

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

Name of Applicant: Avondale Meadows Middle School

Overall Ranking: 50.5 out of 71

OPTIONAL COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points Applicant opts not to address this element, OR narrative does not focus upon any of the designated priority areas (Early Childhood, Postsecondary, or Rural)	1 point Area of focus is indicated, but only one of the three required elements is fully described	2 points Area of focus is clearly defined, and two of the three required elements are fully described	3 points Area of focus is clearly defined and <i>all three</i> elements fully addressed: (1) Expected targets and outcomes are clearly described; (2) Targets/outcomes are supported by qualitative or quantitative data or specific measurable and accessible goals; and (3) Unique populations are clearly defined and described
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 0			
Comments: Applicant did not apply for competitive preference priority.			

REQUIRED ELEMENTS

1. CHARTER SCHOOL VISION and EXPECTED OUTCOMES (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1-2 points Only 1-2 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element	3-5 points At least 3-5 of the required six elements are <i>fully</i> described. 1 point per element	6 points (1 point per element) <i>All six elements are fully developed and described.</i> (1) Vision; (2) Need and Communication Plan; (3) Curriculum Framework and Key Evidence-based Instructional Practices; (4) Specific Strategies Support All Students in Meeting/Exceeding Indiana Academic Standards; (5) Development of 21 st Century Skills or Preparing Students to be College & Career Ready; and (6) Sustainability beyond CSP Grant Funding
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.3			
Comments: Repetitive language used throughout the descriptions. Some missing elements and others vaguely explained in narratives (Page 12-17). Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs on page 12-13 describe percentage of proficiency drops of enrolled students (but does not identify the measure used); applicant notes that proficiency rates on ECs in Algebra & English for IPS are even worse (but does not provide evidence/achievement rates). Communication plan not addressed by applicant. • Pages 13-14 cite the curriculum <i>sources</i> (e.g., Amplify Ed, Eureka Math, Discovery Science Techbooks) – but does not specify any research base. Applicant’s instructional practices are “defined by the <i>Instructional Vision</i> (Appendix J) and monitored through use of the <i>Elements of Effective Instruction Walk-Through Form</i> (Appendix K),” but applicant does not explain the significance of these resources within the narrative. Best practices for teachers reinforced through TAP evaluation rubric. Will use RtI model, quarterly NWEA assessments. • Page 15 notes that their team developed a <i>specific framework and process</i> for serving students with special learning needs—but does not explain it. This section does not address specific practices or IEP/504 strategies (beyond the reference to RtI). • College and career ready descriptions are based primarily on motivation and inspiration, rather than evidence-based methodology or the link between practices and goals. (Pages 16-17) • Sustainability beyond CSP funding is not addressed here. 			

2. EXPERTISE OF CHARTER SCHOOL DEVELOPERS (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points No description provided or	1-2 points Key personnel are identified,	3-4 points Key personnel are identified and solid	5-6 points Key personnel are identified and their strong qualifications are clearly described and relevant to

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	but descriptions are vague and qualifications not directly aligned to proposed program	descriptions provided showing each individual's qualifications aligned to the proposed program	the proposed program. Team members appear to exhibit exceptional expertise and the previous successful experience needed to bring about academic growth and student achievement. Applicants that intend to REPLICATE or EXPAND must also provide data analyses findings to be scored within the 5-6 point range.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3.6			
<p>Comments: Only the qualifications of the executive director and school principal are described. Classroom, curriculum and school leadership experience support their capacity to carry out the goals of the proposed project. Director of business affairs and a business manager are mentioned (pages 17-18), but descriptions of their qualifications are not provided.</p> <p>As an FYI, the applicant also responds to Item 2(b), but since they are not replicating or expanding, it is Not Applicable.</p>			

3. CHARTER SCHOOL GOALS & COMMUNICATION PLAN (Up to 9 Points Total)

A. Charter School Goals (up to 7 points for this element, under Part A)

0 points	1-2 points	3-5 points	6-7 points
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Goal descriptions are partial, vague or unclear; <u>or</u> applicant has only identified one or two goals; <u>and/or</u> goals are not aligned to proposal priorities (e.g., STEM, Early Childhood, etc.)	No less than three specific, measurable goals are identified. Some goals may not appear rigorous. Methods for measuring success toward goals described but may be somewhat unclear. Some key proposal priorities (e.g., STEM) do not have aligned goals.	No less than three specific, measurable goals are clearly described. Academic outcomes of all students (all grade levels served) will be addressed. All goals appear rigorous, yet attainable. Applicant specifies who will do what, by when, and based upon what measurement. Applicant MUST include at least one goal aligned to a State Assessment to be scored within the 6-7 point range.

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **4.3**

Comments: 80% of students will make at least one year's growth on NWEA Reading; same for Math. At least 50% of students will make 1.5 year's growth on NWEA Reading; same for Math. 65% of students will be proficient on ISTEP (ILEARN) Reading; 58% proficient on ISTEP (ILEARN) Math. Given the baseline data provided in the previous section, the NWEA student growth goals presented here do not appear particularly ambitious.

