

Putnam County School District

# William D. Moseley Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>25</b>

## William D. Moseley Elementary School

1100 HUSSON AVE, Palatka, FL 32177

[www.putnamschools.org/o/moseley](http://www.putnamschools.org/o/moseley)

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 10/17/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

Using a diverse system of supports, we seek to nurture a safe, rigorous, and equitable learning environment where all students develop their ability to thrive in a collaborative and technological world.

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

At Moseley, we exist to to become a learning community that transforms critical thinkers into creative developers and leaders who possess the skills that will positively impact their educational and living environments throughout their lives.

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

#### **School Leadership Team**

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lee, Chris	Principal	I will be responsible for establishing the instructional vision and strategies for the dissemination of state benchmarks, academic and/or behavioral interventions, and social-emotional learning, for students from Kindergarten to 6th grade. I will also provide coaching for teachers in the areas of instructional practices and guidance in responding to student discipline. I will establish systems for culture and safety that provide a positive, safe, yet rigorous learning environment. I will establish a system of supervision and accountability for state and district professional practices for all faculty and staff, monitor all school functions (i.e. school-based meetings, community programs, and staff acquisition/development), and set the course for coaching of classroom instruction, respond to data trends, and assess student engagement
McNeil, Aeron	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Mcneill will support the mission and vision of the school by offering direct supervision to non-instructional personnel and establish/monitor strategies that support parent involvement. She will participate in all areas and advise on ways to further the mission. She will also provide direct supervision to the Discipline Department, while offering instructional guidance in PLC's, IEP, and MTSS meetings. She will lead PBIS efforts, as well as organize, promote and support the development of the six competencies that we believe all students should demonstrate when they graduate from our school district also known as The Portrait of a Graduate.
Bellamy, Shelby	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Shelby Bellamy will provide instructional strategy coaching and will support highly effective classroom practices focusing on academic teaming and engagement in the areas of ELA and Reading. She will provide professional development through targeted feedback cycles, Look and Learns, and PLCs. These duties will also include assisting the principal with setting the course for coaching of classroom instruction, responding to data trends, and management of student engagement.
Cates, Mercedes	Math Coach	Mrs. Mercedes Cates will provide instructional strategy coaching, and will support highly effective classroom practices focusing on academic teaming and engagement in the areas of Math and Science. She will provide professional development through targeted feedback cycles, Look and Learns, and PLCs. These duties will also include assisting the principal with setting the course for coaching of classroom instruction, responding to data trends, and management of student engagement.
	School Counselor	Mrs. Kristin White will establish systems for a successful assessment and social-emotional learning environment. She will provide SEL support to students and staff. As it is important to adhere to district and state guidelines for identifying and serving underperforming students (academically and behaviorally) she will assist staff will establishing service goals in MTSS, Threat Assessment, and IEP meetings. She will also arrange staffing and provide training and scheduling for state/district assessments.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Campbell, Elysha	Dean	Mr. Elysha Campbell will oversee responses to disciplinary events at Moseley. He will investigate, then make district-guided decisions that address actions that create an unsafe or non-educable environment on, and in some cases, off campus. He will also offer in-service training in the areas of classroom management and behavior intervention strategies. In order to support Moseley's vision for academic success, Mr. Campbell will offer prevention and reintegration strategies to both students and staff in an effort to maintain optimum levels of exposure to standards-based, social-emotional instruction.
Wilds, Michelle	Reading Coach	Work with and support teachers with the development and successful demonstration and application of knowledge, strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach reading and writing to all students. Provide guidance and coaching for instructional practices from the district perspective in the area of ELA/Reading. Assist the principal with establishing instructional goals that support the district's reading plan. Directly assist teacher-teams in PLC's, and provide training in areas such as, but not limited to, Target-Task Alignment, Academic Teaming, and Mini-Lessons. Assist the principal (and site-based coach) with responding to student data trends.
Kellner, Asia	Math Coach	Work with and support mathematics teachers assisting with the development of strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach mathematics to all students.
Paul, Kerry	Science Coach	Work with and support social studies and science teachers assisting with the development of strategies, skills, tools, and techniques to effectively teach social studies and science to all students. Provide guidance and coaching for instructional practices from the district perspective in the area of Science. Assist the principal with establishing instructional goals that support school improvement for Science. Directly assist teacher-teams in PLC's, and provide training in areas such as, but not limited to, Target-Task Alignment, Academic Teaming, and Mini-Lessons. Assist the principal (and site-based coach) with responding to student data trends.

