
Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 6 |
| Planning for Improvement | 9 |
| Title I Requirements | 16 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 18 |

Gocio Elementary School

3450 GOCIO RD, Sarasota, FL 34235

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 88% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 77% |

School Grades History

| | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
| Grade | C | C | C | C* |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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.

Our Mission at Gocio Elementary School is to maximize academic success and responsible citizenship of all students through our passionate commitment to excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Gocio Elementary School community values all children and is dedicated to nurturing and challenging students to reach their maximum learning potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Royce, Steven | Principal |
| Kocur, Heidi | Teacher, K-12 |
| Dutkiewicz, Michael | Teacher, K-12 |
| Annicelli, Marya | Assistant Principal |
| Baldwin, Amy | Teacher, K-12 |
| Gambill, Amanda | Teacher, K-12 |
| dromgool, shannon | Teacher, K-12 |
| anderson, lori | Teacher, K-12 |
| Wasley, Laura | Teacher, K-12 |
| Hodges, Rana | Teacher, K-12 |
| Diveley, Brandy | Teacher, K-12 |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Gocio's Team Leaders are an integral part of our shared decision making team. The administration engages grade level curriculum leaders to provide quality lesson plan designs, curriculum mapping and implementation of the state standards. Administration meets with grade level curriculum leaders monthly to discuss important instructional issues facing grade levels, best practices, and progress monitoring of student data at every grade level. In addition, significant time is spent on detailed data discussions so that members understand school grade, but individual data of every student on their team. Grade levels meet weekly during their common planning time, under the facilitation of the curriculum leader to conduct professional discussions on curriculum, data, and lesson design and interventions for struggling learners. Monthly meetings also include best practices utilizing the book High Expectations for Teaching by John Saphier so that all leaders are up to date on instructional strategies that have the most impact.

Specific roles and responsibilities:

Mr. Steve Royce, Principal-Administrative Support and Decision Making

Mrs. Marya Annicelli, Asst. Principal-Administrative Support and Decision Making
Curriculum/Team Leaders- Representatives for respected grade levels

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 | 10 | 16 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| One or more suspensions | 11 | 8 | 11 | 17 | 12 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 37 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | | 12 |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |

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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 1 | 2 | 1 | 24 | 26 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 |

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 10/3/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 31 | 26 | 20 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 11 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment-math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

Year 2016-17 - 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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 31 | 26 | 20 | 14 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 7 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 11 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 26 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment-math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 21 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

For the year 2017-18 there were 2 areas that performed the lowest. These two areas also experienced significant decline from prior year. Science continues to be a lower performing area for our school and tends to show larger decreases or increases from year to year. This area is below the state and district average. The math lowest quartile would not be considered a trend, for most years this area mirrors percentages in our other grading categories. 2017-18 experienced a significant decrease.

The two areas of concern were:

Science decreased 8% from 46% to 38%

Math lowest 25% decreased 15% from 46% to 31%

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The area that demonstrated the largest decline was Math lowest 25%. This area had a 15% decline from the prior year, from 46% to 31%.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

The data component that had the largest gap from the state average was science. The state average was 55%. Gocio's proficiency was 38%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The area that showed the most improvement was ELA Learning Gains. There was a 7% increase in this area. We are seeing steady increases in ELA due to our intermediate grades work in standards based assessments.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Over the last year Gocio has worked extensively to offer quality professional development in the area of FSA ELA tested clusters and standards. Our teachers participated in trainings once a month to have collaborative discussions and planning in this area. Teachers worked on lesson development together and created assessments that were aligned in this area.

