Volusia County Schools

Coronado Beach Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 5

Needs Assessment 9

Planning for Improvement 14

Positive Culture & Environment 17

Budget to Support Goals 18

Coronado Beach Elementary School

3550 MICHIGAN AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/coronadobeach/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Tracy Buckner A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	

* 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 Volusia 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Coronado Beach Elementary School:
“From marine science to agriscience, educating the next generation of critical thinkers and problem solvers."

Provide the school's vision statement

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Buckner, Tracy	Principal	Liason that facilitates monthly meetings, and reports information back to faculty and staff.
Bartley, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Bass, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Cloer, Debbie	Other	Administrative Teacher on Assignment Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Pecoroni, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Quigley, Kim	Instructional Coach	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Mullins, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Sokerka, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Scalo, Jenifer	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.
Simmons, Angel	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Tracy Buckner A

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
22

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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	28	51	28	40	37	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	6	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/11/2020

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	47	36	38	48	35	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	6	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	

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	47	36	38	48	35	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	6	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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
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	76%	56%	57%	71%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	56%	58%	67%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	53%	53%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	78%	59%	63%	83%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	71%	56%	62%	75%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	43%	51%	75%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	79%	57%	53%	79%	58%	55%

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	82%	58%	24%	58%	24%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	54%	24%	58%	20%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
	2018	74%	58%	16%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	59%	9%	64%	4%
	2018	91%	60%	31%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	84%	54%	30%	60%	24%
	2018	83%	57%	26%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	33	30		42	64						
HSP	75			67							
WHT	78	73	50	82	72	50	81				
FRL	64	68	45	64	65	50	77				

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 2015-16**	**C & C Accel 2015-16**
SWD	31			31							
WHT	72	67	58	84	75	83	78				
FRL	56	59	50	76	86	91	75				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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

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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	69
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

The lowest performing groups were the students in the ELA LQ and Math LQ. Some of the contributing factors may include implementation of new resources, pacing of standards in comparison to the scope and sequence in the curriculum maps in addition to understanding of vertical articulation of the standards.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was students in the lowest quartile in math. Some of the factors that contributed to the decline may include pacing of standards. Additionally, it may be possible that the decline may be contributed to a lack of awareness when considering vertical articulation of the standards from one grade level to the next.

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

The greatest gap when compared to the state average in 2019 was in the area of science achievement. 53% of students scored proficient at the state level, and 79% of students scored proficient at the school level. This data component is a positive gap and may be attributed to the increase of hands on science investigations, in addition to looping and departmentalization models in 4th and 5th grade.

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

The area that showed the most improvement from 2018-2019 was overall ELA achievement. This may be contributed to the looping model that is used at our school in grades 2-3 and 4-5.

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

As we reflect on the EWS data, it appears our potential areas of concern are attendance below 90% and students with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Instructional practice specifically related to ELA- ELA Lower Quartile Students
2. Instructional practice specifically related to Math- Math Lower Quartile Students
3. Culture and Environment specifically related to Social Emotional Learning- SEL for all stakeholders
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, in addition to our 2019 FSA data, 44% of our lower quartile students scored proficient. This is below the district average of 46% and below the state average of 53%. Additionally, this proficiency percentage showed a decline from 2018 where 53% of our lower quartile students scored proficient which was above both the district and state average.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase proficiency in ELA Lowest Quartile from 44% to 47%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to the research of John Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review ELA learning gain data to discuss interventions (Kim Quigley)
2. Coaching on Small Group Instruction (Kim Quigley)
3. Collaborative planning sessions to plan for instruction (Kim Quigley)
4. Classroom Visits (Kim Quigley)
5. Monitor small group instruction (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer)
6. Quarterly progress monitoring meetings (Kim Quigley)
7. PLC meetings to review student data (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer)
8. Professional Learning for ELA instruction (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer, Kim Quigley)
Will occur in the form of coaching cycles and planned support for teachers .
Will be monitored by way of Classroom Visits, PLC's and Data Chats.
9. Professional Learning for technology integration (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer, Kim Quigley, Jason Pecoroni)
Will occur in the form of self paced canvas courses.
Will be supported through coaching cycles and planning support.
Will be monitored by way of Classroom Visits, PLC's and Data Chats.

Person Responsible Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, in addition to our 2019 FSA data, 47% of our Lower Quartile students scored proficient. This is above the district average of 43% but below the state average of 51%. Additionally, this proficiency percentage showed a decline from 2018 where 75% of our lower quartile students scored proficient which was above both the district and state average.
Measureable Outcome:	The percentage of Math lower quartile students will increase from 47% to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Aligned Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to the research of John Hattie.

Action Steps to Implement

1 Review math lower quartile data to discuss any needed interventions (Kim Quigley)
2. Coaching on Small Group Instruction (Kim Quigley)
3. Collaborative planning sessions to plan for instruction (Kim Quigley)
4. Classroom Visits (Kim Quigley)
5. Monitor small group instruction (Kim Quigley)
6. Quarterly progress monitoring meetings (Kim Quigley)
7. PLC meetings to review student data (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer)
8. Professional Learning for math instruction (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer, Kim Quigley)
Will occur in the form coaching cycles and teacher planning support.
Will be monitored by way of Classroom Visits, PLC's and Data Chats.
9. Professional Learning for technology integration (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer, Kim Quigley, Jason Pecoroni)
Will occur in the form of self paced canvas courses.
Will be supported through coaching cycles and planning support.
Will be monitored by way of Classroom Visits, PLC's and Data Chats.

Person Responsible	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SEL for all stakeholders including students, teachers, faculty, families, community members will be crucial to implement for a successful school reopening and for a successful school year.
Measureable Outcome:	Coronado will decrease the amount of discipline referrals from 126 to 110 for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Cloer (dacloer@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide SEL instruction utilizing Sanford Harmony.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony, is SEL curriculum that has been implemented district wide. It is aligned with CASEL (Collaborative for Academic and Social Emotional Learning. John Hattie's research on factors that positively impact student achievement say that the following influences which can be found within Sanford Harmony have effect sizes resulting in a likelihood to either positively impact or advance student achievement: Positive self concept: 0.41 (potential to advance) Social Skills Programs: 0.39 (likely to have a positive impact) Positive Peer Influences: 0.53 (potential to advance) Strong Classroom Cohesion 0.44 (potential to advance)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students may request the assistance of the school counselor as a behavioral intervention. (Jessica Canfield)
2. SEL instruction will take place in the classrooms daily. (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer)
3. Utilizing team support for teachers, staff, and administration. (Tracy Buckner, Debra Cloer)
4. Implement restorative practices (Debra Cloer, Jessica Canfield)
5. Monthly lessons will take place with the school counselor (Jessica Canfield)

Action Step implementation and monitoring will occur by means of teacher and student surveys in addition to observational data or student interviews/anecdotals

Person Responsible	Jessica Canfield (jkcanfie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Identify common assessments that can be used to identify our LQ students. Create and monitor SMART goals directly aligned to LQ student needs.

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.

Schoolwide SEL instruction
Incentive programs in lunchroom
Student Voice groups
Informing stakeholders of school wide themes, events etc. via social media
Class Spotlight for displaying classroom work digitally
Outstanding Student displays
Pirate of the Month
Team building
Teacher Shoutouts
Positive Referrals

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**