

St. Lucie Public Schools

West Gate K 8 School



A word cloud featuring terms such as 'students', 'leadership', 'school improvement', 'learning', 'success', 'teaching', 'relationships', 'growth', and 'instruction'. The words are arranged in a circular pattern with varying font sizes and colors (blue and yellow). A circular logo on the left contains a sun rising over a path, with a graduation cap on top of the sun. Text around the logo includes 'family and community involvement needs assessment', 'mission Florida college and career', 'striving achievement', 'supportive environment resources', 'strategic planning', 'collaboration', and 'vision'.

mission Florida
college and career

students
analysis
ambitious

leadership

school improvement

learning
striving
achievement
supportive environment
resources

success
teaching
relationships

relationships

areas of focus
instruction
growth

vision
collaboration
strategic planning
family and community involvement
needs assessment

2022-23 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 8/1/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	62%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (67%)
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	ATSI

* 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 10/11/2022.

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	0

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>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>62%</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>69%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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.

We, Mustangs, exist to work collaboratively to create an inclusive environment that supports social and academic growth to be successful in high school.

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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

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. Leading 6-8 Math CLP and instructional planning. Math PBIS/MTSS (Middle) SAC Faculty Council Title 1 Master Schedule PTO School Assessment Team Technology Plan CLPs Tutoring Program
Hutchings, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Leading 6-8 ELA CLP and instructional planning, Grades K-3, Dept ELA N.E.S.T. MTSS (K-3) Activities and Fundraisers Literacy Committee School Assessment Team (SSA) CLPs School Calendar Remind Student Discipline K-3 Votino, Counselor K-3 Safety Committee
Guzman, Esther	Assistant Principal	Grades 7-8 Student Discipline 7-8 Graduation Monitoring Dept History Dept Electives Maintenance Cafeteria Clinic Attendance Field Trips Beaty, Guidance (7-8) Threat Assessment
Taylor, Leslie	Assistant Principal	Grades 4-6 Dept Science Dept ESE MTSS(4-6) Master Schedule

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		SIP (Vasquez & Brehm) Instructional Technology Textbook Orders (Amabel) PR/Website SEL (Cultural learning environment) CLPs Perez, Counselor 4-6 Student Discipline 4-6
vasquez, sherri	Instructional Coach	Leading CLP with ELA grades K-5, triaging teacher needs and implementing the coaching cycle to support instructional practices.
Brehm, Michelle	Math Coach	Leading CLP with Math grades K-5, triaging teacher needs and implementing the coaching cycle to support instructional practices.
Randolph, Victoria	Other	Interventionist grades 3-8
Glauber, Amy	Other	Math Interventionist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2021, Jason Martin

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

41

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

78

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,502

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	119	138	143	127	166	155	206	219	240	0	0	0	0	1513
Attendance below 90 percent	47	44	40	37	48	32	60	65	90	0	0	0	0	463
One or more suspensions	5	4	3	6	10	9	21	44	52	0	0	0	0	154
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	1	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	13	1	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	36	17	26	34	56	0	0	0	0	169
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	52	23	35	42	78	0	0	0	0	255
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	3	8	2	0	104	25	0	0	0	0	0	147

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	4	2	2	19	41	22	67	66	79	0	0	0	0	302

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		3	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	9
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

Monday 8/22/2022

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	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

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	53%	55%				64%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						55%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						50%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	57%	41%	42%				67%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	62%						60%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						60%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	52%	50%	54%				59%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	55%	59%				86%	74%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	71%	50%	21%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	48%	4%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
07	2022					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	52%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019	71%	54%	17%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	76%	47%	29%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
06	2022					
	2019	68%	47%	21%	55%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
07	2022					
	2019	57%	50%	7%	54%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	34%	23%	46%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	46%	13%	53%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	56%	48%	8%	48%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	67%	18%	71%	14%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	70%	51%	19%	61%	9%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	22	36	37	29	47	41	21	40			
ELL	44	57	59	44	62	60	35	61	45		
ASN	50	45		50	59		71				
BLK	51	61	59	48	60	50	39	70	67		
HSP	56	58	48	56	60	61	50	78	63		
MUL	45	57	64	55	70		64				
WHT	63	57	50	65	64	56	61	84	65		
FRL	49	58	54	49	58	56	46	74	61		
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				
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	588

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	52
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	55
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	63
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 achievement gap between racial groups and SWD and ELL has narrowed over the past three years. We have outpaced the district averages in ELA proficiency, LG and B25 in all grade groups except 4th grade B25.

