

Sarasota County Schools

Gocio Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Gocio Elementary School

3450 GOCIO RD, Sarasota, FL 34235

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio

Demographics

Principal: Steven Royce

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	11
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Gocio Elementary School

3450 GOCIO RD, Sarasota, FL 34235

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/gocio

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

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

As a school staff, we embrace the district's mission of "Working as One for the Success of All."

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	Position 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.
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. Responsible for observation, evaluation, and coaching of teachers. Supports and oversees the ESE programming at Gocio. Works with teachers through PD and coaching to implement research based best practices. Responsible for discipline of school and communication with families.
Diveley, Brandy	Instructional Coach	Brandy supports instructional development of teachers at Gocio. She leads, coaches, and helps implement progress monitoring of all students. Brandy models instructional strategies, pulls small groups when needed, implements PD for teachers and serves as a link between district initiatives and school implementation.
dromgool, shannon	Administrative Support	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.
Baldwin, Amy	Administrative Support	ESOL liaison responsible for managing ELL students, LEP plans, ESOL paras and working with classroom teachers to provide interventions specific to student needs.
Ellis, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and reading recovery coach responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading teams effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices in the area of reading.
Wasley, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Classroom teacher and reading recovery coach responsible for instruction and management of class as well as communicating and leading team effectively through collaboration and research based instructional practices in the area of reading.
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.

Name	Position 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.
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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, 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

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

605

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

4

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	86	81	95	94	83	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	45	38	42	44	43	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	257
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	14	26	38	37	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155

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	14	25	38	35	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	0	4	7	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				54%	68%	57%	45%	66%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	62%	58%	54%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	53%	53%	47%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	73%	63%	55%	72%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	67%	62%	59%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	53%	51%	31%	51%	47%
Science Achievement				45%	65%	53%	38%	66%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	70%	-27%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	67%	-13%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	68%	-8%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	73%	-20%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	72%	-4%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	70%	-9%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	65%	-21%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Gocio utilizes a variety of progress monitoring tools to determine how students are progressing. I Ready is used to monitor students in the areas of reading and math. In addition to these tools, during the 21-22 school year, students will be monitoring through district wide progress monitoring tools in reading measuring students fluency, reading comprehension, and other fundamental components of reading. In science, district science benchmark tools will be used to ensure students are mastering standards. In the spring, all students in grades 3-5 take the statewide assessment, FSA which serves as an indicator of expectations met for each grade level. For this particular section, IReady was the tool used for sub groups and overall progress monitoring data by grade level.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	30	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	45	84
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	38
	English Language Learners	5	19	55
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2	25	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	31	76
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	25
	English Language Learners	5	5	52

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	33	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	25	63
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	13
	English Language Learners	0	13	39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12	22	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	20	61
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	33
	English Language Learners	0	7	29
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	43	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	29	45
	Students With Disabilities	14	25	24
	English Language Learners	8	25	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	28	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	17	45
	Students With Disabilities	5	15	22
	English Language Learners	0	8	21

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	27	37	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	48	56
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	13
	English Language Learners	8	24	46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	42	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	32	48
	Students With Disabilities	3	13	29
	English Language Learners	8	28	41
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	25	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	31	51
	Students With Disabilities	6	15	12
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	23	31	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	38	55
	Students With Disabilities	6	9	21
	English Language Learners	20	18	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	n/a	n/a	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	29
	Students With Disabilities	n/a	n/a	83
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	8

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	21	35	40	22	23	17	24				
ELL	36	47	77	46	43		19				
BLK	26	21		38	16		29				
HSP	44	46	63	48	37	36	27				
MUL	47			41							
WHT	62	68		50	32		48				
FRL	41	44	59	44	28	25	29				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	344

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	47
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	44
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	52
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

In evaluating Gocio's data, not only through the lenses of progress monitoring, but through summative FSA data there are certain trends that need to be addressed in content as well as subgroups. The 2021 year showed a significant decline in proficiency across the board in reading, math, and science for Gocio students in all grade levels. Most concerning was a steady decline in math proficiency as well as science. The area that suffered the most was learning gains, especially in math with a 43% decrease from the 2019 school year. Our lowest quartile in math learning gains mirrored these losses as well with a 35% decrease. At each grade level in IReady (especially our primary grades), math growth as well as proficiency rates has either remained stagnant or experienced vast decreases. This is a school wide systemic concern that is hindering proficiency at intermediate grade levels.