School Data

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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 45% | 66% | 56% | 38% | 65% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 54% | 57% | 55% | 46% | 54% | 52% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 46% | 48% | 34% | 49% | 46% |
| Math Achievement | 55% | 72% | 62% | 48% | 70% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | 59% | 63% | 59% | 49% | 66% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | 51% | 47% | 47% | 50% | 46% |
| Science Achievement | 38% | 66% | 55% | 32% | 64% | 51% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 16 (31) | 10 (31) | 16 (26) | 8 (20) | 14 (14) | 10 (25) | 74 (147) |
| One or more suspensions | 11 (7) | 8 (5) | 11 (0) | 17 (1) | 12 (4) | 16 (3) | 75 (20) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (11) | 5 (2) | 3 (2) | 5 (4) | 2 (4) | 6 (2) | 21 (25) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 46 (11) | 37 (26) | 36 (10) | 119 (47) |

Grade Level Data

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 | 2018 | 45% | 68% | -23% | 57% | -12% |
| | 2017 | 37% | 71% | -34% | 58% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 46% | 67% | -21% | 56% | -10% |
| | 2017 | 45% | 69% | -24% | 56% | -11% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 45% | 66% | -21% | 55% | -10% |
| | 2017 | 48% | 66% | -18% | 53% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 56% | 72% | -16% | 62% | -6% |
| | 2017 | 46% | 71% | -25% | 62% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 54% | 71% | -17% | 62% | -8% |
| | 2017 | 53% | 73% | -20% | 64% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 53% | 72% | -19% | 61% | -8% |
| | 2017 | 59% | 70% | -11% | 57% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 38% | 67% | -29% | 55% | -17% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 | 9 | 31 | 29 | 19 | 28 | 30 | | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 52 | 52 | 41 | 50 | 32 | 19 | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 37 | | 43 | 41 | | 15 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 59 | 50 | 53 | 62 | 38 | 37 | | | | |
| MUL | 67 | 75 | | 73 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 47 | | 66 | 61 | | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 53 | 48 | 52 | 58 | 31 | 36 | | | | |

| 2017 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD | 7 | 35 | 26 | 20 | 45 | 34 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 56 | 57 | 46 | 68 | 58 | 38 | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 53 | 40 | 40 | 51 | 33 | 14 | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 61 | 52 | 55 | 72 | 53 | 49 | | | | |
| MUL | 44 | 40 | | 56 | 80 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 79 | | 65 | 76 | | 60 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 60 | 45 | 51 | 66 | 45 | 45 | | | | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title Math learning gains lowest 25%

Rationale Gocio's bottom quartile in math learning gains demonstrated a significant decrease this past year and is well below the state and district average. There was a 15 point decrease from 16-17 to 17-18. Not only is this area a significant part of school grade, but students in the bottom quartile are our students that have the furthest to go to reach proficiency.

Intended Outcome To better serve our lowest quartile, we have designated an interventionist at each of the FSA tested grades. This person works closely with each grade level to identify which students are in need of the most support based on last years data as well as progress monitoring data from this year. Our goal is to demonstrate math learning gains in our lowest quartile from 31% to 35%.

Point Person lori anderson (lori.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Action Step

Description We have indicated our team leaders as the point people for our lowest quartile. Our team leads along with our interventionist at each grade level meet, plan, and do the following:
1) Identify with administration and school wide data our lowest quartile
2) devise schedule that works with small group push in and pull out in the area of math with our lowest quartile
3) Plan together at weekly CPTs small group, skill based instruction for students in grade 3,4,& 5.

Person Responsible Laura Wasley (laura.wasley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration has regularly scheduled meetings with each teacher and interventionist to specifically plan for and review data of students. Data review includes:
1) Cluster tests
2) I Ready information

