

P.K Yonge Developmental Research School

P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2018-19 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%) 2014-15: A (72%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	16
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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
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 and position title 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

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	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	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

68

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/31/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Students with two or more indicators															

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%
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%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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			

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
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%	
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%	

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	75
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	48
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	72
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	70
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	72
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

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	
Title	Students with Disabilities (SWD)
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.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	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 Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedule and plan for (at minimum) quarterly student progress/data meetings 2. Identify SWD, along with any initial placement for intervention services 3. Based on SWD reading or math needs, identify evidence-based strategies for instruction 4. Monitor student progress aligned with assessment measures for progress 5. 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 (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

optional

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

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).
- 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

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

PK Yonge establishes a core response team that meets quarterly to update, plan for, or monitor social-emotional needs of students during student success team meetings. These meetings include teaching faculty, school leadership, and guidance counselors. Services for students are identified during these meetings as well as during consultation throughout the school year amongst members of the student and family services (SFS) team. The SFS team also meets weekly to coordinate pupil services across the school.

Core social-emotional programs are established across the school as well, where students proactively develop skills such as goal-setting, relationship building, and self-monitoring.

Teaching faculty or on-campus service clubs (ie Key Club) offer mentorship services to students throughout the school year as well.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Counselors at each level work to provide individualized transition services that are differentiated to meet the students unique needs of each student socially, emotionally and academically. The high school counselor facilitates one on one meet and greet consultations with incoming students and families to discuss but not limited to scheduling, campus layout, extracurricular activities, community services, graduation requirements, transcript review, and post-secondary options. The counselor hosts exit interviews of outgoing members of the PK Yonge student body.

The middle school counselor hosts one on one consultations with students and families, and is a part of an experience for incoming middle grades students that involves students coming to campus prior to the opening of the school year to develop positive relationships with each other and with their school teaching team (teachers, counselor).

The elementary counselor works to build a rapport with new students at the beginning of the year open house. The counselor meets and greets with new families, ensures students are aware of the location of the counseling office, and encourages students to take time exploring the items within her office. The elementary counselor can be found observing the new students in their respective classrooms, hosting new student lunch bunch sessions, and completing weekly check-in services.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

At P.K. Yonge we are dedicated to the academic, social, and emotional success of every student. In an effort to ensure this success, the leadership structure is designed with students at the core. Our collective focus is that every student leaves P.K. Yonge college and/or career ready. College and/or career ready in the 21st century means that every student develops strong skills in communication and collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity.

The school organization model emphasizes teacher-leaders (Learning Community Leaders) who are committed to support each child's learning needs through multi-tiered systems of support. The Administrative Leadership team works to coordinate services for students and to monitor system progress in conjunction with teacher leaders on campus (academic, social-emotional). In addition, the Student and Family Services (SFS) team, composed of counselors, school psychologists, deans, school resource officer, and nurse, meet to coordinate services to students across campus.

The various school leadership teams meet weekly for problem-solving, updating, and monitoring resources and student needs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

School counselors work to ensure the success of each and every student as they collaborate with teachers, parents, and administration to identify the most effective path for every student. College and career readiness activities include but are not limited to; individualized and comprehensive one on one consultative services to discuss and plan for post secondary options, transition planning, scheduling and hosting on campus college admission visits, participation in local college fairs, creation of monthly newsletters where content is driven by college and career ready text, scholarship awareness, classroom lessons, award opportunities, college application labs, summer college workshop, data collection, after school sessions with topics specific to college fit, financial aid, and writing college essays.

Students at PK Yonge are offered advanced level coursework throughout their high school careers, and during the 2018-2019 school year, all 11th grade students took the SAT free of charge during the school day. This opportunity offered equitable access to all students interested in a college-track for post secondary, limiting barriers to access for sitting to take the SAT.

PK Yonge upperclassmen have the opportunity to participate in an Executive Internship program, where they are partnered with local businesses and engage in on-the-job learning experiences.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities (SWD)	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00