Sugar Mill Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sugar Mill Elementary School

1101 CHARLES ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

Demographics

Principal: Carol Sullo

Start Date for this Principal: 9/12/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (48%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 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.

Table of Contents

Sugar Mill Elementary School

1101 CHARLES ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

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

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	C	C

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 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.

With the cooperation of home, school, and community, the Sugar Mill family will provide a warm, caring atmosphere where all children will be challenged to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Panthers Always Will Succeed

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
Speidel, Mary	Principal	
Snodgrass, Traci	Instructional Coach	
Bracciale, Marie	School Counselor	
Interdonato, Joe	Teacher, K-12	
Hammond, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
Whitson, Lianne	Teacher, K-12	
Colucci, Carol	Teacher, K-12	
Bennett, Audra	Teacher, K-12	
Interdonator, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Hawver, Deborah	Teacher, ESE	
Flaherty, Sherry	Teacher, K-12	
Cormier, Marina	Teacher, K-12	

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	110	85	93	89	102	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	22	15	13	15	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
31

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 9/12/2019

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	17	10	12	9	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	24	13	30	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	44	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123

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	4	1	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	61%	56%	57%	58%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	56%	58%	53%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	46%	53%	47%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	61%	59%	63%	65%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	56%	62%	55%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	43%	51%	36%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	57%	53%	48%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	110 (0)	85 (0)	93 (0)	89 (0)	102 (0)	103 (0)	582 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 ()	15 ()	13 ()	15 ()	16 ()	12 ()	93 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	5 ()	6 ()	12 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	6 ()	18 ()	27 ()	51 (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	64%	58%	6%	58%	6%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	54%	8%	58%	4%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	60%	-3%	62%	-5%
	2018	62%	58%	4%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	59%	12%	64%	7%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	60%	-6%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%
	2018	69%	56%	13%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
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	22	38	46	28	54	50	11				
ELL	43			43							
BLK	30	43	30	27	38	36	17				
HSP	50	60		50	55		38				
MUL	70			60							
WHT	65	66	66	66	71	66	64				
FRL	55	59	51	55	59	45	47				
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	25	35	20	29	16	5	37				

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
BLK	30	38		36	24						
HSP	53	41		53	45						
MUL	64			73							
WHT	65	52	26	71	63	31	73				
FRL	53	46	26	61	53	30	65				
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	22	29	31	38	45	25	20				
BLK	54	60		42	27						
HSP	48	35	20	52	47						
MUL	60	62		60	54		50				
WHT	59	54	55	70	60	37	52				
FRL	50	51	45	59	52	36	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	62
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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	65
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	66
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	56
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance Math Learning Gains/Lowest Quartile with 53. The contributing factor was teacher's not doing small group instruction with those students who needed support with the standards they have not mastered.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Science. The factors that contributed to this decline were that the 3rd and 4th grade standards had not been mastered by our 5th grade students.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math achievement. The contributing factor was teacher's not doing small group instruction with those students who needed support with the standards they have not mastered.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was ELA Learning Gains/Lowest Quartile +28%. The new actions that we took were small group instruction, writing intervention (Being A Writer), and Sugar Mill Writes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The potential concern is Math and Science achievement.

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

1. Black/African American Students (32%)
2. Students with Disabilities (36%)
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	The data showed that there was an increase of only 1% from last year in ELA Achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Achievement from 61% to 65% for 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group learning has a .47 effective size according to John Hattie.