Person Responsible Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Activity #2 | |
| Title | Science |
| Rationale | Science has been a historically low area of performance for Gocio, and this past year dropped 12 percentage points, from 46% to 38%. This is significantly below the district average (by 28 points) and well below the state average (by 17 points). In looking at our subgroup data we experienced steep declines across the board. Our largest declines came from our white students, falling 13 percentage points from 60% to 47% and our ELL students who dropped from 38% to 19%. |
| Intended Outcome | To help our students with science instruction we have added a science intervention time, as well as an additional science teacher to the master schedule. With specific instruction and additional time we are hopeful that we will see an increase in our science proficiency from 38% to 42%. We have also ensured that we are looking at science standards and mastery or lack of to identify students who are receiving additional science intervention. |
| Point Person | Brittany Leavine (brittany.leavine@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | To be able to have students have additional science instruction as well as remediation in the area of science we implemented the following for 2018: 1) Added an additional science teacher to our specials rotation. This allows for students to have science instruction more frequently than in past years 2) Use science coach and work together in CPTs to determine what particular standards students are not mastering 3) Target students who are struggling with particular standards and pull them for small science intervention groups, this will include students in our lowest performing subgroups. |
| Person Responsible | Brittany Leavine (brittany.leavine@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | Both science teachers meet monthly with our grade 5 team to review science data. In addition administration reviews Science coach and benchmark data with teachers to determine next instructional strategies. |
| Person Responsible | Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Activity #3

Title ELA learning gains lowest 25%

Rationale Gocio's lowest quartile in ELA has demonstrated growth over the last few years, with an increase from 45% to 47% this past year and a 13% growth over the last two years combined. In addition this is one area that we slightly outperformed the district and are competitive with the state average. However, that is still less than 50% of our most struggling readers making growth, or putting them on pace with proficiency. Because of this, it is still critical that we maintain this as a focus area.

Intended Outcome ELA lowest quartile learning gains currently sits at 47%. Our goal for the 2018-19 school year would be 51%.

Point Person Tamara Ellis (tamara.ellis@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Action Step

Description In order to reach the lowest quartile effectively, we have put a variety in things in place for each grade level.
1) For our retained 3rd graders we are using a Reading Recovery teachers to work in small group on specific skills to help remediate the students.
2) For grade 4 and grade 5 students who are in the lowest quartile we are using our ELA interventionist to push in and help run small groups with each teacher. In addition for those students who need more are pulled in small group for additional assistance.

Person Responsible Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration has regularly scheduled meetings with each teacher and interventionist to specifically plan for and review data of students. Data review includes:
1) Cluster tests
2) I Ready information
3) Progress of students in small groups

Person Responsible Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Activity #4 | |
| Title | ELA proficiency |
| Rationale | While we have had slow increases in overall proficiency, ELA overall proficiency still is 21% below the district average, and 11% below the state average. Our current ELA proficiency is 45%. In examining of subgroup data, we are making some positive increases with subgroups, but have other areas that need to change trajectory. Our white students had the largest declines, dropping 15 percentage points, from 71% to 56%. Our multi-racial students had the largest increase, a gain of 23 percentage points, from 44% to 67%. This particular subgroup was our highest level of proficiency too. Our Hispanic students increased 4% and our SWD increased 2%. Our black subgroup dropped 3%, from 32% proficient to 29%. |
| Intended Outcome | To increase overall ELA proficiency to 49%. |
| Point Person | Marya Annicelli (marya.annicelli@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <p>Last year Gocio worked extensively on Cluster assessments and standards based planning. In year two we plan to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Continue to have monthly PD sessions with grade level teams to work on common assessments and quality lessons. 2) Continue to have on-going training with iReady and standards based assessments as well as understanding progress monitoring data from iReady. 3) Strategically schedule intervention support for our most struggling students, including those from our lowest performing subgroups. This infusion of support also allows grade level teachers to work with those students more individually that are at or approaching proficiency. 4) Regularly scheduled data meetings with administration and support staff to address specific needs in the classroom and plan for additional support. |
| Person Responsible | Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <p>To ensure that we are monitoring there are a variety of behaviors/actions we are responsible for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Regular walkthroughs and observations in all classrooms. There is a shared spreadsheet between the admin to ensure that we are in classrooms frequently and providing feedback. 2) Regularly scheduled data meetings with all grade 3,4,5 teachers to ensure we are providing supports to teachers. This provides a frequent "check in" not only for progress of students but ways we can support our teachers. 3) Regular review of data points: i Ready, cluster assessments, and standards based assessments. |
| Person Responsible | Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Activity #5

Title Math proficiency

Rationale Math proficiency year to year tends to be a higher area for Gocio. This psst year math proficiency was 55%, a 1% increase over the year before. However, 55% proficiency is no where near where we want our students to be performing. The district average is 72%, so we are well below the average in Sarasota County. In examining our subgroup data we did not experience the large declines in subgroups as in ELA, but still have areas that need additional attention. Our largest decrease in math proficiency came from our ELL group, at a 5% decline. Our multi-racial subgroup however, saw a huge jump of a 17% increase.

