

P.K Yonge Developmental Research School

P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School



2020-21 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School

1200 SW 6TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32601

<http://www.pkyonge.ufl.edu/>

Demographics

Principal: Carrie Geiger T

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 UF Lab Sch 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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School

1200 SW 6TH ST, Gainesville, FL 32601

<http://www.pkyonge.ufl.edu/>

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)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

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 UF Lab Sch 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.

The mission of P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School, since its establishment in 1934, has been to design, test, and disseminate innovations in K-12 education through serving a diverse student community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

P.K. Yonge's vision is to be an internationally-recognized leader in developing and disseminating tested educational practices that equip all students to succeed in the global economy.

P.K. Yonge students are positioned to be creative, dedicated, and resilient learners and workers who embrace the power of diverse ideas, talents, and cultures to improve our world.

P.K. Yonge faculty are creative, dedicated, collaborative practitioner scholars who design, test, and disseminate innovations that support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success of every student.

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
Hayes , Lynda	Other	K-12 Director of School
Hill, Ashley	Other	Director of Student & Family Services
Gabbard, Christy	Other	Director of Program Development & Outreach
Geiger, Carrie	Principal	K-12 Principal
Henderson, Julie	Other	Director of Communications

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/3/2018, Carrie Geiger T

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	54	54	53	55	65	66	130	131	130	138	139	125	106	1246	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	5	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	1	7	
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	1	10	7	6	6	11	18	10	0	0	69	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	18	14	21	4	0	0	0	0	0	64	

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	10	7	6	6	1	2	1	2	0	36

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
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 9/28/2020

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	54	54	53	52	65	67	114	111	108	124	115	126	101	1144	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	2	1	6	3	2	1	7	6	19	24	73	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3	0	12	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	6	5	6	2	27	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	15	16	15	15	15	11	7	115	

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	2	0	7	0	8	7	9	2	35

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	1	4	6	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	5

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	54	54	53	52	65	67	114	111	108	124	115	126	101	1144	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	2	1	6	3	2	1	7	6	19	24	73	
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	3	0	12	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	6	5	6	2	27	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	15	16	15	15	15	11	7	115	

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	2	0	7	0	8	7	9	2	35

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	1	4	6	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	5

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	73%	73%	61%	67%	66%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	59%	58%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	54%	51%	43%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	67%	67%	62%	64%	73%	58%
Math Learning Gains	57%	57%	59%	58%	58%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	52%	47%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	71%	71%	56%	71%	70%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	82%	78%	82%	86%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	85%	85%	0%	58%	27%
	2018	76%	76%	0%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	60%	0%	58%	2%
	2018	73%	73%	0%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	72%	72%	0%	56%	16%
	2018	70%	70%	0%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	80%	80%	0%	54%	26%
	2018	80%	80%	0%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
07	2019	78%	78%	0%	52%	26%
	2018	65%	65%	0%	51%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	72%	72%	0%	56%	16%
	2018	68%	68%	0%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
09	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
	2018	64%	64%	0%	53%	11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	70%	70%	0%	53%	17%
	2018	75%	75%	0%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	63%	0%	62%	1%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	51%	0%	64%	-13%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	51%	51%	0%	60%	-9%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	53%	53%	0%	55%	-2%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	90%	90%	0%	54%	36%
	2018	88%	88%	0%	54%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		30%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	49%	0%	53%	-4%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	76%	76%	0%	48%	28%
	2018	71%	71%	0%	50%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		28%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	78%	0%	67%	11%
2018	84%	84%	0%	65%	19%
Compare		-6%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	0%	0%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	0%	0%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	81%	81%	0%	70%	11%
2018	75%	75%	0%	68%	7%
Compare		6%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	65%	0%	61%	4%
2018	70%	70%	0%	62%	8%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	77%	0%	57%	20%
2018	74%	74%	0%	56%	18%
Compare		3%			

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	27	42	36	32	44	43	20	43			
ASN	83	54		76	77		85				
BLK	54	50	42	43	40	35	42	60	25	100	32
HSP	82	59	52	73	53	50	74	93	80	96	82
MUL	78	60	58	76	67		76	75			
WHT	78	64	45	75	65	59	82	91	82	100	51
FRL	61	51	41	53	53	44	60	72	50	100	38

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	27	40	32	37	52	47	18			100	9
ASN	81	77		69	50		77				
BLK	49	46	29	48	48	42	53	48	58	92	33
HSP	79	68	50	70	63	50	72	82	64	100	78
MUL	71	71	50	69	61	42	62	72			
WHT	78	62	52	78	66	47	81	77	79	100	69
FRL	59	50	32	55	55	43	61	60	57	95	52
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	20	42	44	35	43	32	28	50			
ASN	73	52		77	52		64	90			
BLK	43	50	41	44	49	49	41	67	62	96	5
HSP	77	58	65	75	64	53	80	86	88	100	73
MUL	65	54	53	56	57	47	67	85			
WHT	75	63	57	71	61	48	81	86	89	97	67
FRL	52	53	49	48	51	43	57	71	64	94	40

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
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	726
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
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%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	75
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	48
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	72
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	70
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	72
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	57
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.