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

In looking at progress monitoring data as well as summative FSA data, Gocio's math scores demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. In both proficiency (a 14% decrease), as well as learning gains (a 43% decrease), math scores were alarmingly low. Due to incredibly low scores at the primary level over the last two years, this seems to be a concern school wide that will have to be addressed through a variety of measures.

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

There have been a variety of contributing factors that have led to gaps in student achievement in all areas, but certainly math skills. For the last two years due to Covid, Gocio has been unable to have our Summer Learning Academy (SLA) which was critical in our increasing proficiency scores in prior years. As a Title I school with almost 90% free and reduced lunch, summer instruction reinforcing math and reading skills has been an important factor to allow for more time for instruction and foundational skills. In addition, during Covid students lost quality direct instruction for over three months of school. When we were able to return, Gocio experienced an massive increase in absent rates with students out sick or required quarantines. All of these factors have impacted students significantly.

To address this improvement, students at Gocio need time with skills that have had significant losses. We are hopeful that summer instruction can occur again to allow students the additional time that they need. With quality instruction in the morning and hands on exploration in the afternoon, this time is critical to reinforce and enrich our students. In addition, additional support for small group instruction focusing on intervention areas would greatly help with specific deficits students have.

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

For the 2021 Spring assessment, the area that improved the most was the lowest quartile learning gains which remained constant. Every other area decreased.

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

Due to the fact that there were no true gains, the impact of covid, missing instruction, absent students, over three months of online learning, and no summer learning; unfortunately these factors outweighed any contributing factors we had in place. The stagnant of the reading proficiency rather than decrease could be attributed to the increase in small group instruction with interventionists that we added to the intermediate grade levels.

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

There are a multitude of strategies that will be needed to accelerate learning and increase learning gains:

- small group instruction
- additional time with students in tutoring sessions after school and during teacher planning times
- reading and math interventionists
- quality instruction directly aligned to skill gaps
- science inclusion with science teacher on grade level teams to allow for more time with exploration and inquiry based learning
- additional professional development for teachers
- progress monitoring and clear instructional paths for students based on these results

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers have already participated in a variety of professional development and will continue to do so as the year progresses:

- BEST standards training
- Benchmark Advance training in new reading curriculum
- Progress monitoring training
- running records training
- data meetings with Instructional facilitator to identify learning gaps and problem solve
- Science PD

- SEL training
- MTSS training

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

Additional services will be added at multiple grade in the form of an interventionist to allow for additional small group instruction under the direction of the classroom teacher. When students have skill gaps that are a year or more below in reading and math instruction, it is critically important that these skills are addressed as well as the content that they have to know at their respective grade level. In order to to that as well as ensure continuity of instruction, additional support will be pushed in the classroom. This will allow for frequent and impactful small groups for students on a regular basis.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data shows a clear need for additional work with our instructional practice relative to math. Both math proficiency as well as math learning gains experienced significant decreases with all students in each subgroup. As a result, it is critically important that we address both student gaps in math skills as well as teacher instruction in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	By the year 2022, there will be a 4% increase in math proficiency from 47% to 51%. In addition math learning gains will increase from 30 to 34%.
Monitoring:	Math will be monitored in a variety of ways. I ready as well as additional progress monitoring tools will be used to monitor math instruction throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Additional professional development and vertical conversations will happen for math instruction led by our instructional facilitator. Teachers will work collaboratively with our instructional facilitator to examine grade level and specific class data and identify areas of concern in math. Specific, direct, and targeted instruction will occur in these areas. In addition grade level interventionists and resource teachers will push into classrooms to allow for small group instruction to occur daily.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With covid, students experienced significant instructional losses. Time did not stop. Students have to be instructed at current grade level standards and be re-taught areas that they missed or did not master from previous years. In order for this to occur, teachers must truly understand exactly the gaps their students have, instruct in targeted ways to these areas, and have additional resources to provide the small group time students will need to catch up on these skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted PD and data conversations at each grade levels.

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

additional interventionists at each grade level.

