Moton Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Moton Elementary School

7175 EMERSON RD, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/mes

Demographics

Principal: Patty Martin D

Start Date for this Principal: 11/1/2018

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (33%)
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 Hernando 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

Moton Elementary School

7175 EMERSON RD, Brooksville, FL 34601

https://www.hernandoschools.org/mes

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

Moton Elementary School, is a place of excellence where students realize their full potential, respect core values such as compassion, integrity, and determination and achieve academic success through active engagement so that as citizens of our community they will contribute to its growth and success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Showing P.R.I.D.E in all we do!

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
Martin, Patty	Principal	
Sauvageot, Stephanie	Other	
Casey, Erin	Attendance/Social Work	
Spatz, Patricia	Instructional Coach	
Sermons, Tisha	Teacher, K-12	
Kidd, Robin	Administrative Support	
Davis, Susan	Dean	
Neal, Alexa	Assistant Principal	
Whatley, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Kuykendall, Rebecca	Teacher, ESE	
Stewart, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Duncan, Emma	Teacher, K-12	
Caldwell, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	
Gainer, April	Teacher, K-12	
Morris, Michele	Teacher, K-12	
Stewart, Adriann	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 11/1/2018, Patty Martin D

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.*
1

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
50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (46%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (33%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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

Friday 9/25/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	108	87	91	86	82	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	22	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	5	4	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	22	14	22	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	12	0	7	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	7	3	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	108	87	91	86	82	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	22	14	22	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	5	4	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	22	14	22	19	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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	12	0	7	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	7	3	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	40%	54%	57%	37%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	53%	58%	42%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	52%	53%	40%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	43%	58%	63%	43%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	46%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	48%	51%	39%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	54%	53%	32%	54%	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	38%	57%	-19%	58%	-20%
	2018	35%	62%	-27%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	59%	-19%	58%	-18%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	38%	52%	-14%	56%	-18%
	2018	38%	53%	-15%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	62%	-18%	62%	-18%
	2018	46%	67%	-21%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	62%	-29%	64%	-31%
	2018	40%	60%	-20%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	60%	-17%
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	61%	-26%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	55%	-7%	53%	-5%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
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	18	35	33	24	48	50					
ELL	35	67		63	69						
BLK	22	38	50	20	31	36	30				
HSP	37	59		49	59		36				
MUL	69			69							
WHT	46	45	21	46	57	64	54				
FRL	38	46	41	38	50	57	48				
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	22	30	38	21	35	17	40				
ELL	25	60		50	55						
BLK	18	43		27	39		43				
HSP	35	50		48	48	30	69				
MUL	75	64		73	60						
WHT	51	59	48	51	52	28	76				
FRL	39	52	59	42	45	29	63				
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	6	31	37	8	22	13	6				
ELL	23			46							
BLK	27	38		29	40		33				
HSP	26	32		45	40		14				
MUL	50			67							
WHT	42	47	38	45	49	44	33				

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
FRL	31	40	42	40	44	32	31				

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	46
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	59
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	32
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	48
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	69
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	48
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student performance data indicates 40%, which is a decrease from 42% last year of all students were proficient in ELA, while only 22% of Black students and 18% of Students with Disabilities were proficient in ELA. We also had a decrease in learning gains from 54% to 47%. We will focus on understanding the depth and rigor of standards and aligning standards with all lessons and activities and include instruction focusing on phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, writing and comprehension through our Focused 5 Centers to increase student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency on the state assessment will increase from 40% to 45% or higher. Black students will increase from 22% to 32% and Students with Disabilities will increase from 18% to 28% proficient as we move forward in closing the achievement gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitative planning will specifically focus on unpacking the standards and understanding the depth/rigor of the standard in order to plan lessons and activities that support the learning process and show growth and or mastery of the standard. We will use Standards Mastery iReady assessments to do a pre-assessment prior to beginning the teaching of the standard and a post-assessment to show whether the lessons/activities truly supported the mastery of the standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers, through facilitative planning, will understand the standard and the depth of the standard to be able to teach it. The focus on standards based activities is to make sure our students are "doing" the work in order to learn and master the standards. Coaches will provide PD and support teams with planning while maintaining focus on standards. Teachers will work with coaches and admin using standards mastery data to support if what they've planned works or if it needs to be changed.

