
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

West Gate K 8 School

1050 NW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wgk/>

Demographics

Principal: Jason Martin

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	62%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

West Gate K 8 School

1050 NW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wgk/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>57%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>66%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of West Gate K8 School is to ensure that all students are successful at the highest possible levels, acquire technological expertise, and become productive interdependent, and empathetic members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The core business of the West Gate learning community will be to empower students with the skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in an evolving global society. This empowerment will be achieved by engaging students in challenging work, designed by skilled educators, in a nurturing and caring environment.

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
Martin, Jason	Principal	Setting performance objectives for students and teachers. Implementing and monitoring school policies and safety protocols. Overseeing administrative tasks

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/31/2021, Jason Martin

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.*

5

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.*

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

91

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,518

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

13

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
17

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	121	134	123	153	152	152	215	237	231	0	0	0	0	1518
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	11	20	8	21	13	36	40	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	2	3	18	8	8	0	0	0	0	44
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	1	11	27	17	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	3	11	31	28	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	25	14	37	46	23	0	0	0	0	170
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	29	25	37	40	40	0	0	0	0	208
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	28	20	13	49	91	56	0	0	0	0	258

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		2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	119	122	127	132	149	150	207	209	219	0	0	0	0	1434
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	5	9	1	9	18	39	35	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	2	4	11	14	13	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	22	35	13	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	19	31	30	19	0	0	0	0	101
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	0	0	2	8	23	32	22	0	0	0	87

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		4	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	7

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	119	122	127	132	149	150	207	209	219	0	0	0	0	1434
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	5	9	1	9	18	39	35	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	2	4	11	14	13	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	22	35	13	0	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	19	31	30	19	0	0	0	0	101
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	8	23	32	22	0	0	0	0	87

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	4	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	7

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				64%	60%	61%	63%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	58%	59%	62%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	50%	54%	56%	55%	52%
Math Achievement				67%	58%	62%	71%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				60%	56%	59%	67%	57%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	46%	52%	59%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				59%	58%	56%	63%	56%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				86%	74%	78%	83%	74%	77%

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	71%	50%	21%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	48%	4%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	52%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2021					
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	47%	29%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
06	2021					
	2019	68%	47%	21%	55%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
07	2021					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2021					
	2019	57%	34%	23%	46%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	59%	46%	13%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	56%	48%	8%	48%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	85%	67%	18%	71%	14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	70%	51%	19%	61%	9%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring for K-8 was iReady Diagnostics. Science and Civics progress monitoring data was District created Unit Assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	35	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	27	44
	Students With Disabilities	29	0	0
	English Language Learners	25	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	27	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	21	31
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	22
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	30	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	25	37
	Students With Disabilities	22	18	25
	English Language Learners	14	14	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	20	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	15	34
	Students With Disabilities	6	11	33
	English Language Learners	14	29	43

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71	75	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	72	77
	Students With Disabilities	21	41	20
	English Language Learners	44	64	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78	83	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	77	84
	Students With Disabilities	38	56	59
	English Language Learners	33	64	46
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77	82	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	72	77	80
	Students With Disabilities	35	56	64
	English Language Learners	50	50	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78	78	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	72	71	78
	Students With Disabilities	35	44	50
	English Language Learners	42	42	58

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65	72	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	57	65
	Students With Disabilities	22	22	41
	English Language Learners	67	25	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75	79	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	66	66	79
	Students With Disabilities	33	39	73
	English Language Learners	78	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	73	73	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	65	58
	Students With Disabilities	46	46	39
	English Language Learners	75	25	25

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	62	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	45	58	54
	Students With Disabilities	11	17	15
	English Language Learners	15	27	27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	64	74	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	66	68
	Students With Disabilities	30	41	29
	English Language Learners	31	33	67

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	55	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	52	60
	Students With Disabilities	7	3	15
	English Language Learners	13	33	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59	65	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	63	67
	Students With Disabilities	12	31	41
	English Language Learners	36	43	46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	57	52	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	49	58
	Students With Disabilities	41	32	46
	English Language Learners	38	25	41

