A. Crawford Mosley High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 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: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

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)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	47%

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	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bullock, Brian	Principal	Administrators- Brian Bullock, Maria Lang, Gena Burgans, and Ellen Grainger. Our School Leadership Team, known as MULET, is comprised of team members from all core curriculum areas who meet monthly to discuss school improvement, professional development offerings, Tier I Behavior Plan and discipline data, and other issues relevant to the students at Mosley High School.
Lang, Maria	Assistant Principal	
Burgans, Gena	Assistant Principal	
Grainger, Ellen	Dean	
Tidwell, Rhonda	Teacher, K-12	
Hair, Joe	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Robert	Teacher, K-12	
Lee, Doug	Teacher, K-12	
Hughes, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Wolfrom, Sandra	School Counselor	
Barron, Greg	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Brian Bullock

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

92

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 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: A (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

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	495	529	416	379	1819
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	37	28	29	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	67	63	38	249
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	29	19	20	78
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	47	28	35	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	56	47	55	219
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	637	32	25	747

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	71	71	58	50	250

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	7	4	4	1	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	5	9	30

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/13/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	113	59	45	56	273
One or more suspensions	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	13	68	51	72	204
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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

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	
Number of students enrolled	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	113	59	45	56	273
One or more suspensions	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	13	68	51	72	204
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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

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**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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**
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%
	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%
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

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
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
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%	0
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%	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	70
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	54
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	68
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	66
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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. Additional contributing factors would be seat time we missed due to COVID-19, no testing 2019-2020, and the barriers of the virtual learning platform.

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. Additional contributing factors would be seat time we missed due to COVID-19, no testing 2019-2020, and the barriers of the virtual learning platform.

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. Additional contributing factors would be seat time we missed due to COVID-19, no testing 2019-2020, and the barriers of the virtual learning platform.

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. Additional contributing factors would be seat time we missed due to COVID-19, no testing 2019-2020, and the barriers of the virtual learning platform.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two concerns from the EWS data are: The total number of students with a level 1 on the 2019 ELA and the number of students with a 1 on the 2019 math assessment which includes 57 Juniors and Seniors. Additional concerning factors would be seat time we missed due to COVID-19, no testing 2019-2020, and the barriers of the virtual learning platform.

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

1. ELA lowest 25%
2. SWD sub group
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Academics	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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.
Measurable Outcome:	Learning gains in both ELA and Math overall will increase at least 7%. Students with disabilities achieving proficiency in subgroup data will increase from 37% to 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacey Brady (bradyss@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement the new ELA curriculum Utilize district mental health resources. PLC's Walkthroughs
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting the implementation of the new ELA curriculum pacing guide is that the guide was just recently completed and created with our current barriers in mind. 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 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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. ELA Thinktank developed new curriculum for ELA teachers to implement this school year. The curriculum is theme based using anchor text and all ancillary materials support the anchor text theme. This new ELA Canvas embedded curriculum will only be used this year while waiting on the new standards. ELA teachers will receive PD as needed on the new curriculum. Person Responsible: Stacey Brady
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. Utilize the TRIAD team as needed to assist with students that are struggling due to COVID or other mental health issues. Person Responsible: All Administrators and counselors
3. Admin participate in assigned PLC's-Administrators will attend assigned PLC's. Person Responsible: All Administrators

Person Responsible	Brian Bullock (bullobe@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Mosley High School will foster quality relationships with all stakeholders within our school community. The school will assemble a School Advisory Committee that includes administrators, teachers, students, parents/guardians, and community stakeholders. This committee will meet each quarter or as needed to address current goals, events of the school, and any concerns brought forth by the members. The school sponsors several events throughout the year where parents/guardians are invited to attend and learn about different aspects of their child's educational experience and how they can support that process. The school also partners with stakeholders to provide support for students.
These events include:
Freshman and New Student Orientation
Open House
Partner with BCSO for Drug, Alcohol, & Safety seminars for students
Financial Aid Nights for Juniors and Seniors
College Application Nights for Juniors and Seniors
School Advisory Council Meetings- Quarterly or when needed
Career Day with local businesses for Exceptional Students
College Signing Day for GCSC Registration

Parents, families, and community stakeholders can access school information through a variety of different formats including CANVAS, FOCUS, and social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter), and the Mosley High School website. Parents may also be contacted about special events or concerns through Link alerts, PeachJar, email and/or USPS mail. The school also utilizes our marquee to disseminate important information.
Parents/guardians are encouraged to contact their child's guidance counselor to schedule teacher conferences, discuss graduation requirements and academic progression.
Mosley partners with GCSC and is assigned a liaison to provide college planning strategies for students. The liaison is housed on our campus and is available to advise students on steps to take toward planning their college career.

Mosley is extremely fortunate to have the support of many community members and alumni throughout Bay County and the state of Florida. We encourage their participation in our school improvement efforts; such as mentoring, contribution of resources, and volunteering, just to name a few.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.