Action Step

Description	1. Professional Learning During PLC's on Small Group Instruction 2. Book Study-Making the Most of Small Groups 3. Coaching Cycles on Small Group Instruction 4. Lesson Plan Template Including Small Group Instruction 5. Learning Walks 6. Data Chats 7. Small Group Intervention with K-2 including students with Disabilities and ELL
Person Responsible	Traci Snodgrass (tmsnodgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	Math Achievement scores went down 5% points from 2018-2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math Achievement with increase from 61% to 66%in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction in Math
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group learning has a .47 effective size according to John Hattie.
Action Step	
Description	Professional Learning During PLC's on Small Group Instruction 2. Book Study-Making the Most of Small Groups 3. Coaching Cycles on Small Group Instruction 4. Lesson Plan Template Including Small Group Instruction 5. Learning Walks 6. Data Chats 7. Small Group Intervention with 3-5 including students with Disabilities and ELL
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	Science Achievement went down 13% from 2018. Science instruction was not consistent.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Science Achievement will increase from 56% to 61% in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Mary Speidel (mspeidel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Based Instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards Based Instruction according to John Hattie has an effect size of 1.79.
Action Step	
Description	1. Science Standards Based Instruction Professional Learning 2. Grade Level PLC Planning for Science Standards Based Instruction 3. Science Standards Based Interventions for Grades 3-5 4. Learning Walks 5. Data Chats 6. Small Group Intervention with 3-5 including students with Disabilities and ELL
Person Responsible	Traci Snodgrass (tmsnodgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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).

We will be focusing our PD in the area of ELA small group instruction, as well as, the weekly Grade Level PLC's. Also, when we have the full day planning days for each grade level each 9 weeks, our focus will be to look at the data and the lower 25% quartile students in the area of ELA-using iReady Data, Waterford, and SUCCESS Maker.

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.

To maintain 5 Star School Status by encouraging parent involvement at all school events.

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.

Sugar Mill Elementary has a Certified School Counselor at the school to provide for the social-emotional needs of our students. This is done by providing character development, bully-proofing, and classroom lessons with all students. She is also available to provide group and individual counseling to help meet the specific needs of students. She helps to coordinate outside agencies to provide additional counseling, mentoring, behavioral coaching, and family support at the school. During a time of crisis with a student, she can help in providing an individual concern of harm to get the student additional psychological support immediately. If there is a school wide crisis or incident, the school counselor can assist with the district crisis intervention plan for the school-wide needs and coordinate with the district's PrePare team to help debrief students and families from the effects of the crisis.

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

The District, in conjunction with the local Head Start agency, Early Learning Coalition, VPK sites and other local pre-school facilities, coordinates efforts to promote continuity of services and effective transitions for children and their families.
These Include:
* Providing the opportunity for ongoing communication between agencies to facilitate coordination of programs and shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school.
* Collaborating and participating in joint professional development, including transition-related training for school staff and pre-school staff when feasible.
*FLKRS (Star Early Learning) is used to assess Kindergarten readiness by all Kindergarten teachers.

In addition, Sugar Mill currently has one VPK, one Blended VPK, one full-day ESE PreK, and two half-day ESE classes. PreK teachers are included in all professional development opportunities on campus, including PLC meetings and vertical articulations.

At the end of the year, the School Counselors from area middle schools articulate with 5th grade teachers and students for appropriate academic placement in 6th grade.

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.

The SLT identifies resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and response of the SLT and other key individuals and teams such as the PLCs, Literacy Leadership Team, and School Counselor. As with the development of the SIP, the SLT uses the 8-step problem solving process to determine needs and strategies to address those needs, including the coordination and supplementation of school resources with federal and state funds, services, and programs. Adherence to the problem solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress.

Title I, Part A

Programs supported by Title I at Sugar Mill Elementary include:

*Intermediate Intervention Teacher (3-5) to provide interventions for students in need via a push-in model (half-day).
*Primary Intervention Teacher (K-2) to provide interventions for students in need via a push-in model (full day).
*Supplemental materials and supplies needed to close the achievement gap.
*Parent To Kid workshops (K-2 & 3-5) to teach literacy skills to parents so they can help their children to become better readers.

Title X- Homeless

The school works closely with our Title X Coordinator, to ensure that homeless students have the materials and resources they need to be successful.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers the following non-violence and anti-drug programs:

*Student Mentoring Program
*Crisis Training Program
*Suicide Prevention Instruction
*Bully Proofing Instruction
*Cyber Bully Prevention Program
*Anti-Drug/Alcohol Instruction
*The Great Kindness Challenge
*Smarter Safer Kids Program

*Peer-Mediation Program
*K Kid Leadership Group

Nutrition Programs

*Free and Reduced Meal Plan
*Wellness Policy School Plan

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

Not Applicable

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Math Achievement**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Science Achievement**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**