

Duval County Public Schools

Fishweir Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Fishweir Elementary School

3977 HERSCHEL ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

<http://www.duvalschools.org/fishweir>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Dennis M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
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: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (69%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Fishweir Elementary School

3977 HERSCHEL ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

<http://www.duvalschools.org/fishweir>

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	No	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

Fishweir Elementary School is a standards-based learning community where the individual needs of the student are assessed and the results are used to direct our instruction. The child-centered curriculum encourages children to grow academically and creatively. The academic and arts curriculum focuses on strengthening communication skills, fostering creative problem solving skills and enabling our students to exhibit exemplary interpersonal skills to become productive lifelong learners that will enrich their lives and our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Fishweir Elementary School, we strive for excellence, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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
Dennis, Kimberly	Principal	The Principal's job and responsibilities include monitoring instruction, analyzing student data (cognitive and non-cognitive), providing individualized and prescriptive professional development for teachers and support staff members. In addition to these responsibilities, the principal is responsible for increasing student achievement, ensuring managerial operations are effective and consistent. The Principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community members with securing business partners.
Smith, Latoya	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal's job and responsibilities include monitoring instruction, analyzing student data (cognitive and non-cognitive), providing individualized and prescriptive professional development for teachers and support staff members. In addition to these responsibilities, the principal is responsible for increasing student achievement, ensuring managerial operations are effective and consistent. The Assistant Principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community members with securing business partners.
Black, Amy	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor's job and responsibilities include providing counseling support to students, teaching classroom guidance lessons, facilitating MT meetings, provide crisis intervention, provide A.L.E.R.T. training to staff, processing referrals (i.e. gifted, 504, speech).
Brantley, Katherine	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Lead Teacher's job and responsibilities include supporting the other VE Resource teacher, working collaboratively with general education teachers to support students, servicing Inclusion students, developing IEPs, providing accommodations for students based on their IEP, serving as the LEA Liaison.

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	91	69	73	71	74	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	12	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

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	10	12	5	5	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	80%	50%	57%	77%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	58%	69%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	62%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	62%	63%	83%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	62%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	52%	51%	41%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	48%	53%	74%	50%	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	91 (0)	69 (0)	73 (0)	71 (0)	74 (0)	65 (0)	443 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	10 ()	12 ()	5 ()	5 ()	11 ()	43 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	6 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	11 (0)	18 (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	81%	51%	30%	58%	23%
	2018	82%	50%	32%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	52%	25%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	49%	34%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	82%	50%	32%	56%	26%
	2018	68%	51%	17%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	61%	23%	62%	22%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	64%	12%	64%	12%
	2018	88%	60%	28%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	90%	57%	33%	60%	30%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	49%	28%	53%	24%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	55%	19%
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	50	40	27	68	55	42					

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
BLK	63	40		68	64	30	60				
HSP	94			94							
WHT	83	71	48	85	62	43	80				
FRL	66	50	48	71	47	26	65				
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	45	41	33	50	26	13	43				
BLK	65	61	36	76	39						
HSP	75			85							
MUL	83	50		83	60						
WHT	79	62	55	81	60	50	80				
FRL	67	56	41	77	56	50	67				
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	46	37	35	54	38	29					
BLK	58	68	57	69	68	45	57				
HSP	73			82							
WHT	82	68	56	88	60	39	80				
FRL	66	68	67	77	60	41	66				

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	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	94
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	67
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	53
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 is the "Math Lowest 25th Percentile", which was 42%. The students who were identified as LPQ (lower performing quartile) students did not make adequate progress in Math. These students usually need frequent remediation and qualify for safety nets, such as before/after school tutoring, small group instruction and one-on-one support from our VE Resource teachers as well as our classroom teachers.

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 lowest performance is the "Math Lowest 25th Percentile", which was 42%. The students who were identified as LPQ (lower performing quartile) students did not make adequate progress in Math. These students usually need frequent remediation and qualify for safety nets, such as before/after school tutoring, small group instruction and one-on-one support from our VE Resource teachers as well as our classroom teachers.