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

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Currently our lowest quartile is struggling to make learning gains. In math only 24% showed a years worth of growth. In reading, it was better at 58%, but this is still lower than what we want to see. We know from dissecting the data of our lowest 25% of students in grade 3,4,and 5 that these students fall into multiple ESSA subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	In regards to expected growth with our lowest quartile, In the area of reading and math we would hope to see a minimum of a 4% growth in each of these areas. That would increase our math lowest quartile learning gains from 24% making gains to 28%. While we expect higher, we know from current progress monitoring that we have significant skill gaps that we have to address. In reading, we expect our lowest quartile to continue to make gains and would anticipate learning gains increase from 58% to 62%.
Monitoring:	We have already determined using FSA data as well as the district dashboard what students fall into our lowest quartile. The vast majority of these students fall into one of our ESSA subgroups. Teachers have examined the specific student data from their class paying careful attention to the LQs. Each of these students are receiving additional interventions in needed academic areas on a daily basis. In addition, constant progress monitoring will take place with each of these students to determine growth in each area and any additional interventions or support that would need to occur.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steven Royce (steven.royce@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Each of these students have been provided with additional interventions and small group instruction through their teacher as well as an interventionists that are targeting the specific areas that each student is struggling with. In addition, each of the students families have been notified and provided with additional resources and strategies that can be used at home.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students have significant gaps in instruction that have occurred as a result of many factors; absenteeism, covid and online instruction, direct and explicit instruction must occur so that each specific area of deficit can be addressed. By providing an interventionist, the teacher or support person is able to provide daily individualized instruction for students.

Action Steps to Implement

- Students identified as LQ
- Teacher teams and administration examined areas of deficit and current progress monitoring scores
- Interventionist added to grades 3,4,5 to offer specific and small group support for students

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data shows a clear need for additional work with our instructional practice relative to ELA. Both ELA proficiency as well as ELA learning gains are still well below district averages with all students in each subgroup. As a result, it is critically important that we address both student gaps in ELA skills as well as teacher instruction in this area. In addition with new standards (BEST standards), as well as a new ELA curriculum teachers will need additional guidance, professional development, and modeling from instructional specialists.

Measurable Outcome: Although ELA learning gains outperformed math, it was still below district gains as well as realistic gains the school has made in the past. At 48% overall reading learnings gains, 58% for the lowest quartile in gains, and a total proficiency of 45%, there is significant room for our school to improve. With effective strategies, targeted and high quality instruction we would expect to see improvements of:

ELA proficiency from 45% to 49%

ELA learning gains from 48% to 52%

ELA learning gains in the lowest quartile from 58% to 62%

Monitoring: ELA progress will be monitored through a variety of ways to ensure students academic success. Students will participate in district wide progress monitoring. These assessments will be administered by the classroom teacher and discussed at data chats. Interventionists are assigned to tested grade levels to work directly with the teacher to allow for additional small group instruction. Administration attends all data chats and helps to monitor academic progress monitoring data to guide instructional conversations.

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

Evidence-based Strategy: In the area of ELA we are working as a staff on instructional professional development with our new series, Benchmark. In addition teachers are participating in progress monitoring trainings, and working with an Instructional coach on best practices in the area of reading. We have also contracted with an interventionist at each grade level to allow for additional small group time with targeted instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: With covid, students experienced significant instructional losses. Time did not stop. Students have to be instructed at current grade level standards and be re-taught areas that they missed or did not master from previous years. In ELA we have seen a significant decrease in students basic skills such as phonics and phonemic awareness. In order for teachers to be able to remediate such significant gaps in foundational skills. they must truly understand exactly the gaps their students have, instruct in targeted ways to these areas, and have additional resources to provide the small group time students will need to catch up on these skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Work with teachers for ELA PD in multiple areas: new standards, new Benchmark curriculum, progress monitoring.

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

Progress monitor and data conversations and instructional next steps for growth.

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

Interventionist assigned to each grade level to allow for facilitation of more small group within each classroom.

