

Sarasota County Schools

# Gocio Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Gocio Elementary School

3450 GOCIO RD, Sarasota, FL 34235

[www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio](http://www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio)

### Demographics

**Principal: Steven Royce**

Start Date for this Principal: 9/10/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (42%) 2014-15: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota County School Board.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Gocio Elementary School

3450 GOCIO RD, Sarasota, FL 34235

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Royce, Steven	Principal	Mr. Royce is responsible as the instructional leader of the school, creating a positive school culture, creating a long-term plan for student academic success, cultivating leadership in others, managing people, data, and processes, and communicating with families and community regarding on-goings at Gocio Elementary.
Kocur, Heidi	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team lead responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading team effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices.
Dutkiewicz, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team lead responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading team effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices.
Annicelli, Marya	Assistant Principal	Primarily responsible as an co-instructional leader (alongside principal) of the school. Directly responsible to support the principal and operate in a cohesive way. Works with teachers through PD and coaching to implement research based best practices. Responsible for discipline of school and communication with families.
Baldwin, Amy	Teacher, K-12	ESOL liaison responsible for managing ELL students, LEP plans, ESOL paras and working with classroom teachers to provide interventions specific to student needs.
Gambill, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Title I teacher and writing coach responsible for implementing small group intervention in the area of ELA. Direct work/planning with grade level teachers to support classroom goals.
dromgool, shannon	Teacher, K-12	ESE liaison responsible for ESE students, IEP plans, Resource and self contained teachers. Works extensively with families to ensure academic and behavioral supports are in place that meet the specific needs of their child.
Wasley, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team lead responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading team effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices.
Hodges, Rana	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team lead responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading team effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices.
Diveley, Brandy	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team lead responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading team effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices.



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Magyar, Anne	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and team lead responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading team effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices.

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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	94	88	84	101	91	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567
Attendance below 90 percent	4	14	5	11	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	8	17	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	4	18	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	4	13	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	1	19	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

59

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/11/2019

### Prior Year - 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	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 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	1	1	2	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

**Prior Year - 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	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 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	1	1	2	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### 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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	68%	57%	44%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	62%	58%	61%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	53%	53%	45%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	73%	63%	54%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	67%	62%	69%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	53%	51%	46%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	65%	53%	46%	64%	51%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	94 (0)	88 (0)	84 (0)	101 (0)	91 (0)	109 (0)	567 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 (16)	14 (10)	5 (16)	11 (8)	11 (14)	4 (10)	49 (74)
One or more suspensions	1 (11)	1 (8)	3 (11)	2 (17)	6 (12)	7 (16)	20 (75)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (5)	8 (3)	17 (5)	18 (2)	10 (6)	53 (21)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	18 (46)	24 (37)	27 (36)	73 (119)

**Grade Level Data**

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	70%	-27%	58%	-15%
	2018	45%	68%	-23%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	67%	-13%	58%	-4%
	2018	46%	67%	-21%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	60%	68%	-8%	56%	4%
	2018	45%	66%	-21%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	73%	-20%	62%	-9%
	2018	56%	72%	-16%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	72%	-4%	64%	4%
	2018	54%	71%	-17%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	61%	70%	-9%	60%	1%
	2018	53%	72%	-19%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	65%	-21%	53%	-9%
	2018	38%	67%	-29%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

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	21	37	51	28	48	46	12				
ELL	43	54	61	58	75	71	25				
BLK	39	56	50	49	71	69	39				
HSP	51	55	59	61	72	60	36				
MUL	63	69		63	77						
WHT	70	67		74	76		60				
FRL	50	56	57	59	72	61	41				
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				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
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	58
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	68
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	69
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

For the 2018-19 school year, the data component that had the lowest performance was our SWD group. Currently this group was at 35% proficiency and well below grade level averages. Contributing factors included significant instructional turnover in the room (with 4 different instructors) and serious behavioral concerns that impacted instructional time and resources.

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

For overall data analysis, the only areas that showed decline were grade 3 ELA achievement from 45% to 43%. During the 2019 school year we had 4 of the 6 teachers new to an FSA tested grade

level. These teachers had to quickly learn new standards and test specs and rigor for the grade level. One of these teachers was new to Florida as well. In a further analysis, the only sub group that experienced declines was our multi-race sub group in both ELA and math. Most of these declines were minimal, for example 77% learning gains in math to 75%, but we will examine this group closely this coming school year to ensure increases in proficiency and learning gains.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

In analyzing the state averages compared to Gocio's data, the area that has the largest gap is currently Grade 3 ELA. Again, during the 2019 school year we had 4 of the 6 teachers new to an FSA tested grade level. These teachers had to quickly learn new standards and test specs and rigor for the grade level. One of these teachers was new to Florida as well and had to learn Florida standards as well as resources available for their students.