Intended Outcome Math proficiency will increase from 55% to 59%.

Point Person Laura Wasley (laura.wasley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Action Step

Description We have indicated our team leaders as the point people for our lowest quartile. Our team leads along with our interventionist at each grade level meet, plan, and do the following:
1) Identify with administration and school wide data our lowest quartile as well as students who are approaching or at proficiency. This includes students who are in our lowest performing subgroup areas.
2) devise schedule that works with small group push in and pull out in the area of math with our lowest quartile; allowing our grade level teacher to run targeted small groups with our students who are approaching proficiency
3) Plan together at weekly CPTs small group, skill based instruction for students in grade 3,4,& 5.

Person Responsible lori anderson (lori.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description Administration has regularly scheduled meetings with each teacher and interventionist to specifically plan for and review data of students. Data review includes:
1) Cluster tests
2) I Ready information

Person Responsible Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Activity #6 | |
| Title | ELA Learning gains |
| Rationale | Current ELA learning gains was 54% to the 2018-18 school year. This is just below the state and district average. However, to continue to work towards higher levels of proficiency for all students, we must increase and expect our students to achieve learning gains. |
| Intended Outcome | Our current ELA learning gains was 54%. Our goal for the coming school year is 59%. |
| Point Person | Laura Wasley (laura.wasley@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <p>In order to reach the all students effectively, we have put a variety in things in place for each grade level.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) For our retained 3rd graders we are using a Reading Recovery teachers to work in small group on specific skills to help remediate the students. In addition we are using support staff to push into each grade 3 classroom to offer a level of support for all students so we can run targeted small groups based on skill. 2) For grade 4 and grade 5 students we are using our ELA interventionist to push in and help run small groups with each teacher. In addition for those students who need more are pulled in small group for additional assistance. 3) Continued use of i Ready and IXL to target specific skills. 4) Creation and refinement of cluster tests that are based on each specific standard to be able to work skill specific with every student. 5) Special area teachers push in to grade 5 to help run small groups. 6) Continued PD and planning for grade level teams outside their weekly CPT to occur monthly. |
| Person Responsible | lori anderson (lori.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <p>Administration has regularly scheduled meetings with each teacher and interventionist to specifically plan for and review data of students. Data review includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Cluster tests 2) I Ready information 3) Progress of students in small groups |
| Person Responsible | Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Activity #7

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Title | Math Learning gains |
| Rationale | Math learning gains is currently our highest performing area, with 59% of the students making a learning gain. This is at the state average and just a few points below our district average. However, 59% is not an acceptable number when we think about every student having the opportunity to grow academically in the year. |
| Intended Outcome | For the coming school year, Gocio's goal is to increase our math learning gains from 59% to 63%. That would put us on par with our district average. |
| Point Person | Brandy Diveley (brandy.diveley@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Action Step

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Description | We have indicated our team leaders as the point people for our learning gains. Our team leads along with our interventionist at each grade level meet, plan, and do the following: 1) Identify with administration and school wide data our lowest quartile and exact points that each student needs to make learning agins. 2) devise schedule that works with small group push in and pull out in the area of math with our lowest quartile and students who are in need of small group instruction. 3) Plan together at weekly CPTs small group, skill based instruction for students in grade 3,4,& 5. |
| Person Responsible | lori anderson (lori.anderson@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Description | Administration has regularly scheduled meetings with each teacher and interventionist to specifically plan for and review data of students. Data review includes: 1) Cluster tests 2) I Ready information 3) Progress of students in small groups |
| Person Responsible | Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Gocio strives to provide a variety of opportunities for families to attend school wide functions. We intentionally schedule activities at different times of the day so that families have the opportunity to attend. For example, Gocio conducts conferences and meetings at different times to meet families' needs. Our fall conference times are available to families during the day as well as evening time slots. We provide interpreters for all of our meetings and programs. All written communication is done in dual languages. We work with local organizations such as Forty Carrots to have offerings for our families that have children birth to age five. We offer ESOL and grade level parent nights, Winter Festival, Hispanic

