

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

Introduction

In alignment with the goals and priorities of Prince George's County Public Schools (PGCPS), the School Performance Plan (SPP) allows for a transparent and collaborative school improvement process with a focus on student achievement.

The SPP is designed to engage school leaders and stakeholders in a structured data analysis process that leads to the creation of SMART Goals targeted to impact student achievement. Through the successful utilization of the SPP, schools are able to assess, plan, and monitor targeted improvements in challenge areas.

| School Profile | | | |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------|
| <u>Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan</u> | | School Code | School Designation |
| School Name | Glenridge Elementary School | 2006 | Title I |
| School Address | 7200 Gallatin Street, Landover Hills, MD 20784 | | |
| Local School System (LSS) | Prince George's County Public Schools | | |
| Grades Served | Pre-Kindergarten - Sixth Grade | | |
| Principal's Name | Gloria B. McCoy, Ed.D. | | |
| Principal's Email Address | <u>gmccoy@pgcps.org</u> | | |
| School Phone Number | (301) 918-8740 | | |
| Principal Supervisor's Name | Ava Tasker-Mitchell, Ph.D. | | |
| Principal Supervisor's Email | <u>ava.taskermitchell@pgcps.org</u> | | |
| School Vision & Mission | | | |
| Vision | The vision of Glenridge is to prepare students to be college and career ready, to have all students perform on or above grade level in all academic areas, to acquire and demonstrate the cognitive and affective skills that are needed to succeed, to develop a love of learning, and to increase the metacognitive strategies that will help them facilitate their own learning. | | |
| Mission | We, the staff of Glenridge Elementary School, believe that all students should have an opportunity to learn in a safe, healthy, and orderly environment. We commit ourselves to join with parents and the community in providing an atmosphere where students acquire the skills needed to become college and career ready and productive members of society. | | |

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

| Identification of 3 Priority Challenges, SMART Goals, & Focus Area Identification | | |
|---|--|--|
| Identify Prioritized Challenges Statements | SMART Goal | Focus Areas |
| What are the 3 prioritized challenge statements? | | What will we focus on to address this challenge? |
| <p>1 (RELA) Our MCAP scores indicate that growth is occurring as students advance across the grade levels, e.g. grade 3 students scored 18% proficient in SY15-16 and by sixth grade (SY18-19) that cohort scored 30% proficient. Similar gains have occurred at grades 4 and 5 as those cohorts advance to grade 6.</p> <p>There was a decline from grade 4 to grade 5 each year (SY15-16 to SY16-17, SY16-17 to SY17-18. From SY17-18 to SY18-19, there was an increase of 3% from 14%-17%. There was also a decline from grade 3 to grade 4 in SY16-17 to SY17-18 (17% to 14%).</p> <p>The trend across each grade level shows variability in increases/decreases in the percentage of students scoring proficient on MCAP, e.g. grade 3 students scored 18%, 17%, 23%, and 21% respectively from SY15-16 to SY18-19. There are</p> | <p>During the 2019-2020 SY, the number of students in grades 3-6 scoring proficient and advanced will increase by 5 percentage points on the spring administration of the Reading MCAP from 21% to 26% (each grade level).</p> <p>In Grade 3 from: 21% to 26% In Grade 4 from: 26% to 31% In Grade 5 from: 17% to 22% In Grade 6 from: 30% to 35%</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Survey of teachers to identify PD with differentiated PD to follow survey analysis ● Structuring of data analysis and monitoring of RELA instruction and CP consistently at all grade levels ● Implementation of CP, intervention programs, and learning walks of RELA instruction beginning the second week of school. ● Vertical planning periodically. ● Reading achievement in preK - 6. |

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>increases in grade 6 from 18% proficient to 30% during those years. At grades 4 and 5, the trend is downward from SY15-16 to SY18-19. Grade 4 students scored 28% proficient in SY15-16 and 26% in SY18-19. Grade 5 students scored 22% proficient to 17% during those years.</p> <p>K-2 students made less than expected gains over the past four years as indicated by our K-2 data.</p> <p>Approximately 40% of our students are at various levels of English language acquisition which impacts their success on assessments as they develop their facility with English. Assessments require students to be able to read with grade level proficiency. We have many non-ELL students who are still working toward grade level proficiency in reading. Our K-2 data indicates that our ELL students have made gains in reading level with the exception of grade 2 in SY18-19. Our Special Education (SPED) data is more variable across years; we have a relatively small number of SPED students, and our roster changes throughout the year. It is difficult to draw conclusions about SPED data; we analyze that data by student. Our General Ed students have shown increases as they move from grade to grade, e.g. K</p> | | |
|--|--|--|