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

We had multiple data areas that showed significant improvement. Grade 5 ELA increased by 15% proficiency, from 45% to 60% and were 4% above the state average. At this grade level we added a Title 1 teacher to specifically focus on student skill gaps and pull small groups daily. At grade 4 we increased math proficiency by 14% and again were 4% points above the state average. At grade 4 we added a Title 1 math interventionist who worked directly with the teachers to pull small math groups daily. We also infused a math fluency program to help with our basic math skills that were lacking. In examining sub groups, our SWD group increased from 9% proficient in ELA to 21% and showed a 22% gain in the lowest quartile. Our ESE resource teacher began extensively pushing in and planning with grade level teams to help with students on ELA strategies throughout the day.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

In reflecting on our EWS data two areas continue to be a concern. Gocio's attendance and students who are below the 90th percentile attendance impacts a students ability to access daily instruction. In addition, we have multiple students at grades 3,4,5 who are still below level (level 1 on FSA ELA and Math).

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

1. SWD proficiency and LG
2. Grade 3 ELA and Math
3. lowest quartile LG

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Students with Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	Currently our SWD sub group continues to perform significantly below other groups at Gocio. While we demonstrated significant gains in ELA, from 9% to 21%, it is still significantly below our ELA proficiency of 54%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the end of the 2020 school year, there will be a 4% gain in SWD in ELA from 21% to 25% in proficiency.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	SWD are in the general education classroom as much as possible for core instruction. We have tailored our ESE resource schedule to provide as much consistent support as possible as well as have a full time Title I interventionist who works with this group of students on a daily basis.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Last year our SWD, while still not proficient; the strategies we utilized last year resulted in a 12 point increase. In examining this gain and the strategies we used last year, we strongly feel that what we are doing is working for our SWD and continued time will continue to increase proficiency.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SWD schedules and resources to be tailored for as much mainstream core instruction as possible</li> <li>2. SWD in intervention groups on a daily/weekly basis focused on skill gap areas</li> <li>3. SWD to be able to participate in after school tutoring</li> <li>4. Continual monitoring of SWD data through district benchmark tests and iReady data</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	shannon dromgool (shannon.dromgool@sarasotacountyschools.net)



#2	
<b>Title</b>	Grade 3 ELA and math
<b>Rationale</b>	Our grade 3 students continue to perform at lower levels of proficiency compared to overall school average. Our school wide ELA proficiency was 54% during the 2018-19 school year, while grade 3 was 43%. In addition our math proficiency at grade 3 is below the overall school wide average as well. Grade 3 math proficiency was 53% while school average was 61%.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the end of the 2020 school year, there will be a 4% gain in grade 3 ELA from 43% to 47% in proficiency. In Math there will be a 4% gain in grade 3 math from 53% to 57%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In analyzing our grade 3 ELA data, data over the last few year shows minimal growth or slight declines as in last year. Last year, 4 of the 6 teachers were brand new. This year having only one new teacher to the grade will allow for consistency and the ability to plan deeper according to the standards. Specific strategies will include continued PD in standards, cluster based planning and assessments, additional support for our grade 3 students in the form of a Title I interventionist.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Data at grade 4 and grade 5 have used these strategies over the last two years and have steadily and consistently shown academic gains. With a solid instructional staff at grade 3, we feel confident that these strategies will produce gains for our grade 3 students.
Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PD in ELA standards</li> <li>2. Common planning for cluster assessments and lesson planning</li> <li>3. Title I interventionist for small group instruction</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Lowest quartile ELA and Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Both areas of our lowest quartile in ELA and Math showed gains. In ELA we saw an 11% increase and in math we saw a 28% increase. However, in reviewing this data our lowest quartile is still significantly behind other students.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	By the end of the 2020 school year, there will be a 4% gain in lowest quartile ELA from 58% to 62% and in lowest quartile math from 59% to 63% of the students demonstrating gains.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Marya Annicelli (marya.annicelli@sarasotacountyschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our lowest quartile students need to be presented with material in a variety of formats including small group instruction, additional time, and a variety of strategies. We have seen success in working with our Title I interventionists in focusing on skill gaps that each individual students has and providing quality targeted small group instruction to fill these gaps.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our lowest quartile students are those students who academically are struggling in significant ways, continued intervention and direct progress monitoring of them is critical. This group of students has historically struggled and is need of quality and regular intervention to meet their needs.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear identification of our lowest 25%</li> <li>2. Daily intervention in ELA and math with Title I interventionist</li> <li>3. Regular progress monitoring of specific data points for students with strategies specific to needs</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Marya Annicelli (marya.annicelli@sarasotacountyschools.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

School wide priorities:

- 1) Attendance- Weekly recognition of students with regular attendance. Directly tied into our PBS plan. Attendance is monitored weekly and rewarded. In addition using the Early warning indicator report, any student that is below the 90th percentile will meet with our social worker to develop an attendance contract and determine how to improve their attendance.
- 2) Behavior-Each staff participated in CHAMPS training at our pre-planning week. In addition we had 15 staff members who participated in an in depth book study on CHAMPS and are leading each PD/faculty meeting this school year.