We have outpaced the district averages in Math proficiency and LG in all grade groups except 4th and 8th grade.

We have outpaced the district average in Civics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is in 4th grade ELA and Math, 6th grade Math, 8th grade ELA and Math, and 5th and 8th grade science.

4th grade ELA - 54%, down 13%

ELA B25 - 34%

4th grade Math - 44%, down 6%

Math B25 - 47%

5th grade Science - 54%, down 7%

6th grade Math - 64%, up 8% and we have 2 long term substitutes in there this year

8th grade ELA - 51%, down 13%

8th grade Math - 13%, down 32%
8th grade Science - 47%, down 10%

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

West Gate experienced a high infection rate of COVID during the 2021-2022 school year resulting in a high teacher absence rate the first semester. The school was not completely staffed at the start of the year and the collaborative planning process was not functioning with fidelity among all grade groups and subjects.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Third grade showed the most improvement in ELA and Math.
3rd grade ELA - 63%, up 8%
3rd grade Math - 67%, up 20%

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

Mid way through the school year the master schedule was adjusted to strategically schedule particular teachers in key areas. Additionally, the collaborative planning process was done with fidelity in grades 3 and 5 to include data analysis, small group instructional practices, deliberate focus on students close to learning gains and the bottom quartile. Consistent and deliberate instructional strategies were implemented and followed up with rich small group instruction around the data analysis of progress monitoring tools.

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

Collaborative planning practices such as data analysis, standards unwrap, small group instruction, and student work analysis will be implemented for grades K-8 with Coaching and Administrative support. The coaches and Administration will then observe classroom instruction and provide timely and actionable feedback to grade and subject groups for further reflection.

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.

Professional learning will be provided for all teachers and staff around pedagogical strategies: accountable talk strategies and routines, writing in the content areas, unwrapping new math standards and analysis of new instructional resources. Additional professional learning will be around implicit bias and equity, literacy routines, PBIS, LLI, Grade level math PD's. Implement lessons that create instructional goals, methods, materials, and formative assessments/checks for understanding that work for everyone.

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

Continuous and deep dives into the CLE strategies through Sanford Harmony(K-5) and Lions Quest (6-8).

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

1. In kindergarten, first-grade and second grade, the area of focus for the 2022-2023 school year is phonics. Based on the 2022 spring iReady reading diagnostic data, 24% of the kindergarteners, 29% of the first graders, and 34% of second graders performed below grade level in phonics. Phonics teaches children to learn letter-sound relationships to learn how to read.
 2. The area of focus for the 2022-2023 school year in third, fourth and fifth grade is vocabulary. Based on the 2022 spring iReady reading diagnostic data, 22% of third graders, 55% of fourth graders, and 48% of fifth graders scored one or more grade levels below grade level in vocabulary. Vocabulary instruction focuses on words and their meaning, which is the strongest predictor of reading comprehension.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

1. By June 2023, at least 80% of the kindergarten students will perform at or above grade level in phonics on the Spring iReady diagnostic.
 By June 2023, at least 80% of the first-grade students will perform at or above grade level in phonics on the spring iReady diagnostic.
 By June 2023, at least 80% of the second-grade students will perform at or above grade level in vocabulary on the spring iReady diagnostic.
 2. By June 2023, at least 85% of all third-grade students will perform at or above grade level in vocabulary on the spring iReady diagnostic.
 By June 2023, at least 65% of all fourth-grade students will perform at or above grade level in vocabulary on the spring iReady diagnostic.
 By June 2023, at least 65% of all fifth-grade students will perform at or above grade level in vocabulary on the spring iReady diagnostic.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

