Putnam County School District

William D. Moseley Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

William D. Moseley Elementary School

1100 HUSSON AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/moseley

Demographics

Principal: Chris Lee   Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: F (28%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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.

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

William D. Moseley Elementary School

1100 HUSSON AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/moseley

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)
Elementary School KG-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	F

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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.

In the spirit of collaboration and consistency, we provide a safe and enjoyable learning environment, where ALL students are inspired to excel academically and socially in their journey for success. Our students are challenged to become independent critical thinkers and cooperative problem solvers. Within a culture of respect, we strive to engage our students, empower our families, and encourage one another, as we ALL work to improve ourselves and our diverse community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Moseley Elementary School is dedicated to supporting and promoting teacher and student autonomy and responsibility for rigorous standards based learning, planning and teaching. This will be present through student focused scaffolded instruction where teachers model and students are engaged in discourse, all while creating a unified school-wide culture of collaboration that promotes student success...The Moseley Way

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
Benford, Brandon	Principal	Overseeing the safety and everyday functioning of the school. A specific focus on academic procedures and implementation as well as the conditions of the school are a major responsibilities of the principal.
Symonds, Amber	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in responsibilities of the school including instructional practices, safety of the school including monthly required drills, and school climate.
Wilds, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Leading and supporting the curriculum and data at all grade levels is the primary responsibility of the Instructional Coach.
White, Kristin	School Counselor	Overseeing students with special needs as well as ELL students. She also runs an effective MTSS process and counsels small group or individual students based on mental wellness and behavior needs. She also oversees all testing.
Bellamy, Shelby	Administrative Support	Scheduling and overseeing interventions labs for ELA, supporting the guidance counselor with MTSS by providing progress monitoring data, provide ELA and math interventions to students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Chris Lee

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: F (28%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca

Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	62	79	74	59	63	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	416
Attendance below 90 percent	34	26	25	22	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	1	11	6	7	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	33	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	21	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	0	4	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	6	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/18/2020

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	84	84	71	67	78	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	15	24	27	20	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	2	10	7	10	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	37	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	2	5	4	5	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	9	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	84	84	71	67	78	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	15	24	27	20	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	2	10	7	10	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	37	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	2	5	4	5	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	9	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	38%	46%	57%	18%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	55%	58%	37%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	54%	53%	39%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	51%	63%	28%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	39%	56%	62%	28%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	43%	51%	22%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	17%	41%	53%	24%	37%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	27%	41%	-14%	58%	-31%
	2018	30%	40%	-10%	57%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	43%	-6%	58%	-21%
	2018	16%	38%	-22%	56%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	32%	42%	-10%	56%	-24%
	2018	21%	39%	-18%	55%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	46%	0%	62%	-16%
	2018	34%	48%	-14%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	53%	-13%	64%	-24%
	2018	36%	50%	-14%	62%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	16%	44%	-28%	60%	-44%
	2018	38%	48%	-10%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	14%	38%	-24%	53%	-39%
	2018	28%	42%	-14%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	35	70	70	34	43	40	20				
ELL											
BLK	34	62	77	35	38	34	15				
HSP	37	80		47	40						
WHT	54	75		58	42		30				
FRL	37	63	71	41	40	37	19				
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	31	35	22	41	41	11				
ELL	18			36							
BLK	25	32	39	35	45	33	23				
HSP	15	19		30	63		17				
WHT	39	39		46	67						

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
FRL	24	31	33	34	48	40	27				
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	4	31	33	9	13	7					
ELL	20	30			30						
BLK	15	43	42	26	29	25	11				
HSP	25	29		30	24						
MUL	9			18							
WHT	26	29		30	36						
FRL	18	38	39	26	27	23	24				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	52
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	46
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.

Data from the 2019 FSA assessment- Science Achievement for SWD, Black and FRL students showed the lowest performance. There was a change in instruction three times in fifth grade math. We lost a staff member as a result of a low VAM score the previous year. The replacement teacher was new and was being coached in her first year of teaching. Because performance data continued to be low and classroom management was a hindrance, another instructor was placed over fifth grade science shortly after mid year. There was much inconsistency in fifth grade science instruction.

Data from the 2019-20 Progress Monitoring assessments- Students took 5 progress monitoring assessments. The average of the assessments was 63%.

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

Data from the 2019 FSA assessment- Math learning gains of the following subgroups declined last year: Black, HIspanic, White and FRL. Fifth grade scores was the contributing factor in these declines.

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.

Data from the 2019 FSA assessment- Fifth grade math achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There was not a focus on remediation in math. Students were continuously exposed to and working on grade level work. As a result, the gaps that had not been filled in previous years grew larger.

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

Data from the 2019 FSA assessment-4th and 5th grade ELA achievement and ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. A greater focus on planning and exposure to on grade level materials was put in place. Also, interventions were tailored to the needs of each students with many different researched based programs being used.

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

Our area of concern is the number of 5th graders with Level 1's on the 2019 statewide ELA and Math assessments.

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

1. 5th Grade ELA achievement and learning gains- Upcoming 5th grade students were at 20% achievement on the 2019 FSA assessment
2. 5th Grade math achievement and learning gains- Upcoming 5th grade students were at 46% acheivement on the 2019 FSA assessment
3. Science Achievement

4. 3rd Grade ELA and math achievement
5. 4th Grade ELA and math achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Previous year's FSA data indicates that 38% of students are proficient in reading and 41% of students in math. Instructional practices specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction must be delivered daily in all core content areas along with targeted interventions in order for student achievement gaps to close.
Measurable Outcome:	If standards-aligned instruction is delivered daily in all core content areas and targeted interventions are provided, then the percentage of students proficient in reading, mathematics, and science will increase to above 10% on the 2021 FSA assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher instructional practices will include student teaming of standards-aligned rigorous tasks in core and intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Quality standards-based grade level instruction is needed in order for students to master the standards and close achievement gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will follow the district ELA units and participate in PLC's. Teachers will attend PLC's weekly to plan standards based rigorous tasks for students

Person Responsible	Amber Symonds (asymonds@my.putnamschools.org)

TSSSA funds will be used to fund an additional intervention teacher to provide reading and math support. The intervention teacher will meet individually or in small groups with students from underserved sub-groups to provide targeted instruction based on their achievement gaps.

Person Responsible	Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)

TSSSA funds will be used to fund an additional paraprofessional to provide ELA interventions using the LLI curriculum. The interventions will be delivered in a lab setting under the supervision of a teacher.

Person Responsible	Shelby Bellamy (sbellamy@my.putnamschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Creating and maintaining a positive school culture is essential to increasing student achievement. Moseley will implement a school-wide positive behavior intervention system.
Measurable Outcome:	If a positive school culture is created and maintained throughout the school year, then quarterly student discipline and attendance data will be reduced from the 2019-20 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A school-wide PBS system will be implemented that includes character education instruction and effective tiered behavior interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior years discipline data indicated that student behavior was causing an interruption in student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in a refresher training on the Caring Schools Community curriculum. Teachers will begin each day with a PBS lesson from the curriculum and reinforce positive behaviors throughout the day.

Person Responsible	Kristin White (k2white@my.putnamschools.org)

A behavior team, consisting of three support staff members, will provide tier 2 and tier 3 behavior interventions. This will include push-in and pull-out behavior support to students.

Person Responsible	Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)

The school-wide PBS system will be introduced during preplanning. The system will include a whole school reward system based on student attendance and behavior.

Person Responsible	Kristin White (k2white@my.putnamschools.org)

TSSSA funds will be used to hire a Community/School Liaison. The liaison will provide information on programs/services available to students and families as well as school and/or district activities and procedures; referring families to other agencies; and fostering an ongoing partnership between the home and school.

Person Responsible	Amber Symonds (asymonds@my.putnamschools.org)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This year's leadership team consist of a new principal (former AP) and a new assistant principal. The leadership team will receive professional learning and district support in creating systems to maximize instructional success and accessing and coaching instructional practice in order to maximize the effectiveness of the team and the success of the school.
Measurable Outcome:	If the leadership team receives professional learning and district support in creating systems to maximize instructional success and accessing and coaching instructional practice, then the overall success of the school will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The leadership team will receive professional development in order to maximize the effectiveness of the team and increase student success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Improving the effectiveness of the leadership team will ensure that systems are implemented and monitored in order to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Frequent school conditions and rigor walks will be conducted by school administration. The district Leadership Coach and Director of School Improvement will also conduct conditions and rigor walks with school administration to support professional growth.

Person Responsible Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)

Learning Sciences International (LSI) will provide on-site and virtual leadership coaching and support to the administrative team.

Person Responsible Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will continue to address the remaining areas of focus. The team will meet weekly and include instructional practices, progress monitoring data and school climate and culture needs.

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.

Moseley Elementary School will continue to make systematic efforts to build a positive school culture and environment. Our targets will include increased parent participation in the School Advisory Council, increased parent participation in the PCSD Parent Involvement District Advisory Council, increased attendance at Open House events, increased participation in fundraising efforts, an increase in parent volunteers, increase in monthly newsletters, more comprehensive tools and information for parents on school website, increased participation in parent conferences, MTSS meetings and IEP meetings. Connect 5 phone alert system will be used regularly to keep parents aware of important information and upcoming events. Teachers will make regular positive parent contacts. Parents will be invited to curriculum and data chat events. A positive PR campaign for Moseley will be established to communicate the great things Moseley is doing with the community. This year we will include many virtual opportunities for building a positive school culture. This includes utilizing virtual meeting platforms to account for CDC guidelines and provide parents with additional opportunities to participate.

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