Applicant does not specify the measurement period for these goals, i.e., is this the 1st year goal – or the goal at the end of CSP grant-funding period? Reviewer assumes it is the goal for the upcoming school year. If so, what growth is anticipated across the grant funding period? (Proposal pages 18-19)

B. Communication Plan (up to 2 points for this element, under Part B)

0 points	1 point	2 points
Communication plan regarding goals not addressed	A communication plan is outlined to describe school goals to some stakeholders (e.g., to staff and students but not to families)	A communication plan that has been well thought out and includes multiple avenues to reach all stakeholders (staff, students, families) has been articulated with specificity

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = **2**

Comments: Board receives monthly updates about goal attainment via dashboard; staff receives monthly reports during staff meetings and quarterly progress reports during PD sessions. Parents and students informed through monthly newsletter and quarterly Parent/Teacher Conferences. Community Meetings, every Friday, celebrate achievements. (Proposal page 20)

4. USE of CSP FUNDING (Up to 6 Points)

A. Detailed Budget Narrative and Budget Worksheet Addressing all Expenditures Aligned to the Proposal (up to 4 points, for Part A)

0 points	1 point	2-3 points	4 points
<p>No budget narrative, and detailed budget worksheets are not attached to proposal.</p> <p><u>OR</u>, budget narrative is unclear and does not align to detailed budget attached and provides very limited or no detail to justify proposed expenditures.</p> <p>There are many discrepancies between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>Many budget narrative descriptors are partial, vague or unclear. Some costs have not been described within the proposal.</p> <p>Several discrepancies exist between the combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals and the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for most line items and costs are aligned to initiatives described within the proposal.</p> <p>Most combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p>	<p>Detailed budget narrative descriptors are provided for nearly all line items and are directly aligned to anticipated initiatives/costs described within the proposal narratives.</p> <p>The combined <i>Planning & Implementation</i> budget worksheet totals agree with the <i>Budget Summary</i> worksheet totals.</p> <p>Applicant MUST adhere to maximum of \$300K in planning year and a maximum of \$900K for total proposal budget to be scored within the 4 point range.</p>

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2

Comments: The proposal’s budget narrative on pages 20-22 identifies key funding areas included; however the applicant’s attached Budget is extraordinarily confusing. Funding is requested for Implementation Years 2-5. Areas of concern include:

- On the attached budget, it appears as though the applicant has interpreted “implementation year” to mean the number of years the school has been opened. This new school opened in July 2017. Per proposal page 9 (*Funding Request Chart*), the proposed CSP grant funding dates are:
 Year 2 → 2018-19; Year 3 → 2019-2020; Year 4 → 2020-21; and Year 5 → 2021-22
- Budget formatting used by applicant is not consistent across years (most notably the use of **Column G** (Rationale) to show *actual costs budgeted for that period*. Note, however, that this explanatory column is not used in Year 3 and beyond.
- In Year 2 (Implementation Worksheet) it appears that all anticipated costs are identified in Columns A-F – including those for which funding is NOT requested in that that particular year (See list of Zero costs in Column G).
Example: Year 2, Line 6 (Safe Visitor Equipment at \$2,500) shows only \$833 budgeted for Year 2 in Column G. Zero funds are budgeted in Column G for Year 3. Column G has not been employed in the remaining worksheets (Year 4Year 5 (a “missing” worksheet) ... so reviewer *cannot determine where remaining costs have been budgeted* – or IF they are budgeted.

Example: Year 2, Line 7 (Safe Hiring Visitor software at \$700) shows Zero budgeted Year 2 in Column G, and the \$350 budgeted in Column G budgeted Year 3. However, reviewer cannot ascertain whether remaining costs are requested in Years 4-5, since Column G is no longer used.

Note that it is the *total in Column G* that generally agrees with the totals provided on the Budget Summary worksheet.

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

- In some instances, costs appear to be double-entry. For *example*: Year 2, Lines 19-21 include costs for: **\$6,100 stage** for music programs; **two sets of steps to the stage** at $\$317.95 \times 2 = \634 ; and **four 4-levels risers** at $\$899.99 \times 4 = \$3,599.96$. These costs are all accounted for in Column G. In Year 3, although shown on the budget worksheet, Column G shows Zero costs for the stage & steps to stage. However, the **4-level Riser shows a cost of \$3,591**. Is this a duplicated cost ... or are these MORE risers? *Actual costs* anticipated in Years 4 & 5 cannot be determined (Column G no longer used) – however the OVERALL costs from year-to-year (per the *Budget Summary*) appear very similar.
- In other instances, costs are not those that were anticipated. For *example*: Implementation Year 2, Line 15 (**one Digital Piano at \$1,500**) in Column G shows not actually budgeted in Year 2. It does show up in Year 3, at a **cost of \$3,000** (Column G). This is likely a typo in Column D (*number of units*). However, reviewer cannot ascertain whether more pianos are purchased in Years 4 or 5.
- None of the *actual* costs for Year 4 can be determined (in the absence of Column G detail).
- There is NO Year 5 Implementation Budget (as anticipated on the *Budget Summary* worksheet). It appears that the applicant used the *Sustainability Year* worksheet as its “Year 5 Implementation Budget,” and then inserted its sustainability plan in Column D. Even so, *actual* Year 5 (implementation) costs cannot be determined (no Column G on this worksheet)

