

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Robinson High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Robinson High School

6311 S LOIS AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Robinson High School

6311 S LOIS AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	52%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will provide a positive, healthy, and safe environment while promoting high expectations and providing diverse cultural experiences and valuable educational opportunities for the Robinson High School family.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Robinson High School multicultural family is committed to preparing students to meet the challenges of the future by encouraging lifelong learning, international and intercultural awareness, work and professional skills, and "Pride Through Excellence".

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
Bhoolai, Robert	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of Robinson High School. Demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards.
Rosage, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Assists with the provision of instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of Robinson High School.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, David Brown

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.*

1

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 .	

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	366	422	329	349	1466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	24	37	43	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	33	26	37	128
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	14	29	32	53	128

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432	376	353	350	1511
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	38	54	49	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	9	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	45	61	53	211
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	45	61	53	211

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	1	3	4	8

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	2	0	0	5	7
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432	376	353	350	1511
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	38	54	49	181
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	9	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	45	61	53	211
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	45	61	53	211

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	1	3	4	8

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	2	0	0	5	7
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	69%	56%	56%	60%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	54%	51%	51%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	41%	42%	33%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	46%	49%	51%	53%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	34%	48%	48%	43%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	45%	45%	33%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	72%	69%	68%	70%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	75%	73%	85%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%
	2018	65%	53%	12%	53%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	66%	53%	13%	53%	13%
	2018	63%	52%	11%	53%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	66%	4%	67%	3%
2018	71%	62%	9%	65%	6%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	73%	7%	70%	10%
2018	79%	70%	9%	68%	11%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	63%	-36%	61%	-34%
2018	22%	63%	-41%	62%	-40%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	57%	-4%	57%	-4%
2018	55%	56%	-1%	56%	-1%
Compare		-2%			

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	23	30	27	25	34	40	45	50		79	22
ELL	25	38	29	22	25	20	29	36		90	37
ASN	88	86		57			93	97		90	70
BLK	40	46	41	28	18	19	46	70		95	26
HSP	58	54	25	35	35	38	59	71		90	53
MUL	71	68	36	56	44		87	93		100	50
WHT	77	71	45	56	41	44	80	86		90	68
FRL	45	50	28	29	35	38	50	71		85	44

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	39	30	28	45		27	44		69	36
ELL	17	29	24	20	41		27	22		88	57
ASN	85	75		82	59		83	87		96	77
BLK	41	45	38	25	28	50	45	68		76	25
HSP	57	53	43	39	43	36	65	76		88	56
MUL	65	62	33	52	59		85	69		92	70
WHT	73	61	35	58	53	54	82	90		89	73
FRL	48	50	39	35	37	43	56	70		82	47

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	13	23	20	31	44	30	35	56		70	17
ELL	6	31	29	12	19	13	11	69		60	33
ASN	83	67		80	61		97	96		94	93
BLK	31	38	35	27	26	18	42	64		85	36
HSP	53	45	21	44	38	26	58	85		82	60
MUL	62	51		54	48	38	77	78		72	50
WHT	68	55	39	61	46	48	78	91		87	67
FRL	39	43	34	36	30	24	53	78		76	47

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	59
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	651
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
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	49
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.

Most recent available data shows Math Learning Gains at 34%; Math Achievement 46%; Math Bottom Quartile Gains 35%; ELA Bottom Quartile Gains 38%. Inconsistencies due to high teacher retirement, transfers, and turnover have led to a decline in performance. Overall data suggests student performance at middle school level has declined, presenting additional challenges for incoming freshmen. We have teamed our 9th grade teachers in order to coordinate teacher collaborative planning. We have also scheduled highest skilled teachers to work with economically disadvantaged students.

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

Most recent available data showed Math Learning Gains down from 49% to 34%. We now have a Teacher Talent Developer for the Math Department. School-wide we are concentrating on helping students stay on track to reach goals.

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.

Most recent available data shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in Math Learning Gains. The state average was 45%; our school's average was 34%. Inconsistencies due to high teacher retirement, transfers, and turnover have led to a decline in performance. We now have a Teacher Talent Developer for the math department. School-wide we are concentrating on helping students stay on track to reach goals.

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

Most recent available data indicated English Language Arts showed the most improvement, going from 59% to 65%. We began offering after school tutoring for SAT Prep. In addition, coaches began mandatory study hall for their players. Our ninth grade teachers are teamed to facilitate collaborative planning.

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

In reviewing our available data we noticed that students' achievement will significantly increase as we incorporate our instructional priority into daily practice. With approximately 40% of our students performing on or above level, the students' perceptions of their relationships with teachers indicate a lack of trust. Teacher feedback indicates their perception of student misbehavior governs their decision making. In reviewing our data we have two areas of concern. We are concerned with the number of students coming in at low level 1 in Math and/or ELA and the number of students who failed a course in Math or ELA.

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

1. Identify root causes of struggles in Math and ELA.
2. Identify training supports, implement a Professional Development plan, and develop accountability measures for staff.

3. Identify training and Professional Development for Math and ELA.
4. Provide small group Extended Learning Sessions (ELP): Math, ELA, AP Lit.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will train teachers in Creating Culturally Conscious Classrooms. With approximately 25% of ELL students showing proficiency in ELA and 22% of ELL and Black/African American students showing proficiency in Math through the ESSA Index, students' achievement will increase as we incorporate our instructional priority into daily practice. This Area of Focus is an action plan that will support our teachers in their learning and practice.
Measurable Outcome:	We will look for gains in achievement, particularly in Math and in ELA. In CSIP/AsQi we will look for higher percentages of positive student opinions such as enjoying learning, helping me set/stay on track to reach goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Bhoelai (robert.bhoelai@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Creating more culturally conscious classrooms will result in a climate for gains in academic improvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Peer-reviewed research such as Nisar et al (2017), Jones et al (2016), Schindler et al (2016), and Hough (2012) have indicated a positive connection between school climate and academic achievement. Our focus of creating culturally conscious classrooms will facilitate students' academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop advanced professional development in Culturally Conscious Classrooms to build stronger relationships with our ESE, ELL, Black/African, and economically disadvantaged students.
2. Data chats and collaborative planning sessions with departments.
3. Identify target data. Provide related planning, expectations, implementations, and supports.
4. ILT and PSLT data reviews reflecting students' and teachers' needs.
5. Targeted Professional Development based on data. Adjust as necessary.

Person Responsible Robert Bhoelai (robert.bhoelai@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

To ensure efficient/systematic allocation and use of resources, the PSLT/ILT utilizes an RtI/MTSS framework to improve learning for all. Resources allocated support a continuum of academic and behavioral supports, ensuring all students have fluid access to instruction (varying intensity levels matched to most appropriate available resources)..

Professional development sessions in Creating Culturally Conscious Classrooms will positively affect students' perceptions of school and will also increase students' achievement levels.

A variety of service delivery models are in place across all grade levels to provide instruction and related services to students with disabilities in general education classes and natural contexts.

Opportunities for parent/guardian/community collaboration include Open House sessions, Conference Nights, pre-recorded telephone calls, PTSA, an IB parent/guardian group (RIBLI), Canvas, School Advisory Committee, informational events featuring local and distant institutions of higher learning, career events, a FAFSA assistance event, Air Force Base informational sessions, a community Foundation, climate surveys, full time Psychologist, full time Social Worker, full time Student Intervention Specialist, SERVe volunteers.

This is not a Title 1 School.

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: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00