

Sarasota County Schools

Gocio Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Gocio Elementary School

3450 GOCIO RD, Sarasota, FL 34235

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio

Demographics

Principal: Steven Royce

Start Date for this Principal: 6/7/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Gocio Elementary School

3450 GOCIO RD, Sarasota, FL 34235

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.
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.
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.
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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/7/2016, Steven Royce

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	80	88	93	84	99	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	7	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	5	8	3	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	2	3	0	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Wednesday 9/23/2020

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	
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

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	
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

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	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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	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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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%				
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.

ESSA Federal Index	
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%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
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%	0
English Language Learners	
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
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%	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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Keeping in mind that this data is reflective of the 18-19 school year, we will be revisiting our student and school wide data throughout the year to ensure that students are progressing as needed. 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. Currently, we have hired a full time certified teacher and have two instructional aides in the room.

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 area 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. Moving forward to the 20-21 school year, 5 of the 6 teachers have experience in a FSA tested grade level.

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?

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	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%. Our SWD group has significant needs and we need to continually examine strategies we can use that will increase their proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 school year, there will be a 4% gain in SWD in ELA from 21% to 25% in proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	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.

Action Steps to Implement

1. SWD schedules and resources to be tailored for as much mainstream core instruction as possible
2. SWD in intervention groups on a daily/weekly basis focused on skill gap areas
3. SWD to be able to participate in after school tutoring
4. Continual monitoring of SWD data through district benchmark tests and iReady data

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 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 third grade scores are below the district average.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2020 school year, there will be a 4% gain in grade 3 ELA from 43% to 47% in proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: 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 small group and one on one instruction. In addition grade 3 students who were below level were invited to participate in small group after school tutoring through GEER UP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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 Steps to Implement

1. PD in ELA standards

Person Responsible Brandy Diveley (brandy.diveley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

2. Common planning for cluster assessments and lesson planning

Person Responsible Brandy Diveley (brandy.diveley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Title I and ELL support for small group instruction

Person Responsible Brandy Diveley (brandy.diveley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our math proficiency at grade 3 is below the overall school wide average. Grade 3 math proficiency was 53% while school average was 61%. When students at third grade perform at lower levels than the rest of the school average, 4th and 5th grade have significant ground to make up.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2020 school year, there will be a 4% gain in grade 3 math from 53% to 57%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: In analyzing our grade 3 math 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 teacher and ELL support to assist with small groups. In addition grade 3 students who were below level were invited to participate in small group after school tutoring through GEER UP.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: 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 Steps to Implement

1. PD in Math standards

Person Responsible Brandy Diveley (brandy.diveley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

2. Common planning for cluster assessments and lesson planning

Person Responsible Brandy Diveley (brandy.diveley@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Title I interventionist and ELL support for small group instruction

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In evaluating our SWD data in the area of Science, as in the area of reading, they are currently performing below the grade level average. This current group of 5th graders will not have taken FSA since grade 3 and will have significant group to make up in all academic areas. While we demonstrated significant gains in ELA, from 9% to 21%, it is still significantly below our ELA proficiency of 54%. Our SWD group has significant needs and we need to continually examine strategies we can use that will increase their proficiency. I have used the SWD data in the area of ELA, as our students will have to be successful readers to be proficient on the Science test. Our Science data increased 7%, however, we are still 20 percentage points below the district proficiency in this subject area. In addition our SWD science data stood at 12% proficient which was significantly below the rest of the subgroups performance.

Measurable Outcome:

Gocio would like to see an overall increase in our science data from 45% to 49%. In addition our SWD Science proficiency to increase from 12% to 16%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brittany Leavine (brittany.leavine@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

SWD participate in Science in class and mainstream in for Science on the specials rotation. We have increased how many times students have science in specials and have created frequent standards based assessments to see what areas students need re-teaching in.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Last year we saw a significant increase in our science scores. They increased 7%. In analyzing this increase we felt as though it was a direct result of strategic scheduling, solid instructional teaching and assessing and collaborating with grade 5 and the science teacher on student progress. This same approach should be effective for our SWD.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student scheduling to ensure grade 5 has science on the wheel as a priority

Person Responsible

Brittany Leavine (brittany.leavine@sarasotacountyschools.net)

2. SWD mainstreamed into all specials classes.

Person Responsible

shannon dromgool (shannon.dromgool@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Teacher collaboration and instruction based on student assessment results.

Person Responsible

Brittany Leavine (brittany.leavine@sarasotacountyschools.net)

3. Teacher collaboration and instruction based on student assessment results.

Person Responsible

Brittany Leavine (brittany.leavine@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

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 the previous year. New staff had the opportunity to participate this year. Staff also participated in mental health/crisis/trauma training to be aware and appropriately respond to student needs. Examples of recognizing positive behavior include special seating in the cafeteria, class and grade level rewards.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Gocio builds a positive school environment with all stakeholders through a variety of means. First, 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. We work to communicate with families in their native language and use school wide programs such as Class DoJo to provide daily updates to families.

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.

For students we use a PBIS system to encourage and promote positive behavior and choices. Teachers use incentive charts and rewards, and school wide we have a variety of opportunities for students to be recognized making good choices. Students have guidance classes that work with them on social and emotional well being as well.

For volunteers and community members, Gocio has worked over the last few years to build strong partnerships in both of these areas. When able again, Gocio has a large number of volunteers that help both academically, with school functions, and financial needs of the school. Volunteers choose to come back to Gocio again and again because of the relationships that they create. Business partners are a part of our SAC, provide valuable input, and regularly attend school functions.

Gocio teachers and staff are an invaluable group of individuals that help create the culture and community here at school. They serve on SDMT and SAC and we look to them often for input and feedback. The

leadership team works daily to recognize the work teachers do through monthly "treat trolleys," certificates, honoring time, and ensuring that they have the time and resources to do their incredibly important job. In regards to remote learners, administration has been a part of every parent/teacher conference to ensure transparency in regards to grades and progress. We have monitored their grades through progress reports and will continue to do so, but are concerned in regards to full mastery of new concepts. While remote learning presents significant challenges, we are doing our best to find creative and quality practices to ensure students continue to move forward.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00