

St. Lucie Public Schools

West Gate K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	26
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	30

West Gate K 8 School

1050 NW CASHMERE BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/10/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Martin, Jason	Principal	In addition to all Admin duties involved in running a school, Mr. Martin has math oversight K-8 and supervises grades 2 and 5
Guzman, Esther	Assistant Principal	In addition to all Admin duties involved in running a school, Mrs. Guzman oversees Social Studies, Pre-K, discipline K-8 and ESE.
Hutchings, Melissa	Assistant Principal	In addition to all Admin duties involved in running a school, Mrs. Hutchings oversees grades 3 and 5 and ELA K-8.
Taylor, Leslie	Assistant Principal	In addition to all Admin duties involved in running a school, Mrs. Taylor oversees grades 1 and 4 and Science K-8.
Brehm, Michelle	Math Coach	Mrs. Brehm supports mathematics schoolwide through the coaching cycle.
Randolph, Victoria	Other	ELA Interventionist with a focus on grade 3 and grade 4.
Schremmer, Deborah	Parent Engagement Liaison	Bridge school and parents to build community.
Taylor, Amy	Instructional Coach	Ms. Taylor supports ELA schoolwide through the coaching cycle.
Ramirez, Stephanie	Parent Engagement Liaison	Bridge school and parents to build community.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Mrs. Taylor, Assistant Principal, invited the math coach, literacy coach, interventionist, dean, TSA, ESE Specialists, and admin team to work collaboratively to analyze the data and complete the SIP. Mr. Martin involved the SAC which is made up of families and community members.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be reviewed in comparison to our practices during a mid year reflection and modifications will be made at that time if necessary.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	62%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	1	39	44	36	38	38	52	56	64	368
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	3	6	3	10	47	34	112
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	9	16	1	0	0	2	23	55
Course failure in Math	0	3	15	30	1	0	1	4	15	69
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	13	9	3	40	41	51	38	55	250
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	26	18	30	27	39	58	44	29	271
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	39	36	48	53	53	72	73	67	447

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	37	32	44	43	53	75	74	74	432

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	47	44	40	37	48	32	60	65	90	463
One or more suspensions	5	4	3	6	10	9	21	44	52	154
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	1	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	13	1	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	36	17	26	34	56	169
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	52	23	35	42	78	255
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	3	8	2	0	104	25	0	147

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	4	2	2	19	41	22	67	66	79	302

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	47	44	40	37	48	32	60	65	90	463
One or more suspensions	5	4	3	6	10	9	21	44	52	154
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	1	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	13	1	17
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	36	17	26	34	56	169
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	25	52	23	35	42	78	255
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	3	3	8	2	0	104	25	0	147

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	4	2	2	19	41	22	67	66	79	302

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	55	50	53	57	53	55	60		
ELA Learning Gains				58			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			48		
Math Achievement*	59	51	55	57	41	42	59		
Math Learning Gains				62			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			46		
Science Achievement*	50	52	52	52	50	54	59		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	71	68	77	55	59	74		
Middle School Acceleration	72	75	70	65	50	51	71		
Graduation Rate		90	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		69	53		74	70			
ELP Progress	40	44	55	50	78	70	53		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	588
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	22	Yes	2	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	68			
BLK	52			
HSP	57			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	52			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	34	Yes	1	
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	55			
BLK	55			
HSP	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	55			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	55			59			50	67	72			40
SWD	20			30			18	29			5	
ELL	34			61			29	48	60		6	40
AMI												
ASN	66			69							2	
BLK	47			50			39	66	65		7	45
HSP	54			60			48	63	67		7	41
MUL	52			57			50				3	
PAC												
WHT	62			65			60	74	78		6	
FRL	48			52			41	62	68		7	39

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	57	58	54	57	62	56	52	77	65			50
SWD	22	36	37	29	47	41	21	40				
ELL	44	57	59	44	62	60	35	61	45			50
AMI												
ASN	50	45		50	59		71					

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	51	61	59	48	60	50	39	70	67			46
HSP	56	58	48	56	60	61	50	78	63			54
MUL	45	57	64	55	70		64					
PAC												
WHT	63	57	50	65	64	56	61	84	65			
FRL	49	58	54	49	58	56	46	74	61			41

