

Seminole County Public Schools

Goldsboro Elementary Magnet



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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Goldsboro Elementary Magnet

1300 W 20TH ST, Sanford, FL 32771

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0271>

Demographics

Principal: Chris Mulholland

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
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 Seminole 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Goldsboro Elementary Magnet

1300 W 20TH ST, Sanford, FL 32771

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0271>

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 PK-5	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Seminole 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.

The mission of Goldsboro Elementary Magnet School is to empower students to excel in a world of math, science, and technology through local and global collaboration in a nurturing and challenging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Goldsboro Elementary School will be the premier magnet elementary school in Seminole County. Goldsboro will be recognized in the district and the state level for high standards, academic performance, and offering students customized educational pathways in the areas of science. *Goldsboro will support the SCPS vision that all Early Childhood Program and Pre-K through Grade 5 students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens. *All students will make a year's growth in a year's time. *There will be equitable facilities and opportunities for all students. *The school's personnel will be highly qualified, diverse, innovative, enthusiastic, energetic, and dedicated to the mission.

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
Mulholland, Chris	Principal	Oversees overall operations, curriculum, and instruction
Houle, Angela	Assistant Principal	Oversees overall operations and Mathematics curriculum and instruction
Benninghove, Shannon	Teacher, ESE	Oversees ESE instruction
Kellett, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	Oversees Reading curriculum and instruction
Hallett, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Oversees Science curriculum and instruction
Pagan, Anthony	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Strategies and Support
Wakelyn, Robert	Instructional Technology	Technology Integration and Magnet Support
Hess, Mary Lynn	Teacher, K-12	Science integration and Magnet Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 2/1/2019, Chris Mulholland

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.*

3

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

811

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

7

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

0

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	138	131	135	141	145	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	815
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	2	5	5	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	23	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	38	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	8	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	4	6	6	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	141	140	144	141	143	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	2	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

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

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	2	5	6	12	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	141	140	144	141	143	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	846
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	2	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

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

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	2	5	6	12	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				64%	67%	57%	64%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	61%	58%	63%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	51%	53%	47%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	70%	63%	68%	68%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	66%	62%	62%	62%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	50%	51%	45%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				70%	62%	53%	77%	66%	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	64%	67%	-3%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	65%	-2%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	71%	-9%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	72%	-3%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	65%	-8%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	62%	8%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady Diagnostic Assessments were utilized to progress monitor*:

- ELA – Grades 1-5
- Mathematics – Grades 1-5

In Grade 5 Science, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.

*Reported data is based upon having 10 or more students in the subgroup. Less than 10 students will be reported as 0.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/61%	99/70%	111/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/29%	26/43%	38/67%
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	6/38%	8/53%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67/55%	73/53%	101/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/23%	13/23%	30/53%
	Students With Disabilities	3/25%	5/31%	6/40%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	88/66%	107/76%	705/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/46%	35/64%	33/63%
	Students With Disabilities	7/41%	7/41%	6/35%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72/53%	91/65%	107/78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/24%	20/38%	29/56%
	Students With Disabilities	4/24%	5/28%	7/41%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36/28%	47/35%	76/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/15%	14/19%	24/30%
	Students With Disabilities	1/4%	0	6/21%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46/34%	64/50%	82/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/19%	22/31%	32/47%
	Students With Disabilities	1/4%	4/15%	5/23%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68/55%	77/63%	51/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/35%	23/39%	28/48%
	Students With Disabilities	4/19%	5/25%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	55/45%	76/62%	83/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/15%	19/33%	26/46%
	Students With Disabilities	4/19%	7/33%	5/28%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81/63%	95/74%	90/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/41%	32/52%	30/50%
	Students With Disabilities	2/12%	4/25%	6/40%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83/67%	94/74%	95/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/49%	37/60%	35/57%
	Students With Disabilities	4/27%	7/44%	5/33%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	25	28	18	26	37	23	25				
ELL	55	58		50	42		55				
ASN	91	83		91	80		90				
BLK	36	65	45	27	48		70				
HSP	51	50		38	35	25	46				
MUL	69			69							
WHT	63	60		65	43		75				
FRL	43	54	39	34	43	29	55				
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	37	53	42	36	36	23	41				
ELL	50	70	70	38	55		50				

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
ASN	85	66		87	78		88				
BLK	46	52	35	46	39	26	50				
HSP	60	58	47	48	46	30	65				
MUL	78	60		68	73						
WHT	68	59	47	71	61	19	79				
FRL	50	50	37	50	44	25	60				
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	29	40	33	25	43	52	23				
ELL	50	61		50	56						
ASN	90	83		88	77		93				
BLK	41	46	36	47	46	48	46				
HSP	63	69	39	66	63	44	76				
MUL	63	82		68	73						
WHT	74	63	71	79	65	21	96				
FRL	52	59	44	57	54	44	68				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	88
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	91%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	69
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

The performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of students with disabilities demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Progress monitoring data reflects improvement for ELA and mathematics at all grade levels.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring.

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate 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.

Professional development will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support; and expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Mulholland (chris_mulholland@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Student owned progress monitoring
 Low 30% Monitoring
 High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
 Low Level 3 Acceleration
 Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
 Tutoring
 See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible Chris Mulholland (chris_mulholland@scps.k12.fl.us)

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.

The School Leadership Team will regularly review disaggregated discipline data to monitor the effectiveness of strategies and interventions, measure progress, identify patterns, determine root causes of discipline disparities in order to guide planning and decision-making.

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.

Goals for building a Positive School Culture at Goldsboro: 1. Increase awareness of positive character traits to facilitate mutual respect between students. 2. Enhance staff-to-student relationships in order to increase student achievement. 3. Strengthen teacher and staff relationships in order to build collaboration and increase school morale. Goldsboro Elementary Magnet School is continually addressing and evaluating the school climate. A school climate team is made up of teachers, administrators, and at least one parent will continue to meet to revise and refine our school-wide positive behavior and expectations plan and support. Students will continue to recite the GEMS Star pledge each morning. Through our school-wide Positive Behavior Support initiatives, teachers and staff continue to hand out Astro Bucks and Astronaut Rewards for acts representing good character and following GEMS expectations.

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

School Climate/PBS Committee at Goldsboro: Dr. Mulholland, Principal- School Climate Liason Mrs. Houle, Assistant Principal- PBS Committee Liason Mr. Pagan, Behavior Interventionist - Communicator Mrs. Beverly - Kindergarten Teacher Mrs. Blaney - 1st Grade Teacher Ms. Hope - 2nd Grade Teacher Mrs. Archie- 3rd Grade Teacher Mrs. Palmer - 4th Grade Teacher Mrs. Christiansen- 5th Grade Teacher Rhoda Richardson- Parent Kelly Koons - Parent