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 with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is "Science Achievement". The factors that contributed to this gap are the 3rd and 4th Grade Science teachers who consistently taught Science lessons and standards with fidelity. This was evident by the 5th Grade students' performance on the baseline, PMA's and FCAT 2.0. The 5th Grade Science FCAT 2.0 scores are consistently above 70% proficiency each year.

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 is "Math Learning Gains" with a 5% point increase. Weekly, consistent and prescriptive progress monitoring occurred to determine which students needed remediation in each standard/benchmark. The content area teachers as well as the

VE Resource teachers worked collaboratively to review assessments, classwork and small group instruction to determine if the prescriptive strategies for these students were successful.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, one area of concern is absenteeism. Administration and the School Counselor will continue AIT (Attendance Intervention Team) meetings monthly with parents, to discuss strategies to help parents improve their child's attendance. The District's Truancy Officer is also involved to provide support to parents. The School Counselor monitors absenteeism weekly and provides updates to the Leadership Team.

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

1. Increasing the percentage of students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ) in Math for FSA.
2. Increasing the percentage of students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ) in Reading for FSA.
3. Increasing the percentage of Learning Gains in Math for FSA.
4. Increase the percentage of Learning Gains in Reading for FSA.
5. Increase the proficiency in 4th Grade Reading for FSA.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Lowest 25th Percentile (42%)
Rationale	This is the lowest area on state assessment. There was a 3% decrease from 2018.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase five (5) percentage points in this area.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Dennis (dennisk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	There will be weekly progress monitoring from teachers to provide remediation to students by standard/benchmark. This will be done through administering mini-assessments. If students do not score above 70%, the student will receive remediation, then re-assessed to determine if those strategies were successful.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for this strategy is to progress monitor what standards students are mastering individually on a weekly basis. This will be the basis for teachers to plan instruction and teach prescriptive strategies to students who are below proficiency. The evidence will be teachers' implementation of progress monitoring forms along with the mini-assessments that will be reviewed weekly by the Principal. Teachers will re-teach that particular standard, should the student score below 70%. The student will be re-taught and then re-tested to determine if the strategies were successful. This is done on a weekly basis.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with teachers weekly to review progress monitoring, discuss strategies and to ensure assessments align with ALD (Achievement Level Descriptors) and test item specifications. 2. Plan lessons with teachers during weekly PLCs and provide instructional support. 3. Intermediate teachers will provide after school tutoring for students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ). 4. VE Resource teachers will provide before school tutoring with Inclusion students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ). 5.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Dennis (dennisk@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	
Rationale	
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	1.
	2.
	3.
	4.
	5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
Rationale	This is the second lowest area on state assessment. The percentage (50%) stayed the same from 2018.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan to increase five (5) percentage points in this area.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kimberly Dennis (dennisk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	There will be weekly progress monitoring from teachers to provide remediation to students by standard/benchmark. This will be done through administering mini-assessments. If students do not score above 70%, the student will receive remediation, then re-assessed to determine if those strategies were successful.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for this strategy is to progress monitor what standards students are mastering individually on a weekly basis. This will be the basis for teachers to plan instruction and teach prescriptive strategies to students who are below proficiency. The evidence will be teachers' implementation of progress monitoring forms along with the mini-assessments that will be reviewed weekly by the Principal. Teachers will re-teach that particular standard, should the student score below 70%. The student will be re-taught and then re-tested to determine if the strategies were successful. This is done on a weekly basis.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with teachers weekly to review progress monitoring, discuss strategies and to ensure assessments align with ALD (Achievement Level Descriptors) and test item specifications. 2. Plan lessons with teachers during weekly PLCs and provide instructional support. 3. Intermediate teachers will provide after school tutoring for students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ). 4. VE Resource teachers will provide before school tutoring with Inclusion students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ). 5.
Person Responsible	Kimberly Dennis (dennisk@duvalschools.org)

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).

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lowest 25th Percentile (42%)	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus:	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00