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>General Ed students were at 64% in SY15-16, at 75% in Gr. 1, and 77% in Gr. 2. Similar increases are seen in SY16-17 to SY 17-18. This data indicates that our General Education and ELL students continue to make progress toward on and above grade level proficiency. However, our ELL students, while making progress, are often not reading well enough to show success on these assessments.</p> | | |
| <p>2</p> | <p>(MATH) The Math MCAP data from the SY15-16, SY16-17, and SY17-18 shows that the percentage of all students earning proficient scores decreases as they move to the next grade level. While some years show a slight increase between the previous grade level, the overall trend is that the percentage of students earning proficient scores decreases.</p> <p><u>Third Grade Students from the SY15-16 Cohort:</u> In gr. 3, 32% of these students earned proficient scores on the Math MCAP. In gr. 4, 17% of these students earned proficient scores on the Math MCAP, which is a decrease of 15 percentage points from the previous grade. In gr. 5, 18% of the students earned proficient scores on the Math MCAP, which is a 1 percentage point increase from the previous year, but overall 14 percentage points lower than what the students scored their first year of</p> | <p>During the 2019-2020 SY, the number of students in grades 3-6 scoring proficient and advanced will increase by 5 percentage points on the spring administration of the Math MCAP from 19% to 24% (each grade level).</p> <p>In Grade 3 from: 24% to 29% In Grade 4 from: 13% to 18% In Grade 5 from: 19% to 24% In Grade 6 from: 14% to 19%</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conduct a faculty and staff survey in which they identify areas of strengths and areas for growth. ● Provide the faculty and staff math PD based on the aforementioned survey's results. ● Paraprofessional support that is purposeful, with evidence to support what paras are working with student groups, as well as progress monitoring. ● Vertical collaborative planning sessions at the beginning of the school year and periodically throughout the school year as needed. ● Math achievement in preK - 6. |

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>MCAP testing during the '15 - 16 SY. In Gr. 6, 14% of these students scored proficient on the Math MCAP.</p> <p><u>Fourth Graders from the SY15-16 Cohort:</u> In gr. 4, 19% of these students earned proficient. In gr. 5, 10% of these students earned proficient which is a decrease of 9 percentage points. In gr. 6, 12% of these students earned proficient on the math MCAP which is a slight increase of 2% points.</p> <p><u>Fifth Graders from the SY15-16 Cohort</u> In gr. 5, 16% of these students earned proficient scores on the math MCAP. In gr. 6, 12% of these students earned proficient scores on the math MCAP which is a decrease of 4 percentage points.</p> <p>Our Math Benchmark I and II data from the SY18-19 and SY19-20 shows that the percentage of students passing the Math Benchmark I and II decreases as the students move up to the next grade level. More of our students in grades 1 and 2 passed the Math Benchmark I and II than students in grades 3, 4, 5 and 6.</p> <p><u>Percentage of Students Passing During the SY18-19</u> In Gr. 1, 53% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 64% of students passed the</p> | | |
|--|--|--|

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Benchmark II, representing a 11 percentage point increase. In Gr. 2, 42% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 49% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 8 percentage point increase. In Gr. 3, 41% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 39% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 2 percentage point decrease. In Gr. 4, 42% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 32% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 10 percentage point decrease. In Gr. 5, 48% of the students passed the Benchmark I and 29% of the students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 19 percentage point decrease. In Gr. 6 (Math 6), 24% of all the students passed the Benchmark I and 0% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 24 percentage point decrease. In Gr. 6 (Accelerated I) 14% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 35% passed the Benchmark II, representing a 21 percentage point increase.</p> <p><u>Percentage of Students Passing During the SY19-20</u></p> <p>In gr. 1, 64% of all the students passed the Benchmark I, and 77% passed the Benchmark II, representing a 13 percentage point increase. In gr. 2, 48% of all students passed the</p> | | |
|---|--|--|

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | <p>Benchmark I and 64% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 16 percentage point increase.</p> <p>In gr. 3, 47% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 38% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 9 percentage point decrease.</p> <p>In gr. 4, 42% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 47% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 5 percentage point increase.</p> <p>In gr. 5, 23% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 48% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 25 percentage point increase.</p> <p>In gr. 6 (Math 6), 23% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 24% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 1 percentage point increase.</p> <p>In gr. 6 (Accelerated I), 44% of all students passed the Benchmark I and 59% of all students passed the Benchmark II, representing a 15 percentage point increase.</p> | | |
| <p>3</p> | <p>(ESOL) Data on ESOL students shows a growing population for the past 3 years in the “Lower level” language proficiencies (Entering, Emerging, Developing): SY15-16 (58%), SY16-17 (13%), SY17-18 (85%). 41% of all ELL students did not meet the growth target (ACCESS) in those years.</p> | <p>66% of ESOL students in grades 1 - 6 will meet their target growth or target proficiency level on ACCESS.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Survey professional development needs of teachers. ● Provide teachers and staff with PDs based on the result of the survey. ● Starting from the beginning of the school year, all teachers will use the ACCESS data (WIDA Can Do Descriptors, Proficiency levels in |

**Glenridge Elementary School Performance Plan At-a-Glance
Executive Summary
SY19-20**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>In SY15-16 and SY16-17, the exit score was 5.0. The exit score was changed in SY17-18 to 4.5 for students to exit the program. Therefore, a comparison cannot be made with SY 15-16, SY 16-17, and SY 17-18.</p> <p><u>2018-2019 ACCESS Results</u></p> <p>-Growth -to- Target ESSA Accountability: The school met the expected 2019 Growth Rate (Annual Measurable Outcome) of 61% from the set target of 42%.</p> <p>- The school’s exit rate has increased from 7% (from 2018 SY) to 10% (in 2019 SY). The school scored 61% in all proficiency levels while the county has an average growth rate of 54%.</p> <p>-In the four language domains, our students in the ESOL program performed best in the Listening domains (71%) than in other domains. For Reading (27%), Speaking (17%), and Writing (17%).</p> | | <p>the different language domains) to plan instruction by providing supports and opportunities for ELLs to practice and refine their skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing in English.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learning walks will be done to monitor if strategies and supports are implemented by the teachers to the ELL students, to provide feedback to teachers, and to identify PD topics. |
|--|--|--|