

Bay District Schools

# A. Crawford Mosley High School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# A. Crawford Mosley High School

501 MOSLEY DR, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Brian Bullock**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (70%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## A. Crawford Mosley High School

501 MOSLEY DR, Lynn Haven, FL 32444

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

### School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	B	B	B

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

To be a safe school that provides a diverse student body with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in an increasingly complex and technological society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

A national LEADER in education where every student will be successful.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bullock, Brian	Principal	
Lang, Maria	Assistant Principal	
Burgans, Gena	Assistant Principal	
Lachina, Durray	Teacher, K-12	
Sale, Marcus	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, James	Teacher, K-12	
McConnell, Stephanie	School Counselor	
Grainger, Ellen	Dean	
Tidwell, Rhonda	Teacher, K-12	MULET Team
Hair, Joe	Teacher, K-12	
Lisenbee, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	
Zago, Francesca	Teacher, K-12	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	558	439	413	410	1820
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	59	45	56	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	69	54	44	262
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	68	51	72	204
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	77	67	74	299

**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	0	0	0	72	74	47	61	254

**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	15	4	2	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	8	12	9	44

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

90

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/17/2019

**Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	99	75	96	333
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	99	59	52	281
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	63	55	50	177
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	100	43	25	276

**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	0	0	0	60	95	67	44	266

**Prior Year - 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		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	67	54	139	312	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	34	18	13	93	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	68	28	39	140	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	77	36	59	194	

**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	0	0	0	22	77	36	59	194

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	63%	57%	56%	55%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	49%	51%	45%	44%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	35%	42%	31%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	68%	58%	51%	71%	58%	49%
Math Learning Gains	53%	53%	48%	53%	50%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	45%	45%	48%	39%
Science Achievement	79%	74%	68%	72%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	76%	73%	84%	77%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	558 (0)	439 (0)	413 (0)	410 (0)	1820 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	113 (63)	59 (99)	45 (75)	56 (96)	273 (333)
One or more suspensions	95 (71)	69 (99)	54 (59)	44 (52)	262 (281)
Course failure in ELA or Math	13 (9)	68 (63)	51 (55)	72 (50)	204 (177)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	81 (108)	77 (100)	67 (43)	74 (25)	299 (276)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	62%	58%	4%	55%	7%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	53%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	60%	53%	7%	53%	7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	52%	5%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	71%	8%	67%	12%
2018	76%	64%	12%	65%	11%
Compare		3%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	74%	8%	70%	12%
2018	80%	73%	7%	68%	12%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	64%	0%	61%	3%
2018	54%	64%	-10%	62%	-8%
Compare		10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	62%	5%	57%	10%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	68%	62%	6%	56%	12%
Compare		-1%			

### Subgroup Data

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	38	34	41	35	17	26	60		76	23
ASN	86	54						70			
BLK	43	49	37	54	50		68	59		93	30
HSP	60	50	20	78	61		76	91		95	85
MUL	51	48		86	56		71	95		91	80
WHT	65	53	43	67	52	50	81	85		89	73
FRL	53	49	39	64	53	54	71	77		84	56
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	30	24	22	36	35	58	40		90	28
ASN	50	46		90							
BLK	30	33	27	38	29	38	47	58		65	40
HSP	44	48	50	59	68		81	90		96	46
MUL	63	55	31	61	45	40	82	100		88	53
WHT	65	53	35	66	60	50	81	81		86	64
FRL	43	41	34	50	48	40	67	70		73	42
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	11	19	16	39	33	30	28	63		78	24
ASN	44	33		82	38		67				
BLK	31	26	16	56	44	41	48	58		85	31
HSP	57	48		70	56	33	74	88		100	42
MUL	65	53	45	78	59	45	80	88		86	42
WHT	58	47	35	72	53	46	74	87		87	67
FRL	37	38	30	64	49	44	59	70		76	45

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65

ESSA Federal Index	
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	645
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	70
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	54
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	68
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	72
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	66
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The data component that performed the lowest for 2018-19 is the learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA. This is a trend in the data, the same group were low performers in 2017-2018 and 2016-17. While they were our lowest performers they did show a 7% growth from the prior year data, from 34% in 2017-18 to 41% in 2018-19. A contributing factor would be the seat time we missed due to the storm.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

The data component the showed the greatest decline from the prior year was our mathematics learning gains overall. In 2017-18, the learning gains were 56%, and in 2018-19 it dropped by 3% to 53% learning gains. A contributing factor would be the seat time we missed due to the storm.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%. This is the only component where we were below the state average. We were also below the state average in the 2017-18 school year.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The data component that showed the most improvement was our overall math achievement which increased from 62% in 2017-18 to 68% in 2018-19. A strategy we implemented in 2018-19 was to move our Algebra 1A/1B students to a 2 year math progression rather than a 1 year block plan.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

A potential area for concern is our SWD sub group because they did not meet proficiency. This subgroup is at 37% and we need to show a 4% growth.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. ELA lowest 25%
2. SWD sub group

