

Putnam County School District

# William D. Moseley Elementary School



## 2022-23 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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (45%) 2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: D (35%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	SIG Cohort 3
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* 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 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](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>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	75%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

### 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**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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 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 groups 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	Reading Coach	Leading and supporting the ELA curriculum, instructional planning and delivery of lessons and data at all grade levels.
Champion, Vanessa	Math Coach	Leading and supporting the math curriculum, instructional planning and delivery of lessons and data at all grade levels.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 5/20/2020, Chris Lee

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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**

41

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

598

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

7



Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

## Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	107	108	80	101	83	62	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	30	65	42	56	43	28	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	300
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	14	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	2	6	3	8	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	3	10	6	9	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	43	37	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	34	27	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	6	3	9	29	29	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	9	5	14	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	2	12	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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	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

**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	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

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	31%	43%	56%				38%	46%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						65%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						73%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	33%	47%	50%				41%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	59%						39%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						35%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	16%	45%	59%				17%	41%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	27%	41%	-14%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	43%	-6%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	32%	42%	-10%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	46%	46%	0%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	53%	-13%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	16%	44%	-28%	60%	-44%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	14%	38%	-24%	53%	-39%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	23	47	48	26	56	57	9				
ELL	39	40		45	50						
BLK	24	47	53	29	62	69	11				
HSP	40	65		37	59		18				
MUL	26	45		20	17						
WHT	47	53		44	63		29				
FRL	28	48	50	31	55	63	12				
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							
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				

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	47
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	47
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	27
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	47
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	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### 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 achievement, Math achievement and science achievement are all below 41%. English Language Arts Achievement is 31, Mathematics Achievement is 33, and Science Achievement is 16. Student learning gains in ELA and Math were above 50%. Students made more growth in math than in reading, especially the lowest 25%.

The 3rd grade ELA achievement data was the lowest at 26%.

#### What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The 3rd grade ELA scores were at 26%. The cohort of students will need intensive support. Science achievement was also significantly lower than the previous year at 16%.

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

Although improvement was made in ELA from the previous school year improvement is still needed in closing the achievement gap. Science achievement decreased by 6% from the 2021 to the 2022 school year.

A new core curriculum will be used in ELA to support the implementation of the new standards. Teachers are receiving support through district and school led professional learning communities in ELA with curriculum implementation and the new standards.

A designated science teacher will be in grades 3, 5, and 6 this school year. All teachers will receive support from the district science coach and participate in district professional learning communities.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

The most improvement was made in math. Math achievement increased 10%, math learning gains increased 35% and math lowest 25% increased 48%.

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

Math was departmentalized for the 2022 school year. The math teachers had a strong background in teaching math and understood the content. Teachers participated in district and school led PLC's.

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

A new curriculum will be used this school year in both ELA and math. District and school led PLC's will be held frequently to support teachers and assess student learning.

**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 participate in district professional learning that focuses on the new curriculum as well as the new standards.

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

Additional math support at the school level  
Instructional Coach  
District math and ELA coach  
Frequent monitoring and feedback by administration

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

The ESSA subgroup specifically relating to students with disabilities was 38%. This subgroup makes up approximately 25% of students in grades 3-6. The multiracial subgroup was 27%. The multiracial subgroup a very small subgroup and many students in this subgroup are also in the students with disabilities subgroup.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

If we provide targeted and specific intervention support, then by May of 2023, students will increase proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Student classroom data, intervention data and IEP goals will be monitored throughout the school year for an increase in student achievement.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Amber Symonds (asymonds@my.putnamschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Students will receive standards-based instruction and targeted scaffolded intervention in all subject areas to increase student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Standards-based instruction and targeted intervention provide students will opportunities to fill learning gaps to increase student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Weekly PLC's for teachers led by district and school-based instructional coaches.
2. Teachers will participate in district learning communities that include professional learning and support with curriculum and B.E.S.T Standards.

**Person Responsible**

Brandon Benford (bbenford@my.putnamschools.org)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

2022 August I-Ready Diagnostic Data

Kindergarten- 88% of students were reading below grade level

2022 May i-Ready ELA Diagnostic Data

1st Grade Cohort- 24% of students were reading below grade level

2nd Grade Cohort- 55% of students were reading below grade level

This data indicated that students are need to additional support to increase proficiency in reading.

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

Teachers will implement effective instructional practices relating to B.E.S.T. standards. Student ELA achievement was 31% on the 2022 FSA.

2022 May i-Ready ELA Data- 3rd Grade Cohort- 67% of students were reading below grade level

4th Grade Cohort- 26% proficiency on FSA

5th Grade Cohort-24% proficiency on FSA

6th Grade Cohort-31% proficiency on FSA

This data indicated that students are need to additional support to increase proficiency in reading.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

If this support is provided, then on the May of 2023 ELA achievement will improve on the FAST PM3.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

If this support is provided, then on the May of 2023 ELA achievement will improve on the FAST PM3.

### **Monitoring:**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

School administration will monitor ELA instruction through weekly through classroom walkthroughs, collaborative planning PLCs that include district and school based coaching support, participation in professional learning opportunities and data chats based on state and district assessments.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Symonds, Amber, [asymonds@my.putnamschools.org](mailto:asymonds@my.putnamschools.org)

### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Core ELA instruction is aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards using the Benchmark Advance Curriculum for grades K-6. Grades K-3 use Open Court for phonics instruction.

Tier 3 reading interventions are facilitated by a reading endorsed teacher using SIPPS or LLI, depending on student need.

### **Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These practices/programs are outlined in the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence Based Reading Plan. The ELA core curriculum as well as the ELA intervention curriculums were chosen based upon prior evidence of effectiveness. Students are provided with an intervention based upon their individual needs.

Providing teachers with weekly, building level collaborative planning time centered around implementation of the new B.E.S.T standards directly impacts student achievement.

District learning communities provide valuable professional development related to implementing new curriculum and the B.E.S.T. Standards.

### Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Weekly collaborative PLCs focused on implementing B.E.S.T. standards and evidence based phonics instruction.	Wilds, Michelle, mwilds@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in "Look & Learns" with their peers throughout the school year to increase effective instruction in ELA.	Bellamy, Shelby, sbellamy@my.putnamschools.org
Participation in district professional learning communities.	Benford, Brandon, bbenford@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will receive feedback through iObservation in ELA in order to maximize the impact of instruction on student achievement.	Symonds, Amber, asymonds@my.putnamschools.org
Students will receive specific targeted intervention based upon their individual needs. Students in tiers 2 and 3 will receive intervention based upon the guidance of the K-12 reading plan.	Boden, Mercedes, mboden@my.putnamschools.org

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### 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 increasing parent participation in the School Advisory Council, the

PCSD Parent Involvement District Advisory Council, at Open House events, in fundraising efforts and in parent volunteers. We will send home monthly newsletters as well as comprehensive tools and information for parents to access on school website. We also want to increase 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.

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

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.