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62	63	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	56	58	46
	Students With Disabilities	14	21	17
	English Language Learners	43	25	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42	44	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	43	51
	Students With Disabilities	0	21	27
	English Language Learners	25	25	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42	52	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	45	46
	Students With Disabilities	11	13	11
	English Language Learners	17	13	29

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	28	45	40	37	57	46	34	37			
ELL	33	50	40	39	47	44	13	63			
ASN	52	83		54	79						
BLK	49	49	39	50	44	41	43	68	59		
HSP	59	60	47	57	45	46	56	77	65		
MUL	66	58		69	44		73				
WHT	68	65	56	65	55	50	69	72	76		
FRL	51	57	46	52	48	47	49	72	65		
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	20	41	40	33	51	56	37	50			
ELL	46	46	43	54	57	61	41				

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
ASN	64	55		82	79		83				
BLK	53	48	42	55	52	48	53	81	62		
HSP	61	58	54	66	65	68	53	84	70		
MUL	64	54		67	59		55				
WHT	73	57	52	73	60	68	65	93	80		
FRL	57	53	48	59	56	55	51	84	64		
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	20	44	43	32	52	55	26	47			
ELL	40	59	55	52	63	54		60			
ASN	81	71		71	50						
BLK	53	65	60	59	64	58	48	89	76		
HSP	64	63	58	72	67	61	68	81	80		
MUL	66	60	42	73	77	62	87		82		
WHT	66	59	53	77	68	60	67	84	83		
FRL	57	62	56	65	66	60	55	81	74		

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	58
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	579
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	42
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	67
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	57
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	62
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	64
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	54
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?

The trend data shows that ELA has a significant drop from 65% over the past three years to 56% this year. 7th grade specifically was 49%. The average in Math for the past three years was 71%. This year we are at 53%. 3rd, 4th, and 8th are our lowest. Our Science data shows three year average of 60%. Last year we were at 58%.

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

Math showed the largest decrease in performance score from 71% to 53% (18% decrease). The contributing factors for this change were specifically in 3rd, 4th, and 8th grade. ELA also showed a decrease in performance from 65% to 56% (9% decrease) in 7th grade specifically.

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

During that school year, we were under a pandemic where the majority of the students were receiving instruction virtually. Differentiation of instruction needs to be done with fidelity in order to meet the needs of those students. Small group instruction in classrooms. Teacher read-alouds, MTSS and tiered instruction, BASS testing to progress monitor.

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

ELA showed an increase from 52% in 2019 to 65% in 2021.

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

Strategically placing the students with the right teachers. Tutoring, bottom quartile students invited to after school tutoring.

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

Targeted student small group instruction, CLP's, standard-based planning, tutoring, differentiated instruction, targeting the bottom quartile for learning gains. Instruction will be embedded as part of the content for all classes using a Description comprehensive researched-based literacy model. Standards will be taught and with fidelity to assure students are getting the instruction necessary. Instruction will be rigorous, with project-based learning activities. As a result, students will gain various skills at all levels.

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.

Literacy routines, CLP facilitation, PBIS, LLI, Grade level math PD's. Implement lessons that create instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals.

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

Targeted student small group instruction, CLP's, standard-based planning, tutoring, differentiated instruction, targetting the bottom quartile for learning gains. To provide instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: West Gate K8 will continue to work to increase learning opportunities for all students. The emphasis will be the bottom 25th percentile in ELA. Students have been strategically placed in double-blocked ELA classes. Reading instruction will be embedded as part of the content for all classes using a comprehensive researched-based literacy model. Standards will be taught with fidelity to assure students are getting the instruction necessary. Instruction will be rigorous, with project-based learning activities. As a result, students will gain various skills at all levels.