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The process for involving stakeholders in the development of our school improvement plan begins with our previous year's data. We also use input from our Parent/Family Engagement Plan and information from Parent Night activities. In addition, each year, our PTO and School Advisory Council give us input for school improvement. These committees meet periodically throughout the year, and are made up of



teachers, students, parents, and community business members. These organizations exist to maintain focus on all academic and behavioral improvement goals while helping us maintain fiscal responsibility.

### SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Our SIP will be initially monitored for implementation and impact through our weekly data-driven PLC's. These meetings will assure student evidence pieces and data trends are aligned to SIP goals by using teacher input, strategic planning with site-based coaches, and instructional development coaching from district coaches. During those meetings, teachers will discuss and share plans that include closing achievement gaps between subgroups. Additionally, the academic lead team will conduct classroom walkthroughs that will highlight particular instructional focuses (i.e. Target/Task Alignment and Academic Teaming). Coaching "prescriptions" will be utilized where instructional barriers persist. In addition, members of our SAC and PTO's will have the opportunity to monitor school academic and instructional needs through data reviews and special parent/community-involved events. These and other strategies will help us monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of our SIP. Student evidence from classroom tasks, along with assessment data, will provide a platform for plan revision. The academic lead team will carefully monitor data trends, respond to those trends, communicate them to parents, then make necessary adjustments in the area of staffing, materials, and other resources. Our MTSS process will also help us identify students performing below peer averages. SIP goals will be adjusted to engage students from each subgroup who fall into these categories. We will use the data to monitor each subgroup paying particular close attention to Students with Disabilities and Multi-Racial Students.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 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>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	75%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<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 (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)

<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: D
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	27	64	53	48	35	31	35	0	0	293	
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	12	10	11	12	0	0	53	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	7	15	13	17	1	2	0	0	57	
Course failure in Math	2	10	14	21	16	10	10	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	40	35	25	0	0	112	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	32	27	22	0	0	89	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	15	36	23	17	15	6	0	0	112	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	12	15	16	21	15	15	0	0	96

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

### Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	30	65	42	56	43	28	36	0	0	300	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	14	5	3	7	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	2	6	3	8	4	1	2	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	3	10	6	9	6	1	2	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	43	37	43	0	0	135	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	34	27	26	0	0	99	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	6	3	9	29	29	36	0	0	114	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	9	5	14	21	21	21	0	0	93

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	30	65	42	56	43	28	36	0	0	300	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	14	5	3	7	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	2	6	3	8	4	1	2	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	3	10	6	9	6	1	2	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	43	37	43	0	0	135	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	34	27	26	0	0	99	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	6	3	9	29	29	36	0	0	114	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	9	5	14	21	21	21	0	0	93

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review****ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	31	43	53	31	43	56	31		
ELA Learning Gains				51			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			41		
Math Achievement*	35	49	59	33	47	50	23		
Math Learning Gains				59			24		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				66			18		
Science Achievement*	26	45	54	16	45	59	22		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					54	52			
Graduation Rate					36	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	35	56	59	59			38		

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	30
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	150
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	371
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	24	Yes	2	1
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	1	1
HSP	36	Yes	1	
MUL	18	Yes	2	2
PAC				
WHT	44			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	30	Yes	1	1

