitor iReady diagnostics as well as common assessments for progress monitoring. Instructional coaches and administrators will help teachers examine data and set goals to improve teaching and learning in the classroom. Administrator will also monitor grade books quarterly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christy Phelps (christy.phelps@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC instructional planning, with a focus on student learning outcomes, student support structures, both in the class and outside the class. Reviewing student assessment information, i.e. district and teacher-made assessments, throughout the school year to ensure student learning needs are being met.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on early warning indicators, there is a strong correlation between students failing ELA (115) and scoring a level 1 on the 2019 state ELA assessments (255). In addition, based on iReady Diagnostic data, 287 students were projected to score a level 1 on the state assessment. Through instructional planning, teachers will be able to collaborate on student performance data to drive instructional decisions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure instructional common planning is in place for ELA teachers to plan both horizontally and vertically.
2. Coordinate time to review student assessment information, both district and teacher-made assessments, through PLCs
3. Monitor early warning indicators to ensure the appropriate support structures and parent communications are in place. Instructional feedback will be provided through both informal and formal observations as well as instructional classroom walkthroughs. Teachers will receive instant feedback on classroom walkthroughs.
4. SELL components will be monitored through unit plan review, professional learning/common planning, and class observations and walkthroughs.

Person Responsible Christy Phelps (christy.phelps@ocps.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

1. Increasing academic performance with students listed as students with disabilities (SWD) to be equivalent to the performance of the overall school.
2. Improving academic performance of students by reducing the number of students failing their math class.
3. Improving academic performance of students by reducing the number of students failing their ELA class.

Measurable Outcome:

Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data will provide the school with an overview of student academic performance and areas of focus for the school year. Including reducing the number of students that have below 90 percent attendance from 183 to 100. And reduce the number of discipline referrals by 50%.
Cognia survey data will provide the school with student survey feedback that will assist with tailoring student support structures aimed at improving overall student wellness and health.

Monitoring:

Monitoring data will occur during weekly school-wide safe meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.

Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly SAFE Team, Administrative, and monthly School Threat Assessment Team (STAT) meetings will be held to monitor student academic and behavioral progress.

Person Responsible Daniel Kempinger (daniel.kempinger@ocps.net)

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.

Glenridge is currently listed as having 5.09 incidents per 100 student, ranking 388 out of 553 schools during the 2019-2020 school year. There was a rating of very high regarding property incidents and a high rating regarding violent incidents that our grade level administrators will monitor and work with students to avoid fighting, threats and larceny. Our school will be receiving new cameras that will help monitor areas of campus that were previously not monitored by video surveillance. Grade level meetings with students will occur at the beginning of the school year and grade level administrators will provide quarterly reviews of the student code of conduct to remind students of the policy and areas of improvement. A revised school safety plan, for the 2021-22 school year, has been created to improve supervision practices and overall school safety.

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.

One of the most important components to establishing and maintaining a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations is to provide a culture based on transparency and/or open communication. Including stakeholders in decision-making, valuing their insight, and remaining transparent in the process will help maintain a positive culture and environment. To maintain a positive culture and environment, Glenridge Middle School has several stakeholder-based governing bodies in place. A Curriculum Leadership Team (CLT), potentially going to be renamed to Guiding Team, is made up of all curriculum leaders (department chairs). The CLT's main focus is to discuss overall school performance data, curriculum and instructional practices, that focus on student and teacher learning. This year, with the school returning to teaming, a School Management Team (SMT) will be formed. The SMT's will be charged with reviewing and revising, as needed, schoolwide safety procedures. In addition, the SMT will oversee the Social Emotional Learning and Leadership initiative. To include students as stakeholders, both our School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent-Teacher-Student Association (PTSA) have student members. More specifically, the SAC has a

student representative from the PTSA student organization. In addition, to promote team morale, at every staff gathering "You Rocks" are announced. These are recognitions, made by team members to other team members, that are announced at our team gatherings.

In an effort to promote student achievement, Renaissance celebrations are held the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarters to celebrate students that have maintained high levels of academic achievement. In addition, as an IB School, we strive to promote our IB character traits. This year, we will be celebrating students that exemplify a specific IB character trait through monthly Character Trait breakfasts.

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

One of the most important components to establishing and maintaining a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations is to provide a culture based on transparency and/or open communication. Including stakeholders in decision-making, valuing their insight, and remaining transparent in the process will help maintain a positive culture and environment. To maintain a positive culture and environment, Glenridge Middle School has several stakeholder-based governing bodies in place. A Curriculum Leadership Team (CLT), potentially going to be renamed to Guiding Team, is made up of all curriculum leaders (department chairs). The CLT's main focus is to discuss overall school performance data, curriculum and instructional practices, that focus on student and teacher learning. This year, with the school returning to teaming, a School Management Team (SMT) will be formed. The SMT's will be charged with reviewing and revising, as needed, schoolwide safety procedures. In addition, the SMT will oversee the Social Emotional Learning and Leadership initiative. To include students as stakeholders, both our School Advisory Council (SAC) and Parent-Teacher-Student Association (PTSA) have student members. More specifically, the SAC has a student representative from the PTSA student organization. In addition, to promote team morale, at every staff gathering "You Rocks" are announced. These are recognitions, made by team members to other team members, that are announced at our team gatherings.

In an effort to promote student achievement, Renaissance celebrations are held the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarters to celebrate students that have maintained high levels of academic achievement. In addition, as an IB School, we strive to promote our IB character traits. This year, we will be celebrating students that exemplify a specific IB character trait through monthly Character Trait breakfasts.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math					\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22	
	6500	399-Other Technology-Related Purchased Services	0571 - Glenridge Middle			\$10,000.00	
			Notes: MATH IXL				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning					\$0.00
Total:							\$10,000.00