

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Northwest Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Northwest Elementary School

16438 HUTCHISON RD, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Bryan Quigley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Northwest Elementary School

16438 HUTCHISON RD, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Quigley, Bryan	Principal	The principal job is to ensure that safe, secure and educational rich environment that meets the needs of all students by: Collaborating and problem solving to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices with the core of instruction and utilizing the MTSS process at the Tier 1 and intervention/enrichment Tiers 2/3 levels. Support the implementation of high quality instruction. Disaggregate progress monitoring data at all levels to ensure fidelity of instruction, and behavioral supports. Facilitate communication of school-wide data to teachers, CPDs (PLCs) and engage stockholders in the problem solving process. The principal is the instructional leader of the school and the primary person responsible for maintaining a safe and secure learning environment for students, parents and staff.
Cheng, Christine	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal is an instructional leader emphasizing curriculum to ensure that every students educational needs are meet. She assists in the disaggregation of progress monitoring data and participates in the problem solving process. She is also responsible for creating and maintaining safety and security of all students and staff. She is the school's testing coordinator, ELP coordinator, and a key member of the PSLT to ensure MTSS interventions are appropriate and successful. She assists the principal in maintaining the school's high expectations for all.
Kennedy, Jill	Teacher, K-12	She is a 2nd grade teacher at Northwest. She ensures that the school is in compliance with SIP plan and guidelines. She hosts and conducts all SAC meetings, records the notes from the meetings and communicates with all members of the SAC.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, 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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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

4

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

5

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	110	100	115	110	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	3	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	23	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	4	9	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	
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 6/7/2021

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				79%	52%	57%	79%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	55%	58%	58%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	50%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				77%	54%	63%	82%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	57%	62%	64%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	46%	51%	45%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				71%	50%	53%	76%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	55%	19%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	69%	51%	18%	53%	16%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1-5 data based on iReady Reading and Math, Science is just based on the 5th grade district baseline and midyear assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	68	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	60	71
	Students With Disabilities	33	66	71
	English Language Learners	0	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	50	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	42	63
	Students With Disabilities	14	57	71
	English Language Learners	0	5	40
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	69	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	44	79
	Students With Disabilities	47	59	70
	English Language Learners	67	33	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	50	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	42	73
	Students With Disabilities	35	59	65
	English Language Learners	0	27	67

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78	89	94
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	79	90
	Students With Disabilities	77	88	81
	English Language Learners	67	33	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	59	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	52	78
	Students With Disabilities	50	76	91
	English Language Learners	20	27	40
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62	60	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	46	64
	Students With Disabilities	67	70	71
	English Language Learners	67	67	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	59	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	52	78
	Students With Disabilities	50	76	91
	English Language Learners	18	23	23

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64	67	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	48	50
	Students With Disabilities	57	61	56
	English Language Learners	0	0	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54	60	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	45	57
	Students With Disabilities	61	65	65
	English Language Learners	8	24	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	67	84	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	74	na
	Students With Disabilities	54	65	na
	English Language Learners	29	23	NA

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	41	40	42	39	40	27	23				
ELL	44			52							
ASN	88			88							
BLK	56			61							
HSP	73	63	50	68	78	55	50				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	89	74	73	81	74	80	75				
FRL	70	64	60	67	69	54	48				
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						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
ASN	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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
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	534
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	78
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

On FSA and iReady Math is scoring lower than Reading. The Science score in FCAT Science was the lowest individual score (63%) and dropped from the previous testing year (71%)

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

Science Achievement

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

The 2020 school year stop age and the incomplete learning from 2019-2020 and 2020-21. In addition 25% of the students were clearing in 2020-21 and did not get to experience the hands-on-learning being at home.

Staff PD on instructional best practices in science, additional emphasis on: Hands-on-learning, Long Term Investigations, Science Notebooks, Vocabulary walls and development,

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

Bottom Quartile Gains in Math (55%-60%) and Reading (54%-65%)

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

Implementation of Achieve3000 & ELP for bottom quartile students.

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

Using formative and summative data to identify concepts to accelerate learning.

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.

PD on Science Best Practices, PD on disaggregation of data and data collection and concepts to accelerate based on data.

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

Continued PD on instructional best practices in the Science content, grades will vertically articulate and disaggregate previous year's student data to identify areas/concepts to improve, walkthroughs and feedback provided by administration

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

The percent of SWD scoring level 3 or higher math is below 41% on the FSA

Measurable Outcome:

The percentage of SWD scoring 3 or higher on the FSA math will increase to 45%

Monitoring:

SWD will be monitored using the district's math monthly assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The math monthly's will identify standards that need differentiated instruction and additional support/scaffolding

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By identifying the standards to development, teachers can focus on specific strategies and resources that students need and provide very targeted instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify SWD and disaggregate these student's data with classroom and ESE teachers, progress monitor with iReady diagnostics, lesson completion and math monthly assessments, disaggregate iReady and math monthly data to identify standards that need additional scaffolding and support

Person Responsible

Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science is the lowest score content area for the school with 69% of students scoring level 3 or higher.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of students scoring level 3 or higher on the 2022 Science FCAT will increase to 75%+.
Monitoring:	District assessments and administrative walk throughs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bryan Quigley (bryan.quigley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher will implement the following best practices in science instruction: interactive science journals, LTI-long term investigations, hands-on learning opportunities, and vocabulary development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies are endorsed by the district's science curriculum specialist and are elements in the planning support tools provided by the district to support science instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Disaggregate 2021 science FCAT data, identify instructional best practices in science instruction, provide PD on each best practice, monitor science assessments and identify standards needing additional scaffolding and support, provide ELP specifically focusing on science content.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Northwest's only area of concern was that we ranked in the High category for violent incidents in the year with an incident rate of .98 per 100 students (7 incidents in the year) but ranked Very Low in: Property Incidents (0 incidents in the year), Drug/Public Order incidents (0 incidents in the year), and Total Suspensions (0 suspensions for the year).

Quarterly reviews by administration of student discipline data (discipline referrals and incidents) will be conducted to monitor progress at reducing and/or eliminate violent incidents.

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.

Teachers implement SEL strategies in the classroom. NW has a positive behavior system and develop individual behavior plans as needed. The MTSS team supports each and every teacher and student to meet the emotional, educational and behavioral needs of every student. Northwest has an active PTA and Dad's Club to engage students and families both during the school day and after in a multitude of programs/ events. Northwest has a fulltime school counselor and psychologist and shares a social worker with another school.

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

Adrienne Sanders- School Counselor/MTSS Chair
 Linda Hill-School Psychologist
 Monica Allen-Hayes- School Social Worker
 Alicia Battinelli-SEL Champion
 Sarah Ball PTA President
 Bill Donish- Dad's Club President

Part V: Budget

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

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