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	38	Yes	1	
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	47			
MUL	27	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	43			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	31			35			26					35
SWD	23			23			28				4	
ELL	24			43							3	35
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			27			20				4	
HSP	28			42							3	38
MUL	12			24							2	

## 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	48			52			44				4	
FRL	31			36			22				5	40

## 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	31	51	56	33	59	66	16					59
SWD	23	47	48	26	56	57	9					
ELL	39	40		45	50							59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	47	53	29	62	69	11					
HSP	40	65		37	59		18					63
MUL	26	45		20	17							
PAC												
WHT	47	53		44	63		29					
FRL	28	48	50	31	55	63	12					59

## 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	31	38	41	23	24	18	22					38
SWD	28	33	42	22	18	15	17					
ELL	38			23								38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	40	33	20	28	15	17					
HSP	43			26								42
MUL	33			8								
PAC												
WHT	45	23		35	15		31					
FRL	30	40	38	21	22	19	22					33

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	45%	-14%	54%	-23%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	44%	-11%	58%	-25%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	45%	-7%	47%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	18%	36%	-18%	50%	-32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	45%	60%	-15%	54%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	25%	45%	-20%	59%	-34%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	51%	-13%	61%	-23%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	46%	-13%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	20%	42%	-22%	51%	-31%

### III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Our lowest performance came from 3rd grade in ELA. At PM3, only 18% of the students showed proficiency. Although there were barriers in the areas of discipline and attendance, gains were made in this category.

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



Science showed the greatest decline. We went from 22% of the students being proficient, to 16%. One of the major factors contributing to this was staff attendance. This area was too often staffed with substitute teachers during the year.

**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.**

3rd Grade Math had the largest gap compared to the state average (25% to 59% respectively) and barriers included attendance and discipline.

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

Third grade Math went from 0 to 33%. There was increased focus on classroom instruction in this area. Incentives were offered to students who increased their attendance and decreased behaviors that required them to be removed from classrooms.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

ELA achievement is the first area of concern. Science is a secondary concern. In ELA, although there was no decline, we did not show growth in this area.

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

- 1) 3rd Grade ELA
- 2) 3rd Grade Math
- 3) 4th Grade ELA
- 4) 5th Grade Math
- 5) 5th Grade Science

#### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

**#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our plan is to increase our students' desire to own their education and also building culture while attending Moseley. This begins by having teaming as a core value for all we do. As we seek to accomplish our goals from the concept of "TOGETHER", we feel we'll leave no one behind. Our school-wide PBIS system will reveal our intent to provide students' with a safe environment designed to value all learners, such as our mixed students and students with disabilities. These two subgroups are currently among our lowest performing in the areas of Reading and Math. In other words, we believe all students can and will WIN (or get Whatever I Need). Our WIN strategies will be posted around our school. We will also open our doors to our parents and community members by hosting parent/community nights that focus on safety, improvement goals, and student data. Our Winter and Spring festivals will draw community interests for partnership and cultural development. We will provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment and improve the PBIS initiative during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If Moseley provides an effective campus-wide reward system, then by the beginning of the second semester, absences and discipline referrals across campus, and especially among our ESSR subgroups will decrease by 5%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored by Moseley's lead team by using weekly meetings that will focus on EWS and ESSR subgroup data trends.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Chris Lee (c2lee@my.putnamschools.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

As a school, we will seek to implement and provide professional learning on the practice of adopting new research-based strategies and/or programs that will help to reduce negative interactions and foster more positive interactions on campus. The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is implementation of structured professional learning that results in change in teacher knowledge and practices.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance and discipline referrals present high rates among all subgroups, but mostly affect the performances of 2 subgroups. Effective professional development is defined as structured professional learning that results in changes to teacher knowledge and practices, and improvements in student learning outcomes. Professional learning is conceptualized as a product of both externally provided and job-embedded activities that increase teachers' knowledge and help them change their instructional practice in ways that support student learning. Thus, formal PD represents a subset of the range of experiences that may result in professional learning.

### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### **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.

In order to address this area, we plan to have "popsicle with the Principal", Panther Partnership (having the high school football team for motivational and reward visits), and attendance reward dances.

**Person Responsible:** Aeron McNeil (amcneill@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** We will have an event each grading period.

Provide professional learning opportunities to address a positive culture and environment and improve the PBIS initiative during the upcoming school year. There are built in early release days each month where the staff will participate in these structured PL opportunities.

**Person Responsible:** Aeron McNeil (amcneill@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** During the 2023-24 school year.

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our plan is to increase student engagement in all classrooms, with a focus on multi-raced students, and students with disabilities. To accomplish this goal, we desire to strengthen teachers' ability to use Academic Teaming as an instructional practice. In that, students will be able to deepen their knowledge of benchmarks through collaboration in small groups.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If we focus on Academic Teaming in all classrooms then students with disabilities and students among our multi-raced population will improve their performances on formative assessment data by 10%.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area will be monitored by Moseley's lead team and by the instructional coaches in weekly meetings and PLC's.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Shelby Bellamy (sbellamy@my.putnamschools.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

High Leverage Practices 18 - Use Strategies to Promote Active Student Engagement. This strategy provides students with frequent and varied opportunities to respond and encourages students to engage with peers as well. Through effective promotion of student engagement, teachers will acquire and implement a wide repertoire of research-supported active student response practices such as fluency-building activities, guided notes, class-wide peer tutoring, digital tools, and collaborative learning strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will continue to implementing Academic Teaming. Promoting active student engagement has an Effect Size of .82, when implemented with fidelity, we expect to see growth. We will use PCSD's Trend Walk tool that has an element that focuses on students interacting with partners and teams.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

In order to address this area, it has been made part of our instructional culture to give each student access to grade-level instruction through learning targets and success criteria.

**Person Responsible:** Mercedes Cates (mcates@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** Daily

The instructional coaches will support highly effective classroom instructional practices focusing on academic teaming and engagement. They will build capacity through modeling of effective lessons and provide professional learning through targeted feedback cycles, PLCs, and Look & Learns. They will work collaboratively with the grade level teams to maintain the instructional pace and fidelity of the standards.

**Person Responsible:** Aeron McNeil (amcneill@my.putnamschools.org)

**By When:** During the 2023-24 school year.

### CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

District staff from multiple departments support schools with additional funding to ensure schools supplement and do not supplant.

With allocated funds for school improvement, such as UniSIG, school leaders must seek approval through the Department of Strategic Initiatives and School Improvement before expending funds. This collaboration ensures that expenditures follow grant RFPs, are aligned with approved budgets, and meet school needs based on data.

The district has ongoing systems in place to provide resources to schools based on needs. Along with a general fund set-aside for school improvement, district staff from multiple departments provide additional support throughout the school year when student, teacher, and school needs are identified.

### Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

#### 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

Based on full-year students tested in STAR reading, the following grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile are 1st grade 68% and 2nd grade 61%. The instructional

practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA will focus on teaming structures that consist of group collaboration and students having individual access to learning targets and success criteria will be deployed in each K-2 classroom.

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

Based on full-year students tested on FAST ELA for their grade level, the following grade levels had 50% or more of the students scoring below the 40th percentile are 3rd grade 82%, 4th grade 67%, and 5th grade 69%. With 82% of our 3rd graders, 66% of 4th graders, 68% of 5th graders testing below grade level in Reading (FAST 22/23), we believe teaming structures that consist of group collaboration and students having individual access to learning targets and success criteria should be deployed in each 3-5 classroom. We will also use LLI and SIPPS as Reading intervention curriculum to close gaps.