Measurable Outcome: West Gate plans to achieve the number of students in ELA bottom 25th percentile to demonstrate an increase in learning gains in by 25%

Monitoring: A school-wide approach for planning and implementing Universal Design for learning across all instructional and non-instructional school contexts will be adopted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Hutchings (melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To create instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone, not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather one a school-one culture that can be customized and adjusted for all individuals

Action Steps to Implement

- 1 Teachers will be trained in LLI, B.E.S.T. Standards, BAS,
- 2. Grade Groups will be utilizing Lions Quest (6-8) and Sanford Harmony (K-5) strategies to enhance read aloud. 3. Continuous professional development and follow up coaching by the SEL Department
- 3. Training provided in B.E.S.T. Standards

Person Responsible Melissa Hutchings (melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on School Math/FSA Data, West Gate proficiency in Math was 67% which was lower by 4% from 2018. Math learning gains showed the largest decrease in performance score from 62% learning gains to 55% (7% decrease). The contributing factors for this change was specifically in 4th and 7th grade. Trend data of 4th grade cohort lagged behind overall school percentage. 7th grade had a new teacher. Teachers did not consistently collaborate rigorous lessons. Algebra in 2018 was 75%. FSA data shows that the number of students proficient in their Algebra EOC Assessment dropped by 10% percentage points. Although we still have 100% passing in Geometry, the data shows the levels of achievement decreased on their EOC Assessment compared to previous years.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students in Math bottom 25th percentile will demonstrate an increase in learning gains by 25%

Monitoring:
Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jason Martin (jason.martin@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: It is crucial that you are clear about what it is you want your students to learn during each lesson. The lesson goals clarify what you want your students to know and be able to do by the end of the lesson. Tell students what they need to know and show them how to do the things you want them to be able to do. Once you have told students what they need to know, you need to check their understanding before moving on. Summarize and provide feedback to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To implement lessons that create instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals.

Action Steps to Implement

- Rigorous lessons - raise the bar
- 2. Plan ahead using specific concepts students need to master for annual end-of-year tests and pace instruction accordingly.
- 3. Use formative assessments to ensure that students are understanding the concepts. What you learn can guide your instruction and determine next steps.
- 4. Walk through your classroom as students work on problems and observe the dynamics. Talk with students individually and include “hinge questions” in your lessons plans to gauge understanding before continuing.
- 5. Teacher teamwork, collaboration, and reflections are school-wide expectations
- 6. Differentiation of instruction needs to be done with fidelity in order to meet the needs of those students.

Person Responsible Jason Martin (jason.martin@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the Science NGSS for the past two years, our students have shown a 4 point increase in proficiency. They remain above the district average of 58% proficiency for 2018.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students in Science that will demonstrate proficiency will increase from 59% to 65%

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Esther Guzman (esther.muniz-guzman@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: A school-wide approach for planning and implementing Universal Design for Learning across all instructional and non-instructional school contexts will be adopted.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: To provide instructional goals, methods, materials, and informal assessments that work for everyone-not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individuals

Action Steps to Implement

- Setting Clear Goals and Objectives
- 2. Cooperative Learning
- 3. Non-linguistic representations
- 4. Generating and Testing Hypothesis
- 5. Setting High Expectations for Students

Person Responsible Esther Guzman (esther.muniz-guzman@stlucieschools.org)

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.

We were lower than the state average. Some of the concerns were Bullying and physical attacks. We had 41 in-school suspensions and 23 out-of-school suspensions. Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony/Lions Quest/SchoolConnect will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for guided practice of these skills. These activities will be monitored through ongoing class observations using corresponding walk-through tools. An SEL committee will be established to promote school-wide SEL through integrated activities. Our students are lacking many of the basic life skills needed for success in school, at home, and in the community. Intentional focus on cultivating SEL competencies is a proven strategy used to reduce discipline concerns, increase attendance and develop positive learning communities.

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.

Create meaningful parent involvement opportunities. Celebrate personal achievement and good behavior for students as well as positive feedback to faculty and staff. Establish school norms that build values and make sense. Model the behaviors you want to see in your school. Encourage innovation in the classrooms. Provide Professional development for teachers. Follow-up with the new teachers and provide support when necessary.

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

West Gate targets stakeholders that are essential in the community in making improvements to our school and funding resources. We reach out to them by communicating our school activities. We invite them to school events and make them feel like an integral part of our school community. Another way we include their involvement is by providing volunteer and fundraising opportunities for them. We show acknowledgment by mentioning all outstanding contributors in school mailings and sending notes of appreciation. We also include all stakeholders in our school newsletter and web page.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00