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	60	60	48	59	49	46	59	74	71			53
SWD	28	45	40	37	57	46	34	37				27
ELL	33	50	40	39	47	44	13	63				53
AMI												
ASN	52	83		54	79							
BLK	49	49	39	50	44	41	43	68	59			43
HSP	59	60	47	57	45	46	56	77	65			59
MUL	66	58		69	44		73					
PAC												
WHT	68	65	56	65	55	50	69	72	76			
FRL	51	57	46	52	48	47	49	72	65			55

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	46%	1%	54%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	43%	10%	47%	6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	46%	43%	3%	47%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
06	2023 - Spring	60%	42%	18%	47%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	42%	17%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	48%	9%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	55%	38%	17%	48%	7%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	56%	-7%	61%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	69%	43%	26%	55%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	50%	48%	2%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	41%	6%	44%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	47%	5%	51%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	34%	44%	50%	28%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	39%	52%	48%	43%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	61%	5%	66%	0%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

1. Grade 5 ELA showed lowest performance at 47% and 4th grade and 7th grade ELA at 53%.
2. Grade 5 had a large ESE population, were in a pivotal year of 2nd and 3rd grade during COVID, potentially missing key foundational reading skills. Grade 5 has fallen below the 50% threshold and we are in the ATSI category.

Grade 4 had two of two teachers as long term substitutes.

Grade 7 had one long term substitute and there was a loss of instructional time on the team.

3. Students with disabilities scored below the 41% threshold for student achievement in comparison to their peers.

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

Grade 4 ELA decreased by 10 percentage points from the year previous. Grade 4 had two of two teachers as long term substitutes.

Grade 7 had one long term substitute and there was a loss of instructional time on the team.

Grade 4 Math decreased by 18 percentage points. New math curriculum, new test item specs, new resources to learn.

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

ELA grades 4 and 5 have the greatest negative gap against the state average. Grade 4 had a long term substitute and there was a large ESE population (11%) and SWD (18%).

Math in grade 4 had a 12 point gap from the state average. The lowest group of 4th graders with the long term substitute transitioned to math at the end of the day and there were many adaptations the math teacher had to make to instruct that group of students.

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

8th grade math, including pre-algebra, algebra and geometry showed the most growth from the year before. In 21-22 school year, 7th grade math was at 55. The 22-23 school year improved to pre-algebra 69, Algebra 78 and Geometry 91. New actions at the school that impacted math included a new math coach, math interventionist and strategic planning.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

1. Absences
2. Level 1s in ELA - particularly in 6th grade - attribute to feeder school inclusion

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

1. Current 6th grade ELA
2. Current 7th grade ELA

3. Current 4th grade Math
4. Current 5th grade Math
5. Current 3rd grade ELA

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

We had 166 students with disabilities last year in testing grades 3-8. Of the 166, 123 of them tested. Of the 123 that tested, 102 of them scored either a level 1 or 2. That is only a 17% proficiency rate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The measurable outcome for the year is to make progress towards minimally meeting the 41% proficiency threshold for students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

Students with disabilities that are in tested grades will be monitored on their performance on unit assessments, PM1,2 &3 as well as teacher observation/MTSS practices. Areas of need will be retaught to improve proficiency within the BEST standards of concern.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leslie Taylor (leslie.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Classroom and Support Teachers will provide standards based differentiated instruction with a focus on students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Differentiated instruction allows teachers to meet the needs of all students and especially the students with disabilities to improve learning outcomes. Benchmark Advance and Really Great Ready supplemental materials have components to increase both fluency and comprehension. Benchmarks skill bags focus on decoding and the use of MTSS protocols to identify student with deficits in reading.

Middle school students with deficits in reading are placed in intensive reading courses and will be monitored through FAST data on the PM assessments.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identification of students and their instructional needs.

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

By When: August and ongoing all year

Align interventions

Person Responsible: Victoria Randolph (victoria.randolph@stlucieschools.org)

By When: August and ongoing

Monitor interventions and realign based on need

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

By When: September and ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Middle grades ELA underperformed on the FAST exams in the 22-23 school year. Fifth and sixth grade MATH underperformed also. Middle grades ELA and current 5th and 6th grade Math are a focus .

Measurable Outcome:

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

Current 5th and 6th grade Math proficiency will increase by 12%.