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

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus	Gocio's ESE students make up the majority of our students in our lowest quartile. In examining their summative data (FSA) as well as their initial progress monitoring data, the subgroup remains significantly behind grade level expectations.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	In examining the school wide data for our ESSA subgroup (ESE students), as measured by the state were 35% proficient in ELA. This is below the Federal standard of 41%. Gocio would like to see an increase of proficiency to 41%.
Monitoring:	ELA progress for our ESSA subgroup of ESE students will be monitored through a variety of ways to ensure students academic success. Students will participate in district wide progress monitoring. These assessments will be administered by the classroom teacher and discussed at data chats. Interventionists are assigned to tested grade levels for both our our self-contained classrooms to work directly with the teacher to allow for additional small group instruction. Administration attends all data chats and helps to monitor academic progress monitoring data to guide instructional conversations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Each of these students have been provided with additional interventions and small group instruction through their teacher as well as an interventionists that are targeting the specific areas that each student is struggling with. In addition, each of the students families have been notified and provided with additional resources and strategies that can be used at home. Each of the students have individual goals specific to their academic progress that the classroom teacher regularly meets and updates the family on.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students have significant gaps in instruction that have occurred as a result of many factors; absenteeism, covid and online instruction, direct and explicit instruction must occur so that each specific area of deficit can be addressed. By providing an interventionist, the teacher or support person is able to provide daily individualized instruction for students.

Action Steps to Implement

- Students identified as LQ
- Teacher teams and administration examined areas of deficit and current progress monitoring scores
- Interventionist added to grades 3,4,5 to offer specific and small group support for students

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In examining the resource SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Gocio was in the green (or low risk) area in each of the monitored areas, significantly below statewide averages for areas of concern. In examining our own school wide data, there are areas of concern that need to be addressed. Absenteeism continues to be a major concern for Gocio resulting in significant instructional losses. To date this school year, each grade level has already had over 30 students in their respective grades miss more than two days of school, For students who are already behind, this is significant. To combat this, we have added an additional support person at each grade level to support teachers in monitoring attendance, behavior, and academics. These support personnel will serve as the first line of defense for teachers and assist with phone calls, conferences and interventions designed to help students.

Another area of concern at the school level is physical aggression. While it does not rise to the level of a district or state wide concern, at the school level it is still a significant cause for concern regarding student behavior. This school year we have added a behavior specialist position to help teach, model, and monitor expected student behavior. We continue to be a PBS school and use CHAMPS for school wide expectations. Each of these will help create consistency in our expectations and decrease unsafe behaviors from students.

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.

Gocio builds a positive school environment with all stakeholders through a variety of avenues. Starting at the beginning of school and then throughout the school year, it is critically important that we build open lines of communication with our families. One way that we work to just that is 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. Almost every teacher uses the DoJo app to communicate with our families in a format they are comfortable with.

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. This system is used in every classroom and even extends to our bus drivers. Students can earn owl feathers that they can use to shop in our Prime store. 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. This year we created a QR code in which staff could "fill each others buckets" with specific compliments. We continue to evaluate and look at what things are going well and what things we can continue to work to improve for our staff and students.

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

There are many stakeholders that have incredible value in promoting a positive culture and environment at our school.

Our Leadership/Administration team works to ensure the overall climate and culture of our school. Ultimately responsible for safety of staff and students, PBIS team, school wide events, recognition of staff and students, and daily working to create a climate that is happy and positive.

PBIS team-Works to create school wide incentives, programs, and structures for classroom teachers and students to recognize positive behavior on campus.

Teachers-Participate in school wide training (such as CHAMPS) and are responsible for maintaining a positive classroom environment. Responsible for modeling expectations and communicating with families on a regular basis school and class events.

Students-Responsible to following expectations and creating environments on campus that are safe and welcoming for our all.

Families-Supporting and reinforcing the school and teacher in structures and expectations taught at school.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Gocio Elementary School	Other		\$0.00
			<i>Notes: In order to provide for additional interventionists and instructional support, we have allocated our Jumpstart funds to hire individuals who can offer small group instruction in the area of math.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	5100	100-Salaries	0261 - Gocio Elementary School	Other		\$0.00
			Notes: In order to provide for additional interventionists and instructional support, we have allocated our Jumpstart funds to hire individuals who can offer small group instruction in the area of reading and math for our lowest quartile, specifically students in our ESSA subgroups who are not proficient and failed to make adequate learning gains.			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
					Total:	\$0.00