Freedom High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Freedom High School

17410 COMMERCE PARK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kevin Stephenson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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

Freedom High School

17410 COMMERCE PARK BLVD, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	75%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

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.

To inspire our students through the building of a strong, safe academic community that supports each learner in developing his or her unique voice and goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stephenson, Kevin	Principal	Principal
Smith, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Testing
Duncan, Thomas	Assistant Principal	Administration and athletics
McCray, Antonyia	Parent Engagement Liaison	SAC Chair
Lamour, Jenna	Assistant Principal	
Grimm, Debbie	SAC Member	
Reale, Lisa	Instructional Coach	ELA Coach
Bell, Marvin	Assistant Principal	APSA
Siudut, Keri	Teacher, K-12	Reading Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Kevin Stephenson

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
29

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

91

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,836

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

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	522	471	433	410	1836
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	217	156	131	666
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	8	7	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	104	1	106
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	126	70	1	200
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	153	0	0	304
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	154	0	0	210
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	0	0	59

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	76	86	129	108	399

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	15	0	2	0	17
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 8/26/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522	471	433	410	1836
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	217	156	131	666
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	8	7	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	150	121	0	422
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	16	154	23	334
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	196	493

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	55	134	95	50	334

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522	471	433	410	1836
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	217	156	131	666
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	10	8	7	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	150	121	0	422
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141	16	154	23	334
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	297	196	493

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	55	134	95	50	334

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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	35%	52%	51%				46%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						51%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						36%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	36%	39%	38%				35%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	41%						42%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						46%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	55%	46%	40%				78%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	49%	48%				65%	75%	73%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

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

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	71%	66%	5%	67%	4%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	62%	73%	-11%	70%	-8%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	19%	63%	-44%	61%	-42%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	42%	57%	-15%	57%	-15%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	32	27	32	47	39	36	41		89	36
ELL	15	34	35	25	36	33	24	17		92	52
ASN	56	67		71	50		64	89		100	86
BLK	25	38	44	19	33	44	46	45		91	52
HSP	27	37	32	31	34	27	44	50		93	53
MUL	48	51		50	40		71	71		100	80
WHT	54	47	36	58	60	50	74	78		96	75
FRL	27	37	36	30	39	41	45	49		92	54

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	29	25	11	20	30	22	33		98	27
ELL	13	39	36	10	31	49	25	23		92	37
ASN	73	63		47	23		79	82		89	82
BLK	28	35	30	11	14	20	32	44		93	31
HSP	31	40	33	20	23	38	45	51		96	48
MUL	45	34		25	29		64	75		90	61
WHT	61	53	23	41	25	31	62	66		96	68
FRL	28	37	31	16	18	25	41	47		92	38

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	38	31	24	43	37	36	47		85	15
ELL	9	41	38	16	40	50		42		72	28
ASN	79	61		71	58		100	83		95	67
BLK	30	44	34	25	38	42	56	51		87	20
HSP	38	44	34	28	35	45	81	55		87	37
MUL	71	70		38	40		75	94		88	27
WHT	63	61	44	48	52	55	85	78		95	54
FRL	34	45	35	26	38	44	70	53		85	27

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	548
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	73
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	44
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	44
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	64
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	63
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	46
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

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

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

We had an overall increase in performance from the prior year. The largest 1 year gain in points. The only group that did not show an increase in performance were 9th and 10th ELA.
We continue to see ELL and ESE student under performing.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

9th and 10th grade ELA

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

This was the first year back from COVID/e-learning.
We had a 9th English and a Reading vacancy to start the school year.
Level 2 readers were not scheduled for reading classes. They received support through ELA and subject area classes (World Culture Geography, World History, Environmental Science, Biology)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math had the larges gains
Biology also showed strong gains

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

The math and Bio PLC's were focused all year on student assessment data. The teachers used student data to adjust teaching. Common assessments were used to identify areas that needed reteaching. This content was incorporated in current lesson. Teachers also focused on student centered lessons and strategies such as Rally Coach and interactive labs.