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	ACADEMIC
<b>Rationale</b>	This Area of Focus was identified first through the review of data from the 2018-2019 results. We further confirmed the critical need to address this particular area by completing the SIMS Needs Assessment/Analysis. The ELA learning gains overall and learning gains of the lowest 25% are all below 62% (the rating of the school). The Math learning gains of the lowest 25% are 17% and are also an area of concern.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Learning gains in both ELA and Math overall will increase at least 7% points. Students with disabilities achieving proficiency in subgroup data will increase from 37% to 44%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Stacey Brady (bradyss@bay.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Implement the new ELA curriculum pacing guide. Utilize district mental health resources. PLC's Walkthroughs
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The rationale for selecting the implementation of the new ELA curriculum pacing guide is that the guide was just recently completed and is a district-wide mandate. Furthermore, the strategies listed above (including the pacing guide) will also address our school-wide ELA learning gains deficiency as outlined in our Area of Focus. Utilizing a district and school-wide pacing guide will ensure a seamless transition for students who may move from school to school throughout the academic year. The pacing guide will also allow administration to easily identify classrooms where the pace of instruction may be lagging behind.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	1. Professional Development for ELA teachers with the new pacing guide-Our district liaison will meet with ELA teachers to provide PD on how to use the new Literacy Cafe and pacing guide. 2. Refer students using the Community Care Referral as needed-Students are still struggling in the wake of Hurricane Michael and we plan to utilize the CCR to assist when we feel students are in need. 3. Admin participate in assigned PLC's-Administrators will attend assigned PLC's 4. Utilize district provided walk through documentation-Administrators will use the district provided walk through form to ensure fidelity of the process
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Brian Bullock (bullobe@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
<b>Title</b>	BEHAVIOR
<b>Rationale</b>	Developing school-wide behavioral expectations will decrease the incidents of office discipline referrals (ODRs) thus creating a safe learning environment that will ultimately lead to improved student achievement. We will reduce barriers to learning by being consistent with behavioral expectations.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Reduce disruptive behavior resulting in ODRs and build a positive school climate by developing and implementing a school-wide Tier 1 Behavior Plan. We will reduce by 10% for 2019-2020 when compared to 2017-2018 data. (We do not believe we can compare data with 2018-19 because of the month of school we missed due to the storm.)
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Ellen Grainger (graine@bay.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Positive behavior support systems have been proven to decrease disruptive behavior and improve school culture.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Implementing a school-wide PBIS will allow teachers and staff to have a common language with students regarding behavior expectations.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Display "Ride the Wave" posters- WAVE stands for We Show Respect -We Act Responsibly - Value Integrity - Everyone is Safe</li> <li>2. MTSS Behavior Team monthly meetings- Each month we will discuss students of concern regarding behavior and begin to implement Tier II and Tier III strategies as well as BIP as needed.</li> <li>3. Continue using Character Keys-Students are nominated by teachers and staff to receive a "character key" when they are caught doing something positive.</li> <li>4. BDS 360-Program used in ISS to reinforce the need to make good choices.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Ellen Grainger (graine@bay.k12.fl.us)

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.



**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

Administration plans to increase the number of completed climate surveys by parents. Administration uses tools such as Facebook, Twitter, IRIS phone alerts, e-mails, flyers, and letters to communicate with families. Parents have access to their students' progress through the parent portal.

**PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Each student is assigned a guidance counselor that is available when students are in need. Administration also counsels with students and offers opportunities to meet with additional counselors and mentors. The armed forces have representatives that are available to meet with students of members of the armed forces.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

Mosley conducts orientation sessions for incoming freshmen at the start of the school year. Mosley also conducts grade-level assemblies near the start of the school year. Guidance counselors and administration meet with upper-classmen to discuss post-high school options.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

The MTSS Leadership Team is comprised of 9th and 10th grade teachers. Bay District Schools implemented MTSS in the secondary setting with 9th grade for the 2011-2012 school year and added the 10th grade in the 2012-2013 school year. Our Leadership Team is a team of teachers that share a common interest in seeing the successful implementation of MTSS on the Mosley campus. Members meet during the school year to discuss and review any MTSS data. The Leadership Team will share information with the school's leadership team (MULET Mosley Unified Leadership Educational Team), the Literacy Team, and Department Chairs.

Our CTE program provides training for students in the areas of cyber security, computer gaming, programming, marketing. Our culinary and life management programs offer training in the areas of food and nutrition. Our co-op program allows students to receive real-world job experience.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

Elective courses that are offered to students for future employment or job skill training include: Culinary Operations, Television Production, Marketing, Marketing Co-op, Computer Programming, Computer Applications, Cyber Security, Web Design, Marine Corps JROTC, and Internships. Students are encouraged to select these classes through their guidance counselors and homeroom teachers. Students are also exposed to these elective courses throughout the year as the classes participate in school wide activities. Each year, our guidance department holds a Registration Rally for students to receive information relative to the electives and possible course options so that course selection was

based on personal interest. Students may also split their time between Mosley and Haney Technical Center in order to pursue vocational training.