## 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 Schoolwide Improvement Plan 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 works diligently to build long lasting positive relationships with families at our school. Every year we have our Meet the Teacher and Open House and Title I night. Both of these events are encouraged for families to get to know their teacher, staff, and culture of Gocio. In addition we have monthly school newsletters that are sent home in English and Spanish. We regularly update our website, marquee, and send home Connect Ed messages to ensure that families are up to date on school events. Gocio utilizes our home school compact to establish clear expectations of roles with families, students, and school. In addition during our first quarter we have a parent teacher conference week to update families on their students academic progress. Throughout the year we host a variety of evening events to connect parents to the larger school environment.

**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.**

This past year we had a Kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade transition program available to every incoming Kindergarten, 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade student. The program ran M-Thursdays from 8:30-1:30 and worked with students on K readiness skills, 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade students on reading and math. In addition we had a full STEAM program for all grade levels that was very intentionally planned out to integrate quality science, math, art and engineering lessons that were hands on for our students. We worked with feeder VPK programs to identify students who might attend for our K group, as well as continued activities with our pre-k program here for our students to transition effectively to our K classes. 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 three 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. Our General Education 4 year old pre-k program is in its 3rd year 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 strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

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. This school year our Title I teachers are directly aligned with certain grade level times and schedules to be able to maximize instructional and small group time with students. These schedules are aligned to maximize instruction and provide remediation and enrichment for identified students, above and beyond daily instructional lessons delivered by each classroom teacher. This

targeted small group instruction was instrumental last year in our gains last year.

-In grade 3, our Reading Recovery teachers work with our retained third grade students as well as students who are identified as coming into grade 3 behind.

-In grade 4 and grade 5 our interventionists work with each grade level teacher and specific students who are identified as our lowest quartile and determine specific strategies for each of these students that are focused on their needs and the goals that they each have.

Each of our support staff 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 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.**

Gocio's leadership team works with team leads at each grade level and support staff to examine school wide data to determine each grade level needs. This is not a one time activity. Over the summer when school wide data comes out, school leadership teams meet to determine what practices worked and what should be implemented for the coming school year. Quarterly data conferences with teams are held to determine how students are progressing and what additional needs or resources each team may have.

Summer: school wide data analysis with admin team, team leads, and support staff

Pre-plan week: teams look at individual team and class data and determine master scheduling, interventions, and resources

Q1-4: CPTs weekly to determine grade level needs, student progression and evaluation of any pertinent data points such as iReady, district benchmark data. Analysis of this data leads to discussion of team needs and how resources are allocated

Quarterly: Data meetings with grade levels and with support staff to determine how grade level data, lowest quartile and individual students are performing. Resources, support, schedules can be adjusted based on these conversations and analysis

These meetings truly occur throughout the year both in formalized and more informal settings. The goal is to ensure students are getting what they need and that teachers have the resources and time to deliver quality instruction.

**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. Two years ago 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. This is a critical component for our students to understand higher educational opportunities that are available to them. 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, this program has expanded for all 2nd, 3rd, and 4th graders. We have had multiple parent meetings to inform and educate our families and staff on this program that includes students having the opportunity to earn money towards a 529 college savings plan based on academic work that they do. 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

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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities</b>				<b>\$74,813.94</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000	100-Salaries	0261 - Gocio Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$74,813.94
			<i>Notes: Resource teacher will provide individual/small group instruction and intervention support to at-risk students.</i>			
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Grade 3 ELA and math</b>				<b>\$189,823.95</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000	100-Salaries	0261 - Gocio Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$76,196.63
			<i>Notes: Resource teacher will provide individual/small group instruction and intervention support to at-risk students in the area of math.</i>			
	5000	100-Salaries	0261 - Gocio Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$113,627.32
			<i>Notes: Reading Recovery/Resource teacher will provide individual/small group instruction and intervention support to at-risk students in the area of ELA.</i>			
<b>3</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Lowest quartile ELA and Math</b>				<b>\$157,567.12</b>
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5000	100-Salaries	0261 - Gocio Elementary School			\$74,426.17
			<i>Notes: Resource teacher will provide individual/small group instruction in ELA/Writing, as well as intervention support for at-risk students, specifically our lowest quartile students.</i>			
	5000	100-Salaries	0261 - Gocio Elementary School			\$83,140.95
			<i>Notes: Data teacher/support will provide RTI intervention support and data analysis/coordination and support for at-risk students, specifically our lowest quartile students.</i>			
<b>Total:</b>						<b>\$422,205.01</b>