

Seminole County Public Schools

Goldsboro Elementary Magnet



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	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>

Demographics

Principal: Chris Mulholland

Start Date for this Principal: 1/2/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Seminole County School Board on 10/25/2022.

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

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
Mulholland, Chris	Principal	Manage all faculty and staff at the school. Responsible for the school's academic performance and for the safety of students, faculty, and staff. Provide strategic direction for the school and cultivate a positive school climate.
Pagan, Anthony	Behavior Specialist	Works with individual students to eliminate disruptive and negative behaviors and replace them with positive behaviors and actions. Assists teachers and parents to help students who are struggling with their behavior.
Hess, Mary Lynn	Teacher, K-12	Assists with innovating our Magnet Program. Bio-Science STEM Lab Teacher.
Wakelyn, Robert	Teacher, K-12	Assists with innovating our Magnet Program. Space Lab STEM Teacher. Schoolwide technology coordinator.
Froess, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with implementing school-wide goals. Works with the school principal in serving as an instructional leader of the building staff to achieve and sustain high levels of student learning and growth. Assists in the day-to-day operations of the school.
Prather, Jennifer	Reading Coach	Provides resources and support for teachers. Collaborates with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans and analyze data. Design and lead professional development presentations and model lessons for teachers.
Nolting, Kimberly	Math Coach	Provides resources and support for teachers. Collaborates with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans and analyze data. Design and lead professional development presentations and model lessons for teachers.
Finkle, Adam	Teacher, K-12	Assists with innovating our Magnet Program. Robotics and Computer Sciences STEM Lab Teacher.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/2/2019, Chris Mulholland

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

869

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.

7

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	131	144	144	145	151	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	871
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	6	7	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	1	5	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	6	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	4	7	5	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	4	5	8	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
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

Monday 8/15/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	71%	65%	56%				64%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						57%	61%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						43%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	66%	46%	50%				62%	70%	63%
Math Learning Gains	62%						54%	66%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						29%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	69%	65%	59%				70%	62%	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	64%	67%	-3%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	65%	-2%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	62%	71%	-9%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	72%	-3%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	65%	-8%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	70%	62%	8%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

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	20	31	32	21	24	20	27				
ELL	63	75		70	63						
ASN	91	84		93	84		92				
BLK	47	60	50	34	43	32	32				
HSP	60	69	60	52	54	25	75				
MUL	46			54							
WHT	72	67	40	60	55	42	74				
FRL	52	63	51	40	44	29	51				
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				
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				

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	62
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	493

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	58
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	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
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	51
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 proficiency across grade levels
 ELA learning gains across grade levels
 Math proficiency in grades 3 and 4
 Math learning gains across grade levels"

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

L25 learning gains in Math
 Students that are high level 2 moving to proficiency
 Students that are low level 3 maintaining proficiency"

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 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Proficiency

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.

Differentiation needs to remain data-driven, focused on student needs utilizing evidence-based interventions, and implemented with fidelity. Focus on K-5 teachers collaborative planning sessions focused on target task alignment to increase purposeful core instruction."

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 focus on instructional strategies Sustainability of improvement efforts Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include support of standards based instruction across all content areas, 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.

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 Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description****and Rationale:**

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

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:

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

Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

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:

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

Lessons aligned to B.E.S.T. benchmarks at the appropriate grade 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:

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

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.

Teachers will collaborate to develop and implement engaging instructional delivery tools and strategies.

Person Responsible

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

Specific Monitoring of Low 30% with students paired with leadership team to monitor progress frequently.

Person Responsible

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

One to One Teacher Data Meetings with Administration

Person Responsible

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

Weekly Teacher PLC Meetings

Person Responsible

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

Build relationships and school support

Person Responsible

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

Individualized Data Notebooks

Person Responsible

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

Student-Led Conferences

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

Check-ins from assigned leadership team members to students and teachers

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

Sharing effective instructional practices and data analysis on a variety of student learning measures.

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

Plan for more differentiation within the core instruction

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

Ensure that instruction cultivates curiosity and incorporates communication, collaboration, critical thinking, and opportunities for students to create and explore.

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

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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.

Goldsboro Elementary works very closely with its students and families with the intent to educate one another on each other's cultures, with the end result being to create a well-rounded school culture embracing each other's differences and similarities to build positive relationships. Goldsboro/PTA holds several community events throughout the year which include: a fall social, book fairs that accompany "picnic and paperbacks", parent curriculum nights, and family nights each month. The principal and leadership team members work with local community outreach centers to develop relationships with the surrounding community members. Events, such as Teach-In, Space Day, and STEM day also gives our students and parents the opportunity to understand and embrace the mission and vision of the school. Goldsboro has two Conference Nights a year when parents are able to conference with their child's teacher on their current progress.

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

School Climate Committee at Goldsboro:
 Dr. Mulholland, Principal- School Climate Liason
 Ms. Froess, Assistant Principal- PBS Committee Liason
 Mr. Pagan, Behavior Interventionist - School Support Liason
 Ms. Shoucair- Restorative Practices Liason

Ms. Thompson - Kindergarten Teacher
Mrs. Bettinger - 1st Grade Teacher
Mrs. Turner - 2nd Grade Teacher
Mrs. Archie- 3rd Grade Teacher
Ms. Herbert - 4th Grade Teacher
Mrs. Bell-Thompson- 5th Grade Teacher
Rhoda Richardson- Parent
Rula Wakeel - Parent