### **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 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 Measurable Outcomes**

Using the components of explicit instruction consisting of scaffolds such as anchor charts, success criteria, student collaboration, and Tier 2 & 3 interventions for small groups, we will have 50% or more of the students in kindergarten through second grade on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

Using the components of explicit instruction consisting of scaffolds such as anchor charts, success criteria, student collaboration, and Tier 2 & 3 interventions for small groups, we will have 50% or more of the students in third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

## **Monitoring**

### **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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Our ongoing monitoring will have a positive impact on student achievement outcomes. We will monitor through weekly PLC's, iReady diagnostic assessments, Tier 3 Reading PM, and Unit assessments through Benchmark (and Open Court) Reading curriculum.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bellamy, Shelby, sbellamy@my.putnamschools.org

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

**Description:**

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. §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?

Yes, the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based and the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. We use Benchmark Advance, Open Court, SIPPS (TS intervention), and iReady. These programs were selected based on the K-12 Reading plan.

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Yes, Our K-12 Reading plan provides guidance for addressing student needs. The Benchmark Advance Program addresses our ELA needs and shows a proven record of effectiveness for the target population. Open Court phonics was chosen for its proven level of effectiveness in the area of phonics.

**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
We will continue to implementing Academic Teaming. We will use PCSD's Trend Walk tool that has an element that focuses on students interacting with partners and teams. Our Literacy Leadership team will provide guidance for services such as Book Bingo, Literacy Week, and Vocabulary Parade, in order to promote literacy.	Bellamy, Shelby, sbellamy@my.putnamschools.org
Teachers will participate in district learning communities to develop a better and deeper understanding of the BEST standards. The literacy coach will complete coaching cycles with teachers based on individual need.	
Teachers will follow district year at a glance documents to take unit assessments as well as take state progress monitoring 3x per year and iReady reading diagnostics 3x per year. This data will help drive ELA instruction during the school year.	

## Title I Requirements

### Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**

List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Initially, our plan will be disseminated to faculty/staff, parents, community members, and stakeholders through our School Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Organization meetings. The SIP will be available on our school website as well as in our front office.

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

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our plan includes Parent nights, a Fall/Spring Festival, and Mommy/Daddy Read-A-Long during Literacy Week.

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)**

We will employ the components of explicit instruction in every classroom. Teachers will be expected to use scaffolds (i.e. anchor charts, success criteria, student collaboration, etc) to strengthen student



learning in the classroom. Other programs will take place in our intervention classes (i.e. Open Court, SIPPS). We will offer Accelerated Math to 6th grade students this year.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

In accordance with ESSA Section 118 (b) { 2}, the methodology used to allocate State and local funds to each school receiving assistance under Title I, Part A ensures that the school receives all the State and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving Federal funds. The District has a methodology for support, not supplant when allocating State and local funds to each school.

Each school year, the District's Chief Financial Officer assures State and local funds are distributed at an equal level by preparing a report showing comparability across all schools for the allocation of instructional staff. Staff allocations are based on a formula applied consistently so that all schools that are comparable receive allocations in a comparable manner. The report is audited by the State yearly to assure the District meets this mandate.

The funding formula is based on Florida Public Schools Full-time Equivalent (FTE) data. Expenditures of all Federal title funds at the school level are monitored to ensure expenditures supplement the general curriculum and fulfill the intent of grant funding. All expenditures are reviewed by the Federal Programs Office to ensure compliance with applicable Federal and State guidelines.

Additionally, the school leadership team conducts a district unified Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) towards the end of each school year. The CNA reports on how resources including personnel, instruction, and curriculum are aligned to identified needs. Student programming outcomes are monitored both in the CNA and quarterly district-admin data conversations.

Schools implementing CSI, TSI, or ATSI activities may use available funds, including Federal title funds, to support implementation of identified activities in the schoolwide improvement plan.

Federal funding projects are monitored for auditing purposes by the Office of Federal Programs. Audit boxes for each program are maintained and aligned to pertinent work papers and Federal and State guidance.

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

### Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

No