Heritage Night, Book Fair, Movie Nights, Art Fair, our Spring Fling, ELL classes and more. Our goal this year is that a minimum of 80% of families will attend a face to face parent conference. In addition a minimum of 80% of families will attend at least one school wide function.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Gocio has 1.6 school counselors, as well as a Home School liaison(HSL). Both counselors provide small group and classroom counseling in programs such as the Civility Squad, as well as assisting with families in need. Our full time counselor is in charge of our SWST and works with other individuals to ensure academic and/or behavioral interventions are taking place for students. All of our counselors help and assist a mentoring program called Owl Eyes, which serves as a check in/check out program to ensure we are touching base frequently with students who may need more. Both counselors and our HSL are part of the larger school community, working with outside agencies to ensure regular resources for our families such as a food pantry, back pack kids program, school supplies, and other needs. In addition our counselors work with our Student Council to promote and instill leadership. We also collaborate with a local organization that partners with us providing a full time mental health counselor on site. This allows our families to have an on site resource for themselves and their child.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

This past year we had a Kindergarten, First grade, and 2nd grade transition program available to every incoming Kindergarten, First, and 2nd grade student. The program ran M-Thursdays from 8:30-1:30 and worked with students on K readiness skills and first and 2nd grade reading skills. In addition we had a camp for our students who were entering grade 3. The camp focused on STEM activities and a variety of field trips to give our students new experiences. Over 100 students participated. We worked with feeder VPK programs to identify students who might attend for our K group. In addition, our school implements a summer screening process to identify student readiness and create mixed ability classrooms using this data. Gocio also presents a Kindergarten Round-Up for incoming kindergarten students. The past two years we have partnered with Forty Carrots (a pre-k provider) to provide our families with a Partners in Play morning weekly to work with our families on birth to five skills. We also added an additional General Education 4 year old pre-k program on site due to the generosity of a local philanthropist--that makes two classes of 18 each. Students from both of these classes will feed directly into our Kindergarten next year. For our 5th grade students we ensure that we work with our local feeder middle schools for all of our grade 5 students to attend an orientation at their proposed middle school. This past year our administration met with a representative from VPK to gain insight to incoming students that may need additional services or support here during their K year.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Through data analysis of students' academic achievement, a strategic plan is designed to maximize each learning day. We have looked closely at our Title I resources and aligned them with students that are in the most need. Each of our Title I resources that are allocated to staffing are directly involved with students on a daily basis. Each teachers schedule is aligned to maximize instruction and provide remediation and enrichment for identified students, above and beyond daily instructional lessons

delivered by each classroom teacher.

-In grade 3, our Reading Recovery teachers work with our retained third grade students.

-In grade 4 and grade 5 our interventionists work with each grade level teacher and specific students who are identified as our lowest quartile.

Each of our support staff and special area teachers push in daily to work with students who are in need of additional support.

The school's administration works with and monitors this additional support personnel to assist with data management, designing and delivery of interventions for reluctant learners and researching best practices for improving student achievement with large ESOL populations.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

While Gocio serves students in grades K-5, we strive to prepare our students for the world beyond school. This past year we began a partnership with local area colleges for all 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students to visit the local universities to see what opportunities are available. In addition we have partnered with a non profit organization called Two Steps who have created 529 plans for students who work on i Ready outside of the classroom. We have had multiple parent meetings to inform and educate our families and staff on this program. In addition, we work with Sarasota Next Generation ballet program for students to potentially be afforded a full college scholarship if they continue with the program and maintain an acceptable GPA.

Part V: Budget

| | |
|---------------|---------------------|
| Total: | \$520,361.00 |
|---------------|---------------------|