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

PLC - focus on planning for engaging lessons, common assessments and pacing. Teachers will unpack the standards in the PLC meetings to ensure lessons are on level with the rigger of the standard.

Teachers will also focus on differentiation of lessons to meet the needs of students based on assessment and accommodation needs.

Assessment data will be used to target students who need additional support. This will happen through ELP, push in support, and pull out support.

Students needing additional support will also be invited to Saturday School

School wide focus on literacy strategies.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our on site coaches will develop PD based on teacher needs. During pre-planning, we will assess teacher PD needs through a survey.

We have purchased 300 hours of paid PD for teacher through Title 1. Teachers will opportunities to complete coaching cycles with our on campus coaches and get paid.

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

We will continue to fund on campus coaches through Title 1 to provide on-site support.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Student performance on the ELA state assessment indicated there is a critical need to focus on language skills. These skills should be taught and reinforced in all classes, not just English classes.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our goal is to increase student proficiency on the ELA state assessment by 10%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Students will take mandatory baseline and mid year assessments to check proficiency during the school year. Ninth and 10th grade ELA classes will uses additional common assessments. All assessments will be used to monitor progression, identify students for additional learning opportunities, and assess lesson effectiveness.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matthew Smith (matthew.smith@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	All teachers will focus on EE1.1 – Cite evidence to explain and justify reasoning. This can be applied to all subjects.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	EE 1.1 is a foundational strategy that can be practiced in all subjects. Students can practice using evidence to support answers for any topic - art work, political cartoons, math problem, etc... This skill, if practiced in all classes each day, should result in students increased ability to do this on a state assessment.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

On site PD will provide teachers with specific strategies to support EE 1.1. Teachers can complete a coaching cycle to earn in service point. We also have PD pay available through Title 1.

Additional PD will be offered focusing on differentiation for the ELL and ESE students to address under performing sub groups.

Person Responsible	Lisa Reale (lisa.reale@hcps.net)

Walk through observations will focus on looking for evidence of EE 1.1 in action. The school leadership team will complete the walkthrough with a goal of every teacher receiving feedback each month.

Person Responsible	Kevin Stephenson (kevin.stephenson@hcps.net)

Teacher will display posters supporting EE 1.1
Posters will be created by ELA team focused on strategies and skills

Person Responsible	Lisa Reale (lisa.reale@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	During pre-planning, teachers identified planning as the key to creating successful engaging lessons. Teachers also identified engaging lessons as the key to learning gains across all subjects.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Teachers will us engaging lesson plans to improve learning gains in each of the rated performance area: ELA - increase at least 10% Math - increase at least 3% Biology - increase at least 5% US History - increase at least 8%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Each PLC leader will complete a PLC Collaborative Protocol which includes attendance. This will be submitted to the principal each month. A member of the leadership team will also attend core PLC meetings each month to support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kevin Stephenson (kevin.stephenson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	In PLC meetings, teacher will develop common assessments, analyze student performance on common assessment and district assessments, planning engaging lessons that are standards based, share lesson plans with group members.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Planning is the core of all instruction.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Each teacher will participate in at least one PLC each month

Person Responsible	Kevin Stephenson (kevin.stephenson@hcps.net)

PLC Leaders will meet as a group prior to the PLC meetings to discuss plans for their meeting. This will also be a time to get support from other PLC Leads.

Person Responsible	Kevin Stephenson (kevin.stephenson@hcps.net)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We have several positive recognition initiatives including:
Patriot of the week - teachers nominate students each week to receive rewards
No Tardy Party on Fridays
Quarterly Honor Roll celebrations
Faculty Patriot of the Month
Student Nutrition employee of the month
Bus Driver appreciation events
Monthly Teacher events

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

PTSA supports the Patriot of the Month and No Tardy Party
Teachers nominate students for recognition each week.
All staff can nominate employees for the Patriot of the Month
Parents - purchase student incentive items through Amazon Wish List.