

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Symmes 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

Symmes Elementary School

6280 WATSON RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Annamarie Rothenbush

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

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)	90%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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

Symmes Elementary School

6280 WATSON RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[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	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

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.

Lillian Symmes Elementary will provide students with the necessary skills to become productive members of an ever-changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lillian Symmes Elementary will build a collaborative culture where everyone works together to increase student achievement.

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
Rothenbush, Anna Marie	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: 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)
		The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 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.
		A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. 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. 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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>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> <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. 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>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/2/2020, Annamarie Rothenbush

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.*

0

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

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)	90%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	61	59	59	68	65	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	384
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	6	8	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	72	64	86	85	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	7	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	7	12	7	16	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	72	64	86	85	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	457
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	7	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	7	12	7	16	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	57%	52%	57%	59%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	55%	58%	62%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	73%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	54%	63%	60%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	57%	62%	64%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	53%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	45%	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	49%	52%	-3%	58%	-9%
	2018	51%	53%	-2%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
	2018	62%	55%	7%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	54%	5%	62%	-3%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	57%	-10%	64%	-17%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	52%	6%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	20	33	29	33	41	21	17				
ELL	38	60		43	37						
BLK	44	37	23	38	41	36	29				
HSP	58	65	73	53	39	29	45				
MUL	50	54		42	47						
WHT	63	56	50	62	57	50	53				
FRL	55	59	47	48	43	45	40				
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	33	30	14	20	28	23	33				
ELL	41	43		19	43						
BLK	48	38		43	54	40					
HSP	55	59	41	47	47	50	54				
MUL	60	25		43	38						
WHT	67	62	54	63	44	15	67				
FRL	53	53	38	47	46	36	60				
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	24	58	60	36	63	36	27				
ELL	46	63		40	75						
BLK	44	64	90	51	48		31				
HSP	54	62	60	57	65	50	36				
MUL	45	40		64	60						
WHT	69	62	73	65	66	63	54				
FRL	51	61	71	55	59	45	30				

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)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	415
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	48
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	56
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	50
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.

The lowest area for us was our Bottom Quartile in Math and 5th grade Science. We went back to having one teacher teach science to all fifth graders. This allowed the teacher to conduct hands on investigations more frequently, build vocabulary, allocate the full science block to science instruction and to be an expert in the content.

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

Science saw the greatest decline. We went back to having one teacher teach science to all fifth graders. This allowed the teacher to conduct hands on investigations more frequently, build vocabulary, allocate the full science block to science instruction and to be an expert in the content.

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.

We saw the greatest gap in Math Learning Gains compared to the state. Contributing factors- lack of textbook materials for the 2018-2019 school year.

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

We saw the greatest improvement in our Bottom Quartile in ELA. We focused in on Tier 2 and Tier 3 students through the RTI/MTSS process with targeted small group instruction daily. Utilized iReady to supplement instruction, PLC data monitoring, Push in additional support to grade levels to work with students at risk.

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

Areas of concern are our students scoring a level 1 on FSA.

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

1. Bottom Quartile in Math
2. Grade 5 Science
3. Learning Gains in Grade 5
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning will be personalized to meet the diverse needs of all learners equitably. We struggle to meet the needs of our Bottom Quartiles particularly in Math. By personalizing learning based on student need it will allow us to provide targeted instruction to not only our lower performing students , but also to push our higher performing students as well.

Measurable Outcome: We would like to see at least a 3-5% gain in our Bottom Quartile learning gains for math and reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anna Marie Rothenbush (annamarie.rothenbush@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated Instruction (Personalized Learning) Instruction is based on student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: FSA, iReady, and Interim data was used to make this determination and is utilized to monitor progress through out the school year.

Action Steps to Implement

Training and implementation of Achieve 3000- Reading focused computer based program for students in grades 3-5 and IREADY in grades K-5. Goal setting with individual students and making lesson adjustments based on student performance and needs.

Person Responsible Anna Marie Rothenbush (annamarie.rothenbush@hcps.net)

Training and Implementation of SIPS- Phonics and Phonemic Awareness learning activities for students in K-2

Person Responsible Anna Marie Rothenbush (annamarie.rothenbush@hcps.net)

Faculty Training on Personalized Learning through out the school year
Observation and feedback on personalized learning ongoing

Person Responsible Anna Marie Rothenbush (annamarie.rothenbush@hcps.net)

Data Chats to focus in on performance of individual students and ESSA subgroups (SWD & Black Students),
Connect findings back to small group instruction in the classroom setting, ELP supports

Person Responsible Anna Marie Rothenbush (annamarie.rothenbush@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- 1. Implementation of new district programs (SIPPS, Achieve 3000) and continued use of iReady**
- 2. PLCs focused of student data to look for trnds and discuss next steps and implementation**
- 3. Collaborative planning by grade levels including VE, Gifted, Reading Coach and Administration**

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.

Symmes is a PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Support) school. We focus on the positive choices students make that are aligned to our SHARK expectations. (Safe, Honest, Active Learner, Responsible and Kind) Students are rewarded with Shark Bucks and can utilize these to shop in our Shark Store which is run through a partnership with our PTA or purchase their entry into special events held through out the school year, such as, a Glow Party, Popcorn/Movie, etc.

Throughout the school year we also host monthly spirit nights at local restaurants and family activities on campus, such as, Harvest Happenings (our fall story night), Lego Night, Math Night, etc. These activities allow us to build rapport amongst our school community and support local businesses.

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: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00