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Admin Plan time for teachers to participate in Facilitative Planning
2.) Admin and Coaches follow up with specific feedback on the activities they've planned to teach the standard. We will also provide feedback through walkthroughs.
3.)Plan time for teachers to take pre & post standards mastery assessments and reflect on the data and change instruction(activities) as needed.
4.) Data chats with leadership, equity team and teachers will take place to discuss data and how it drives our instruction

Person Responsible	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student performance data indicates 43%, which is a decrease from 46% last year, of all students were proficient in Math while only 20% of Black students and 24% of Students with Disabilities were proficient in Math. We will focus on understanding the depth and rigor of standards and aligning standards with all lessons and activities and include instruction focusing on specific math skills through our Focused 5 Centers to increase student achievement. The small groups will also be used for differentiated instruction in the Guided Math center to support reinforcement of skills.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency on the state assessment will increase from 43% to 53% or higher. Black students will increase from 20% to 30% and Students with Disabilities will increase from 24% to 34% proficient as we move forward in closing the achievement gap.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitative planning will specifically focus on unpacking the standards and understanding the depth/rigor of the standard in order to plan lessons and activities that support the learning process and show growth and or mastery of the standard. We will use Standards Mastery iReady assessments to do a pre-assessment prior to beginning the teaching of the standard and a post-assessment to show whether the lessons/activities truly supported the mastery of the standard.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers, through facilitative planning, will understand the standard and the depth of the standard to be able to teach it. The focus on standards based activities is to make sure our students are "doing" the work in order to learn and master the standards. Coaches will provide PD and support teams with planning while maintaining focus on standards. Teachers will work with coaches and admin using standards mastery data to support if what they've planned works or if it needs to be changed.

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Admin Plan time for teachers to participate in Facilitative Planning
2.) Admin and Coaches follow up with specific feedback on the activities they've planned to teach the standard. We will also provide feedback through walkthroughs.
3.)Plan time for teachers to take pre & post standards mastery assessments and reflect on the data and change instruction(activities) as needed.
4.) Data chats with leadership, equity team and teachers will take place to discuss data and how it drives our instruction

Person Responsible	Patty Martin (martin_p@hcsb.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have a plan in place to start addressing attendance concerns.

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.

Moton Elementary convenes monthly with our School Advisory Council that includes parents and community stakeholders, where student performance data is shared, as well as initiatives at the school in response to the data. Additionally, we have planned a parent and family event four times a year, one during each nine weeks, including a Title I Annual meeting. We are also planning "Focus Meetings" specifically for our ESSSA groups to build relationships with the parents and create a plan to work together to support our students in academic and behavioral improvements.

We have a strong focus on Positive Behavior (PBS). We implement many ways for students to show their PRIDE and different forms of recognition, such as Positive Referrals, Red Carpet Events, Mindful Mart and Getting Caught showing their PRIDE. We offer restorative justice opportunities instead of the typical consequences for breaking schoolwide rules and expectations, in order to keep our students in classes instead of ISS and OSS.

All staff has read the Opportunity Myth and are participating in ongoing in-depth conversations with respect to the opportunity myth in regards to making sure our students have the opportunities they need to be successful and grow as citizens. These practices along with data are being transferred into actions in the classrooms, such as specifically looking at data for subgroups and analyzing how they do on classroom assessments, while problem solving why and how to support them. Schoolwide we are focusing on teaching and having students explore career opportunities to give them more exposure as to what opportunities are available through college, trade and within our community. Each grade level has chosen at least 1 per 9 weeks. We are hoping that this exposure will allow our students to be able to talk about what they want to be when they grow up and to help them with goal setting. In 4th grade, we are starting a "token economy". For the first year, they have 3 ways to earn money being at school (to support with attendance), organizing their binders (to support organizational skills) and completing their work to the best of their ability (to support having high expectations and making work meaningful). We started only in 4th grade to start small and work through any concerns. Our goal is a schoolwide economy that included balancing checkbooks, saving, earning interest and eventually a micro-society.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.