

Howard County Public School System

2019 - 2020 School Improvement Plan

School Name: **Glenwood Middle**

Resource: [SIP Feedback Form](#)

Focus Area: PARCC - Literacy (Achievement - % scoring 4 or higher)

[Hoonuit: Waffle menu > My Focus > SIP > SIP: PARCC > PARCC: Yearly Trends](#)

Baseline Data (2017 - 2018)

<p style="text-align: center;">Overall (1st Hoonuit metric)</p> <p>Total number of students (2017-2018 Total N): 485 Overall number of students scoring 4 or higher (2017-2018 Actual n met): 288 Overall % of students scoring 4 or higher (2017-2018 Actual %): 59.4%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Identified Student Group (scroll down in Hoonuit): IEP Students</p> <p>Total number in the student group (2017-2018 Total N): 39 Number in the student group scoring 4 or higher (2017-2018 Actual n met): 4 % in the student group scoring 4 or higher (2017-2018 Actual %): 10.3%</p>
--	--

Targets

2018 - 2019				2019 - 2020		2020 - 2021	
(Actual & SIP Target columns in Hoonuit, 2018-2019 row)				(SIP Target columns in Hoonuit, 2019-2020 row)		(SIP Target columns in Hoonuit, 2020-2021 row)	
Overall Target met? Yes/No		Student Group (Hispanic) Target met? Yes/No		Overall (SIP Target n & %)	Student Group	Overall (SIP Target n & %)	Student Group (SIP Target n & %)
# scoring 4+: 308 % scoring 4+: 63%		# scoring 4+: 396 % scoring 4+: 81.1		# scoring 4+: 328 % scoring 4+: 67%	New Group Identified? YES If yes, specify: IEP (SIP Target n & %) # scoring 4+: 8 % scoring 4+: 42.5%	# scoring 4+: 348 % scoring 4+: 71%	# scoring 4+: 12 % scoring 4+: 45%
Target (SIP Target n & %)	Actual (Actual n & %)	Target (SIP Target n & %)	Actual (Actual n & %)				
# 4+: 308	# 4+: 396	# 4+: 17	# 4+: 26				
% 4+: 63%	% 4+: 81.1	% 4+: 49%	% 4+: 68.4				

Instructional Root Cause (required): There is not enough evidence of true co-teaching and/or differentiated instruction being implemented in classes.

Instructional Strategies

(not to exceed 3; at least 1 focuses on first instruction; at least 1 focuses on identified student group; addresses professional learning; linked to root cause):

1. Teachers will implement a variety of co-teaching models and differentiated instruction in classes.
2. Continue the instructional rounds visits to reflect on implementation of strategies taught through professional learning sessions.
3. Instructional staff will use an on-grade level class for their SLO and incorporate differentiated on-demand writing into their student learning goals that require students to analyze multiple sources and respond to multi-step prompts.

Instructional Milestones

Staff Actions: How will fidelity of staff implementation of strategies be measured? (e.g., walkthroughs, content-specific look-fors, mtg observations, staff feedback): SLO goal setting, mid-year and year end conferences, instructional rounds data, evaluation artifacts, formal observations.

Student Results: How will student progress toward targets be measured? (e.g., classroom performance, F&P, MAP, student group MAP growth): IEP report card data, quarterly D/E list, MAP data

Checkpoint 1 10/29/19 - What is your progress toward the targets? A [PIP session is scheduled for 10/29](#) to provide staff with strategies for differentiating test they are presenting to their students. SLO conferences are complete and all staff goals align with school improvement initiatives. The D/E list was shared with teams and students with 2 or more low grades were discussed.

Resource: [SIP Data Dive Check-in](#)

Howard County Public School System

2019 - 2020 School Improvement Plan

School Name: Glenwood Middle

Resource: [SIP Feedback Form](#)

<p>What instructional strategies are working? How do you know? <i>Include staff actions and student results data (overall & student group).</i></p>	<p>What instructional strategies still need attention or what are still barriers?</p>	<p>What are your next steps and what adjustments need to be made (if any)?</p>
<p>Checkpoint 2 <u>date</u> - What is your progress toward the target?</p>		<p>Resource: SIP Data Dive Check-in</p>
<p>What instructional strategies are working? How do you know? <i>Include staff actions and student results data (overall & student group).</i></p>	<p>What instructional strategies still need attention or what are still barriers?</p>	<p>What are your next steps and what adjustments need to be made (if any)?</p>
<p>Cultural Root Cause (optional): There is a lack of joint ownership/responsibility for the success of special education students between special educators and general educators.</p>		
<p>Cultural Strategies (not to exceed 1; addresses professional learning; linked to root cause): Incorporate the fundamentals of differentiated instruction in professional learning sessions to help staff see that strategies to support IEP students will positively impact the achievement of all students.</p>		
<p>Cultural Milestones Staff Actions: <i>How will fidelity of staff implementation of strategies be measured? (e.g., walkthroughs, content-specific look-fors, mtg observations, staff feedback):</i> SLO and instructional rounds data, evaluation artifacts, formal observations. Student Results: <i>How will student progress toward targets be measured? (e.g., classroom performance, F&P, MAP, student group MAP growth):</i> IEP report card data, quarterly D/E list, MAP data</p>		
<p>Checkpoint 1 <u>date</u> - What is your progress toward the targets?</p>		<p>Resource: SIP Data Dive Check-in</p>
<p>What cultural strategies are working? How do you know? <i>Include staff actions and student results data (overall & student group).</i></p>	<p>What cultural strategies still need attention or what are still barriers?</p>	<p>What are your next steps and what adjustments need to be made (if any)?</p>
<p>Checkpoint 2 <u>date</u> - What is your progress toward the target?</p>		<p>Resource: SIP Data Dive Check-in</p>
<p>What cultural strategies are working? How do you know? <i>Include staff actions and student results data (overall & student group).</i></p>	<p>What cultural strategies still need attention or what are still barriers?</p>	<p>What are your next steps and what adjustments need to be made (if any)?</p>
<p>Structural Root Cause (optional): Special Education teachers and support staff are not necessarily teaching in their content strength and are under-utilized during instruction. General educators teaching inclusion classes may not be truly invested in supporting special education students and the co-teaching process.</p>		
<p>Structural Strategies (not to exceed 1; addresses professional learning; linked to root cause): Strong co-teaching pairs need to be established and maintained when creating the master schedule.</p>		
<p>Structural Milestones Staff Actions: <i>How will the fidelity of implementation be measured? (e.g., walkthroughs, content-specific look-fors, meeting observations, staff feedback):</i> SLO and instructional rounds data, evaluation artifacts, formal observations.</p>		

Howard County Public School System

2019 - 2020 School Improvement Plan

School Name: Glenwood Middle

Resource: [SIP Feedback Form](#)

Student Results: How will student progress toward targets be measured? (e.g., classroom performance, F&P, MAP, student group MAP growth): IEP report card data, quarterly D/E list, MAP data		
Checkpoint 1 <u>date</u> - What is your progress toward the targets?		Resource: SIP Data Dive Check-in
What structural strategies are working? How do you know? <i>Include staff actions and student results data (overall & student group).</i>	What structural strategies still need attention or what are still barriers?	What are your next steps and what adjustments need to be made (if any)?
Checkpoint 2 <u>date</u> - What is your progress toward the target?		Resource: SIP Data Dive Check-in
What structural strategies are working? How do you know? <i>Include staff actions and student results data (overall & student group).</i>	What structural strategies still need attention or what are still barriers?	What are your next steps and what adjustments need to be made (if any)?