Middle grades ELA proficiency will increase by 14%.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through district unit assessments and state FAST exams. We will also use SuccessMaker to monitor.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Through our MTSS practices in identifying our intervention groups, students will be organized in groups for MTSS Math and ELA groups. Interventions are aligned to student need based on data, we use reading horizons, LLI, Benchmark advanced, small group counseling, bouncy, ripple effects, Heggerty, and Savvas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction is a evidence based strategy to bridge the achievement gap in underperforming students in ELA and Math.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Review diagnostic and progress monitor data from iReady, STAR Renaissance, and FAST

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

By When: Mid September

Triage need and align intervention groups

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

By When: the end of September

Realigning intervention groups as needed

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

By When: ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

In looking at our data for all tested subjects, it is clear that we are underperforming, particularly in the middle school. Differentiated instruction will meet the needs of all learners and further support teachers in providing specialized instruction for the students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Due to the lack of learning gains data since 2019, the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is meeting the previous percentage of 55% for ELA and 60% for Math.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through CLP meetings with Coaches and Admin, classroom walkthroughs, coaching cycle, district assessments, district supports through curriculum specialists, and state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is significant data to support the rationale for differentiation instruction and its correlation to student achievement. Specifically, the significance is greater for students who are underperforming and ESE.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Provide tier 1 training in how to plan for differentiation to meet the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible: Leslie Taylor (leslie.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

By When: October-December in micro PLs

Monitor through classroom walkthroughs and provide supports as needed in CLPs and individualized

Person Responsible: Leslie Taylor (leslie.taylor@stlucieschools.org)

By When: ongoing through the school year

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Teacher attendance is poor - Student discipline is increasing. According to our student climate data, students treat each other well only scored 57% in middle and 69% in elementary. The results of this behavior manifests into discipline issues and increased referrals. We are implementing restorative practices into second grade and the BIC room for middle school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the 57% in middle and 69% in elementary, the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve is a 10% increase in results on the student climate survey.

We will be doing a school survey for second grade as a baseline and as an end of year to track effectiveness.

We will also be doing a survey for all middle school students who spend time in the middle school BIC room.

Monitoring:

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

All discipline referrals and BIRs will be monitored through Power Bi data that the district provides to follow trends.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Martin (jason.martin@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention plan of implementation includes, but not limited to, the school's PBIS program coupled with training, schoolwide, on restorative practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There is sufficient data and evidence to support the success with both of these interventions and the school district has included these as initiatives.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Training on restorative practices for second grade teachers, deans and deans clerk and BIC monitor.

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

By When: End of August

Survey creation and distribution for second grade and BIC participants

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

By When: Mid September

Implement restorative practices as needed

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

By When: ongoing

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus is 5th grade ELA to ensure that they do not fall below the 50% proficiency threshold.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school plans to achieve a 5th grade proficiency of 59% to showcase expected annual growth.

Monitoring:

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

The literacy coach and ELA administrator will meet weekly for a review of coaching support school-wide, and closely monitor the ELA data of unit assessments and PMs. Additionally, the literacy team will utilize the data collected during literacy rounds to provide feedback on particular standards and best practices for instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers of Tier I ELA students will be provided with professional learning, aligned to the science of reading and implementation of the BEST standards, including but not limited to a strong emphasis on focused vocabulary instruction. The literacy coach will continue to provide supports during the CLP process and communicate with the district curriculum department for any additional supports that may be needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The ELA administrator recently completed a Literacy Leadership series facilitated by Florida State University in partnership with Florida Center for Reading and Research (FCRR). Resources and learning gained through the Literacy Leadership series will be applied to both the Literacy Committee goals and the data collection form we will be utilizing during literacy rounds.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

The school seeks input on resources through SAC, PTO, our partnership with the district Administrator on Special Assignment overseeing grants, working with district curriculum department to fund approved resources, our partnership with Federal and Special Programs Manager for Title 1 to plan budgets, and our partnership with the Coordinator for Title 1 to plan parent involvement events and resources.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

The focus for K-2 instructional practice is reading, phonemic awareness, phonological awareness and decoding. These are foundational reading skills.

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

The focus for 3-5 instructional practice is reading, comprehension and decoding fluency. These are foundational reading skills. The rationale for this focus is that our 5th grade was 51% below proficiency.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

This grade group is not within the RAISE criteria.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The school plans to achieve a 5th grade proficiency of 59% to showcase expected annual growth.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

The literacy coach and ELA administrator will meet weekly for a review of coaching support school-wide, and closely monitor the ELA data of unit assessments and PMs. Additionally, the literacy team will utilize the data collected during literacy rounds to provide feedback on particular standards and best practices for instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hutchings, Melissa, melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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. §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?