C. Monitoring:
 The areas of phonics and vocabulary will be monitored through CLP data analysis of formative assessments completed in the classroom each week through unit assessments, checks for understanding, and observations and summative assessment data including statewide tests (STAR and FAST) and iReady diagnostics in fall, winter, and spring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Hutchings (melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Phonics instruction is being taught through Heggerty and Benchmark Advance during whole group instruction. During differentiated instruction teachers may also use additional resources such as Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI), iReady lessons, Reading Horizons, and Benchmark Advance readers. Vocabulary is being taught through Benchmark Advance, iReady lessons, and Flocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

These evidence-based practices/programs address the identified needs of our students in the areas of phonics for k-2 and vocabulary for 3-5. They have been proven to work for the population of students we are serving.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

a. Collaborative Learning and Planning – teachers will work in conjunction with their colleagues, coaches, interventionists and administrators to share research-based practices and strategies that are successful in the classroom, create common assessments, and learn/teach one another

Person Responsible sherri vasquez (sherri.vasquez@stlucieschools.org)

b. Coaching Cycles – coaches will support teachers during the planning process, model instruction, conduct classroom walkthroughs to identify needs and conduct coaching cycles to work with individual teachers or teams to address those needs and improve their practice

Person Responsible sherri vasquez (sherri.vasquez@stlucieschools.org)

c. Literacy Team – will conduct literacy rounds once per month to determine school-based areas of strength and growth, the team will address areas of growth and plan for additional coaching cycles or professional development in those areas

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

New state standards and resources to support math instruction this year is the rationale for choosing this area. Our goal is to have all students leaving West Gate with an accelerated math course in the next five years. In addition, we have new teachers teaching math this year.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will improve in math proficiency by 11% this year for K-8.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Unit assessment data will be used to progress monitor after each unit and the pretest and post test scores will be used to plan for remediation and review leading up to the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Standards aligned instruction, unwrapping standards and the CLP process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

By returning to the basics of instructional practices with a focus on the curriculum will guide us to reach our goals this year.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Collaborative Learning and Planning – teachers will work in conjunction with their colleagues, coaches, interventionists and administrators to share research-based practices and strategies that are successful in the classroom, create common assessments, and learn/teach one another

Person Responsible

Michelle Brehm (michelle.brehm@stlucieschools.org)

Coaching Cycles – coaches will support teachers during the planning process, model instruction, conduct classroom walkthroughs to identify needs and conduct coaching cycles to work with individual teachers or teams to address those needs and improve their practice

Person Responsible

Michelle Brehm (michelle.brehm@stlucieschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Science proficiency is the lowest it has been since 2017 and well below the ELA threshold. Typically science content proficiency produces higher scores than ELA even though it is used as an indicator.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We will increase our Science proficiency from 50% to 65%.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Unit assessment data will be used to progress monitor after each unit and the pretest and post test scores will be used to plan for remediation and review leading up to the FCAT.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leslie Taylor (leslie.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Standards aligned instruction, unwrapping standards and the CLP process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Experienced and passionate teachers are in place for grades 5 and 8. The strategic planning and delivery of standards aligned lessons to the full intent of the standard will be the strategy that will propel proficiency in those classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

CLP planning facilitated and supported by Administrator weekly.

Person Responsible

Leslie Taylor (leslie.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

Data analysis, student work analysis, and hands on experience for students in the delivery of lessons. This will be observed during classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible

Leslie Taylor (leslie.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step

Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We began by reviewing the school climate survey data and having a revisioning two day workshop with the team leads to address the needs of the campus. The vision and mission were recreated around common goals and values. The new vision and mission were rolled out schoolwide. Each meeting we begin by restating the new vision statement and aligning all of our work around this shared philosophy.

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 school culture and environment.

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.

CLE and PBIS committee members meet regularly to provide cultural opportunities for adults and students.