In analyzing and synthesizing, it appears lower performance is evident in the data for SWD, and there are slightly lower scores than the overall state scores for the lowest 25% of students, which also includes a portion of SWD. However, scores in most areas were at or above levels from the previous year both when compared to district or State marks.

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

The greatest decline across all data areas seems to be in upper elementary related to math or ela when making cohort or same grade comparisons, more specifically for math in 4th grade and in some instances in 6th grade.

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.

School data shows a +12% gap and a +15% gap compared to the State average in ELA Achievement and Science Achievement (respectfully) for the 2019 year.

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

From 2018 to 2019, Social Studies achievement had the highest increase from 70% to 82%. In 'core' areas, ELA Achievement improved the most over the same time frame, up 2%.

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

Based on EWS data from Part I (D), one area of potential concern would be a steady number of students achieving at the Level 1 mark on state assessments from 5th-10th grades.

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

1. Students with Disabilities subgroup achievement/performance
2. Lower quartile improvement (Math and ELA)
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a school, the SWD subgroup was below the 41% Federal Index, indicating a need for improvement. As a subgroup across the school, SWD's achievement was often lower than other subgroups in areas measured by State assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Using standardized assessment results, the SWD subgroup will show learning gains of at least 5% in all reported categories (ie ELA, Math).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Hill (ahill@pky.ufl.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using quarterly student data meetings as a driver, teachers, counselors, and administrators will meet to review student data, with particular monitoring of the SWD subgroup. Where SWD are not showing satisfactory learning gains, particularly in ELA or Mathematics, students will be provided tiered services of increased duration, frequency, and/or intensity using targeted, skill focused curricula. SWD progress will then be monitored and discussed at the subsequent data meeting.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitoring and intervention of student data are essential components of successful systems to promote student learning growth. Interventions in math that include guided practice, corrective, feedback, and on solving word problems have been discussed as important, evidence-based practices to support student learning (Institute of Education Sciences, 2009). In reading, providing systematic, intensive instruction on specific reading skills three to five times weekly for 20 to 40 minutes has shown strong evidence to support student learning and growth (Institute of Education Sciences, 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

- Schedule and plan for (at minimum) quarterly student progress/data meetings
- Identify SWD, along with any initial placement for intervention services
- Based on SWD reading or math needs, identify evidence-based strategies for instruction
- Monitor student progress aligned with assessment measures for progress
- Adjust intervention frequency, duration, and/or intensity as needed based on student progress.

Person Responsible Ashley Hill (ahill@pky.ufl.edu)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Given the crossover between SWD subgroup and students in the lowest 25%, strategies implemented as part of the area of focus described in Section III, A should also be of benefit to assisting in raising numbers for students in both the SWD and lowest 25% subgroups.

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.

Relationships with families are created through a myriad of events and gathering opportunities throughout each year. These opportunities provide PK Yonge leadership feedback from families to continue developing and improving positive relationships. Such opportunities include:

-Summer Adventures in Literacy: A literacy camp where students attend to improve skills such as decoding, fluency, and comprehension. Families are invited in for a Family Engagement Night to learn from their child(ren) and to understand literacy progress for their child(ren).

-Adventures in Mathematics (AIM): A math-focused camp where students attend to improve skills in mathematical computation and conceptual understanding. Families are a part of the process both with initial opportunities to sign-up through communication with AIM teachers, through emailed and phone conversations throughout the camp as needed/requested, and with a conferences scheduled as requested by family.

-K/1 and 2/3rd Communities host family literacy days where families are invited to join students in sharing recent work in writing and reading.

-3rd grade hosts a Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) evening for families, where specific information is provided to help families be supported and to help support students.

PK Yonge builds and sustains partnerships throughout the local community through the work of both the Alumni Association and the School Advisory Council. Our School Advisory Council provides a

structure through which parents, students, faculty, and staff can work together in support of student achievement at P.K. Yonge. Monthly meetings, task force committees, and ongoing review of the school's current areas of need. PKY Alumni Association's purpose is to bring together alumni, faculty, and students and to provide a home for all members of our school family who are always welcome to return. Through involvement in the PKY Alumni Association, alumni stay informed about what is happening at P.K. Yonge. Monitoring and communication are accomplished through:

- Maintaining an accurate contact list of P.K. graduates, retired faculty and friends
- Encouraging the development of mentor relationships between current students and alumni
- Informing our alumni and friends about the school
- Participating in school and alumni events
- Raising funds to meet special school needs

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00