Teachers of Tier I ELA students will be provided with professional learning, aligned to the science of reading and implementation of the BEST standards, including but not limited to a strong emphasis on focused vocabulary instruction. The literacy coach will continue to provide supports during the CLP process and communicate with the district curriculum department for any additional supports that may be needed.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The ELA administrator recently completed a Literacy Leadership series facilitated by Florida State University in partnership with Florida Center for Reading and Research (FCRR). Resources and learning gained through the Literacy Leadership series will be applied to both the Literacy Committee goals and the data collection form we will be utilizing during literacy rounds.

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
The literacy team meets monthly to strengthen the literacy focus on campus through events and classroom walkthroughs.	Hutchings, Melissa, melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org
The Literacy Coach and Admin will perform classroom walkthroughs frequently to observe instruction and provide feedback for growth. Data will be collected and used to triage need for the Literacy Coach.	Hutchings, Melissa, melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org
Regular data chats will be held to align interventions in small group instruction in ELA.	Hutchings, Melissa, melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org
Professional learning is provided for all content area teachers in summarizing text and writing strategies.	Hutchings, Melissa, melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org
Administrator will attend 5th grade planning	Hutchings, Melissa, melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org
Literacy Coach to support 5th grade teachers through the coaching cycle	Hutchings, Melissa, melissa.hutchings@stlucieschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The plan to disseminate the information within the SIP to our stakeholders include presentation at faculty meetings, SAC and PTO meetings. The SIP will also be posted on our school webpage and social media outlets once it is approved.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

.<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/wgk/>

Our parent liasons meet monthly to plan for increased community involvement using the school newspaper, Mustang Memos, Quarterly events specific to engage families, Parent University, leverage social media through blasting out various posts (informative and celebratory showcasing student work) and being available to families through PTO. All correspondence is printed in English, Spanish and Creole.

In addition there is a school garden project that is a collaboration between the school, the SLPS Nutrition services department, UF IFAS, the health department and PTO. The goal is to have students growing food that will be tasted and included in lunchroom practices.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

West Gate amended their bell schedule this year from 6 periods to 7 to reduce class size and increase quality instruction in a smaller setting. The deliberate adjustment of school day activities has been revisited to minimize classroom disruptions and scheduled curriculum nights and student led conferences will be done quarterly. Through these the partnerships with families will be strengthened which in turn strengthen our academic programs.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The school garden project is a collaboration with SLPS Nutrition services, UF IFAS, Health Department, PTO and student council. The goal is to grow food that will be served in the lunchroom for students to eat.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The guidance and counseling team, in conjunction with school based mental health counselors, social workers and school psychologists use data and referral systems to provide mental wellness and prosocial skills. Support is provided in all tiers including, but not limited to, restorative practices, whole group lessons, small group and individual counseling, Ripple Effects, Bouncy, FBAs, BIPs, and referral to a mental health collaborative or mobile crisis should the need arise.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students’ access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Students are given opportunities while here in middle school to earn high school credits in Algebra, Geometry and the first year of Spanish. Through course selection for high school, counselors present to students what their options are for CTE and college credit courses in high school.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

West Gate is a PBIS school and focuses on prevention of problem behaviors using a token economy of Mustang Bucks. We offer many resources to support the emotional literacy of our students and adults. Interventions include, but are not limited to, conferences, School counselor visits, Administration, Peer to peer support, Peer mentoring, Parent teacher conferences, partnering with families and community members and Mustang of the month programs.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Administrators, Interventionists, Math and Literacy coaches facilitate collaborative planning where data chats are a frequent component of the cycle. All participants are taught how to use the academic data to drive instruction and interventions for student success. This training is extended to all new teachers through NEST meetings and chunked in a way so the learning occurs when the skill is needed, after academic data is acquired.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Prior to the start of school we have a pre-K and Kindergarten roundup. This activity is led by the teachers and invites students and their families in to experience the school, location of the classroom, introduction to the cafeteria, and some academic screeners. Our school provides pre-kinder screenings in the spring - the kindergarten team then collects these responses and groups students accordingly. The kindergarten team provides a kinder kick off prior to school beginning so the students and parents become accustomed to the school environment, systems and routines.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00

5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes