

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Academir Preparatory Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Academir Preparatory Academy

5800 SW 135TH AVE, Miami, FL 33183

www.academirpreparatoryacademy.com

## Demographics

**Principal: Karla Rodriguez**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

N/A

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Academir Preparatory Academy

5800 SW 135TH AVE, Miami, FL 33183

www.academirpreparatoryacademy.com

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	82%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

## School Board Approval

N/A

## 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.

The mission of Academir Preparatory Academy is to provide students with a well-rounded elementary education, through a challenging program, focused on mathematics and science pursuing innovative, reform-based instructional methods in a stimulating and nurturing environment that fosters maximum student achievement.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Academir Preparatory Academy is to provide students with a challenging and rigorous curriculum enabling students to be well prepared for life through adherence to the mission, shared purpose, and clearly articulated goals.

### 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
Espinosa, Paola	Assistant Principal	
Timilsina, Nabin	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/24/2020, Karla Rodriguez

**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.*

23

**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.*

0

#### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0	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	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 9/11/2020

**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	64	61	77	92	76	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	437
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

**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	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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	64	61	77	92	76	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	437
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	19	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

**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	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	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	63%	62%	57%	50%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	62%	58%	46%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	58%	53%	53%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	69%	63%	51%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	66%	62%	56%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	55%	51%	69%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	55%	53%	52%	52%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	60%	-1%	58%	1%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	64%	1%	58%	7%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	61%	60%	1%	56%	5%
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	67%	-8%	62%	-3%
	2018	68%	67%	1%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	69%	5%	64%	10%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	65%	65%	0%	60%	5%
	2018	64%	66%	-2%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	49%	56%	-7%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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
ELL	58	57	59	72	64	33	50				
HSP	63	60	53	68	62	37	45				
FRL	60	56	52	63	59	37	42				

  

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
ELL	50	55		68	70	92	19				
HSP	56	57	61	69	62	67	49				
FRL	56	58	60	68	62	72	51				

  

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
ELL	47	48	58	44	53	64					
HSP	50	46	53	51	56	69	54				
FRL	43	38	54	46	56	67	44				

**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	55
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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.

Math L25 and Science achievement showed the lowest performance. Our Math L25 group's gains decreased by 33 percentage points - one of the contributing factors may have been a lack of more individualized, targeted instruction toward this student group. Our Science achievement decreased by four percentage points from the previous school year - a contributing factor may have been a lack of standard-aligned assessment tool utilized with a progress monitoring plan.

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

Math L25 group: a lack of more individualized, targeted instruction toward this student group as well as the lack of a continuous progress monitoring plan for our bottom quartile in the area of mathematics.

#### 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.

Math L25 - a sixteen point decrease from the state average.

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

ELA Proficiency: an increase of seven percentage points from the previous school year was seen in this area. One of the actions taken was an action plan that included continuous standard-aligned rigorous instruction, particularly in the area of novel studies.

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

Science achievement and Math L25 learning gains.

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

1. Math Learning gains for the L25
2. Science Achievement
3. ELA Learning gains for the L25
- 4.
- 5.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	A strong area of focus this school year will continue to be maximizing the learning gains for our L25 in the area of math. Based on the 2018-2019 school data, the data component that performed the lowest was Math L25 - a decrease of 33 points from the previous year: 2017-2018.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We plan to increase Math L25 by ten percentage points this school year (35% to 45%).
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Nabin Timilsina (nabin@dadeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Intervention and tutoring will be offered an hour every school day during the school year targeting specifically students who fall in the L25 category. In addition, one hour of Saturday morning tutoring will be offered for 10 consecutive weeks prior to testing days.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Due to our decrease of 33 percentage points with our Math L25, this subgroup will be highly targeted via every intervention window offered in addition to the standard-aligned instruction that will be held in the classroom, closely monitored by our instructional coach, Mr. Timilsina.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify L25 population (in Math) for this school year.
2. Communicate with students and parents about in-school intervention and after school tutoring.
3. Prepare standard-aligned curriculum that targets areas of need (Math domains).
4. Monitor students' progress via I-Ready, USA Test Prep and/or Topic assessments (Unify) for Math.
5. Customize intervention, as needed, based on student progress.

**Person Responsible**                      Nabin Timilsina (nabin@dadeschools.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on our most recent state assessment data, we decreased by four percentage points in the area of Science Achievement; this decrease indicates that student learning needs to improve, therefore an action plan has been formulated that will target this area of concern.

**Measurable Outcome:** We plan to increase Science achievement by five percentage points this school year.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Nabin Timilsina (nabin@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Through both standard-aligned curricula and assessment platform that we have already been utilized, we will follow a progress monitoring plan to assure that our students' needs are being met in the area of Science.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Due to decrease of four percentage points in our Science Achievement, we will focus in this area via our strategic action plan.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students with weaknesses.
2. Implementation of the Progress Monitoring Plan for standard mastery check and remediation.
3. Increase grade-level achievement via tutoring and intervention.
4. Utilization of science lab.
5. Integration of new curriculum and Science enrichment opportunities.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**On going monitoring of student's progress. evaluate and revise classroom instruction,**

- **determine individual student remediation needs,**
- **evaluate and revise implementation of the school improvement plan,**
- **evaluate and revise teacher professional development plans,**
- **evaluate and revise the district assistance and intervention plan,**

## 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.

AcadeMir Preparatory Academy takes a pride in assuring that a positive school culture and environment is present at all times. Through our various communication vehicles, the leadership team is continuously communicating important topics to all stakeholders involved: teachers, parents, community leaders and students.

Clear expectations are delivered prior to the beginning of the school year and remain continuous from administration and teachers to students and families, in the areas of behavior and high quality instruction. Teachers receive training on research-based practices such as the components and implementation of our Positive Behavioral System (PBS); this is then shared with students on the very first day of school along with their families.

**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**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>