

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Northwest Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Northwest Elementary School

16438 HUTCHISON RD, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Bryan Quigley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Northwest Elementary School

16438 HUTCHISON RD, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Northwest Elementary believes that all students are important individuals. Our primary purpose is to create a totally positive environment which provides opportunities for academic and personal success through the joint efforts of our faculty, staff and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Northwest Elementary School, we believe that our first commitment is to prepare our students to be productive citizens of the 21st Century.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Quigley, Bryan	Principal	<p>Leadership team meetings can include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches)
		<p>The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to:</p>
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams.
		<p>A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs.</p>
		<p>Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.</p>
		<p>HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.</p> <p>Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact.</p> <p>Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.</p>
Cheng, Christine	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/31/2020, Bryan Quigley

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

44

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

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	105	119	107	104	107	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	638
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	3	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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

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

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	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	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

Friday 9/18/2020

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	19	8	11	12	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	19	8	11	12	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	52%	57%	77%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	55%	58%	65%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	50%	53%	59%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	54%	63%	81%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	57%	62%	71%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	51%	60%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	50%	53%	61%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
	2018	83%	53%	30%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	55%	19%	58%	16%
	2018	76%	55%	21%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
	2018	74%	51%	23%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
	2018	78%	55%	23%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
	2018	84%	57%	27%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	60%	16%
	2018	73%	54%	19%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	69%	51%	18%	53%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	74%	52%	22%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	45	42	36	51	61	35	33				
ELL	67	67		61	53						
ASN	93	69		93	77						
BLK	78	71		75	53						
HSP	79	77	63	76	75	56	53				
MUL	83	75		83	75						
WHT	77	65	44	76	79	53	82				
FRL	70	72	57	68	70	56	58				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	53	41	25	53	32	15					
ELL	63	75		75	62						
ASN	83	80		91	69						
BLK	71	36		80	45						
HSP	82	60	47	83	62	52	83				
MUL	89	50		95	71						
WHT	77	56	43	78	66	32	73				
FRL	75	60	55	74	58	39	72				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	62	64	75	71	70		21				
ELL	47	67		59	67	64					
ASN	77	85		82	92						
BLK	80			93							
HSP	77	63	73	80	60	53	50				
MUL	90	70		90	100						
WHT	75	62	52	80	74	58	63				
FRL	64	57	62	77	68	68	45				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	557
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
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	83
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	69
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	70

Hispanic Students	
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	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
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	67
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

SWD students scored the lowest in: ELA Ach., Learning Gains, Bottom Quartile Gains, Math Ac., Math Gains, Math Bottom Quartile Gains and Science.

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

Math Achievement and Science both dropped 5%. The math curriculum was very limited due to the district not having a math adoption.

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 Ach. was 22% over the state (79% vs 57%)

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

ELA and Math Gains both increased 12% from prior year. Increased PD and focus on assessment and DI.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance data has the greatest number of students of concern.

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

1. ELA-1. Teachers will plan for Writer's Workshop and individual conference (DI) with students to provide feedback on the instructional focus/craft of that lesson and at least one individual writing component/standard that the student is still developing (DI).
2. Math-Identify and Implement DI tasks for all students (Core, Reteach and Enrich).
3. Science- Teachers will implement science notebooks, vocabulary building strategies and long term investigations.
4. SEL- Teachers will Identify and implement Social Emotional Learning Strategies to support students mental and emotional wellbeing.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After reviewing student report card data, as many or more students were marked OL N, OL U or BL in writing as in reading. Reading and writing are essentially linked and a student's struggle in writing negatively impacts the students achievement/performance in reading.

Measurable Outcome: FSA writing and the corresponding ELA scores will increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christine Cheng (christine.cheng@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiation of Instruction and Feedback through individualized writing conferences with students weekly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Individualized feedback to each student about the lesson's instructional focus, craft or standard along with targeting the student's individual areas of growth in writing will result in increased achievement on classroom, district and state assessments (FSA).

Action Steps to Implement

During Preplanning teachers will receive Professional Development on effective practices for writing with an added focus on conferencing with students.

Person Responsible: Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@hcps.net)

Teachers will conference with individual students weekly. During Conferences teachers will progress monitor students individual area of focus (DI) in addition to providing feedback on the craft or instructional focus of lesson.

Person Responsible: Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@hcps.net)

Students will participate in district writing assessments. Teachers will conference with individual students to provide feedback on areas to develop identified from the writing assessments.

Person Responsible: Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@hcps.net)

Northwest's TLT will review student data from the writing assessment across grade levels to identify school wide trends and develop professional development to support the teachers.

Person Responsible: Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Northwest is implementing SEL Social Emotional Learning strategies to promote students emotional well being and academic achievement given the unique challenges of students living with and learning during a pandemic.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

Northwest is and has been a community based school and values the inclusion of parents, students, business and community members. Northwest provides multiple opportunities for community involvement through it SAC, PTA, NW Dad's Club, Business Partners, Junior Achievement, School Volunteers, Grand Parent's Day, School Programs, Restaurant Nights, Educational Nights (Science and Cyber Safety). Northwest's PTA was recognized as a School of Excellence and Northwest has been a Golden School recipient for the last 18 years.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00