

Putnam County School District

William D. Moseley Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 5/20/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam 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.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 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	80%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam 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.

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	Position 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 and rigor of the instruction are 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.
White, Kristin	School Counselor	Overseeing students with special needs that include social emotional, academics and ELL. Supports the MTSS process and counsels small group or individual students based on mental wellness and behavior needs. She also oversees state testing.
Bellamy, Shelby	Instructional Coach	Leading and supporting the curriculum and data at all grade levels. Oversees the MTSS process by supporting teachers and students with appropriate interventions and documentation.
Wilds, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Leading and supporting the ELA curriculum and data at all grade levels is the primary responsibility of this instructional coach.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/20/2020, 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

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

589

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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	113	85	94	93	56	78	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	592
Attendance below 90 percent	16	41	48	43	36	46	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	284
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	11	6	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	6	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	10	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	17	23	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	19	42	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	32	21	49	44	16	16	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	197

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	2	7	17	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	3	3	3	13	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/15/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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

2020-21 - 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	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
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	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				38%	46%	57%	25%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	55%	58%	32%	45%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73%	54%	53%	34%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				41%	51%	63%	36%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains				39%	56%	62%	51%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	43%	51%	42%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				17%	41%	53%	26%	46%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	27%	41%	-14%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	43%	-6%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	42%	-10%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	46%	46%	0%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	53%	-13%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	16%	44%	-28%	60%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	14%	38%	-24%	53%	-39%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28	33	42	22	18	15	17				
ELL	38			23							

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
BLK	25	40	33	20	28	15	17				
HSP	43			26							
MUL	33			8							
WHT	45	23		35	15		31				
FRL	30	40	38	21	22	19	22				
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						
FRL	24	31	33	34	48	40	27				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	235
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	37
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	21
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	30
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA and Mathematics data was significantly lower in 2021 compared to 2019 data.

2021 2019

ELA-31% ELA- 38%

ELA LG- 38% ELA LG- 65%

ELA BQ- 41% ELA BQ- 73%

Math- 23% Math- 41%

Math LG- 24% Math LG- 39%

Math BQ- 16% Math BQ- 35%

Learning gains in particular were much lower although the 2021 scores only reflect 5th grade scores.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Although ELA scores had the most significant drop from previous years, the largest need for improvement is in the area of mathematics. Proficiency scores as well as learning gains are all under 25%.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

There are several factors that can be attributed to the low math scores. Students had a disruption in math instruction due to the pandemic. Many students attended school virtually and were not successful.

Interventions will be provided for students daily in order to close achievement gaps. Teachers will be provided support in identifying student needs and planning for interventions by district and school instructional coaches.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Science had the most improvement. Science proficiency increased by 5% on FSA.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Progress monitoring assessments were given after each unit of study. Teachers planned with the district science coach.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Standards-based grade level instruction needs to happen daily along with 30 minutes of math mathematics intervention.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will attend weekly math PLC's, have continued support with instructional practices from administrative feedback and district and school-based coaches.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Instructional coaching support
Weekly PLC's
Standards based curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This school has been identified under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence Act (RAISE) as needing to focus on improving student reading outcomes. Data from Spring 2021 showed 33% of students in third grade, 25% in fourth grade, and 21% in fifth grade scored a level 3 or above on the ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Increase students scoring Mid or Above Grade Level on the 2022 Spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic. Targets for Grades K-2 include:
 ___50%___ Percent in Grade K
 ___45%___ Percent in Grade 1
 ___45%___ Percent in Grade 2

Increase students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Targets for Grades 3-6 include:
 ___36%___ Percent in Grade 3
 ___35%___ Percent in Grade 4
 ___35%___ Percent in Grade 5
 ___35%___ Percent in Grade 6

Monitoring: Progress monitoring will occur using the iReady diagnostic in Fall, Winter and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amber Symonds (asymonds@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher instructional practices will include academic student teaming of standards-aligned rigorous tasks in core and intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The identified evidence-based strategies meet Florida's definition of evidence-based and align to the Putnam County School District's K-12 Reading Plan. The programs address the identified need to improve student reading outcomes. Resources and criteria are based on the approved K-12 Decision Trees.

Action Steps to Implement

Students were put into appropriate tiers based upon the criteria in the K-12 plan. An intervention schedule was developed to ensure students will receive the appropriate intervention based upon their individual needs.

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

PLC's will focus on planning standards based lessons as well as instructional practices.

Person Responsible Michelle Wilds (mwilds@my.putnamschools.org)

After school PLC's will be held to support teachers on academic teaming. This includes teaming structures, learning targets and success criteria and team talk. Teacher "Look & Learns" will also be scheduled.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This school has been identified math as needing to focus on improving student math outcomes. Data from Spring 2021 showed 22% of students in third grade, 19% in fourth grade, and 23% in fifth grade scored a level 3 or above on the math FSA.

Increase students scoring Mid or Above Grade Level on the 2022 Spring i-Ready Math Diagnostic. Targets for Grades K-2 include:
 ___60%___ Percent in Grade K
 ___50%___ Percent in Grade 1
 ___50%___ Percent in Grade 2

Measurable Outcome: Increase students scoring Level 3 or above on the 2022 statewide, standardized Math assessment. Targets for Grades 3-6 include:
 ___35%___ Percent in Grade 3
 ___35%___ Percent in Grade 4
 ___35%___ Percent in Grade 5
 ___35%___ Percent in Grade 6

Monitoring: Progress monitoring will occur using the iReady diagnostic in Fall, Winter and Spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amber Symonds (asymonds@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher instructional practices will include academic 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

Math Intervention time has been designated during the math block. School and district support members assist teachers in analyzing data and planning appropriate lessons to teach prerequisite skills and prior standards in order to close achievement gaps.

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

PLC's will focus on standards based lesson planning of the core math block and the intervention block.

Person Responsible Vanessa Champion (vchampion@my.putnamschools.org)

Students will practice math skills using the program Reflex during computer lab.

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

After school PLC's will be held to support teachers on academic teaming. This includes teaming structures, learning targets and success criteria and team talk. Teacher "Look & Learns" will also be scheduled.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Monthly reports of discipline data will be reviewed and analyzed by the administration and the behavior team members. Teachers will be supported in developing classroom PBIS systems.

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.

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. The School Messenger 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Moseley's stakeholders are invested in the welfare and success of the school and the students. Our stakeholders include administrators, teachers, staff members, students, parents, families, community members, local business leaders and elected officials. Stakeholders support the school by providing needed resources and volunteering their time.