Minor errors also are noted on the *Budget Summary* Worksheet:

- According to the total on the **Year 2** Implementation worksheet, the Supplies total should be \$12,830 (and not \$13,230 as shown on the *Budget Summary*).
- According to the total on the **Year 3** Implementation worksheet, the Supplies total should be \$18,743 (and not \$18,743 as shown on the *Budget Summary*).

Budget Summary (worksheet) totals shown for **Years 4 and 5 cannot be confirmed**

B. School’s Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation (up to 1 point, for Part B)

0 Points	1 Point
Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is either not provided, inappropriate, or not adequately described	Explanation of how school will develop and maintain required capacity to continue the program after grant life is clearly articulated and sufficiently described

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1

Comments: Proposal page 22 adequately addresses the school’s sustainability plan beyond grant funding.

C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary (up to 1 point, for Part C)

0 Points	1 Point
Many costs appear either unreasonable, or unallowable, or unnecessary (as they cannot be directly tied to activities or personnel described within the applicant’s proposal narratives)	All – or nearly all costs – appear reasonable, allocable and necessary

Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1

Comments: Overall, proposed funding elements appear allocable and necessary. The *reasonableness* of the costs cannot be fully-determined in the absence of completed budgets for Years 4 and 5 (most notably Column G) and through a better understanding of which costs recur annually – and which do not.

5. GOVERNANCE PLAN & ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS (Up to 6 Points)

Six Required Elements (A-F each worth one point, for a total up to 6 Points)

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

A. All applicants provide description of governance structure of the school. If the school uses an EMO/CMO, applicant <i>also</i> must describe that partnership and why the EMO/CMO was selected
B. Description of how school operates (how charter school leaders are empowered to make daily decisions and how school staff work together)
C. Description of process to select board members and summarize member expectations
D. Description of governance training for board members, current and prospective
E. Description of relationship between the charter school leadership, governing board, or authorizer with the EMO/CMO to ensure no apparent or real conflict of interest involved. IF the school does not use an EMO/CMO, scored as one point
F. Description of how the charter school will ensure timely and accurate data submission for State and federal reporting requirements.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 5.3
Comments: Nearly all required elements of this section are adequately addressed by the applicant. In 5b, staff duties and responsibilities within the school beyond the principal and assistant principal are not described making it somewhat unclear how internal operations will be structured towards accomplishing school goals (Page 23).

6. STUDENT RECRUITMENT & ADMISSIONS PROCESSES (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points	1 point	2 points	3 points
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	Student recruitment plan description is partial, vague or unclear. Evidence to show compliance with IC 20-24-5 is not offered. Public lottery process is poorly described or not present.	Student recruitment plan is described and evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 is offered but may not be complete. A public lottery process is adequately described.	A multi-pronged student recruitment plan is clearly articulated and there is solid evidence of compliance with IC 20-24-5 presented. An appropriate public lottery process is clearly described.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3			
Comments: Student recruitment description appears limited to those matriculating from Avondale Meadows Academy (5 th grade) or those in the immediate prior grade at Avondale Meadows MS. Enrollment preferences/percentage of children of employees provided (siblings included?). Part of Enroll Indy (lottery system).			

7. NEEDS of EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS (Up to 6 Points)			
0 points	1-2 points	3-4 points	5-6 points
No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	One or two student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. OR more than two groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate.	Three or four student groups sufficiently addressed by applicant. OR more than three groups addressed but explanation of strategies does not seem appropriate or sufficiently adequate for all groups.	<i>All five student groups</i> are sufficiently addressed by the applicant (generating 5 points); and the applicant <i>descriptions are viewed as exemplary</i> , demonstrating the school's commitment to ensuring that special population needs are met (generating 6 points).
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3			
Comments: Pages 25-27 sufficiently address students with disabilities (including the employment of a Director of Special Education) and the school's provisions for meeting the needs of EL students. The school counselor will serve as the McKinney-Vento liaison to connect those experiencing homelessness with resources beyond the school. Other anticipated groups (low-income and N/D) are not directly addressed, although applicant notes partnership with Cummins Behavioral Health that provides an onsite therapist to work with students who qualify for school-based therapeutic services.			

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

8. COMMUNITY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 point Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is partial, vague or unclear	2 points Evidence of parent, teacher and community involvement in the planning and design of the charter school is offered but does not seem fully explained	3 points Clear evidence of the involvement of parents, teachers, and community in the planning and design of the charter school is presented
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3			
Comments: Demand for Avondale Meadows Middle Schools came from parents of Avondale Meadows Academy (serving elementary students). A parent advisory group met with MS principal during planning year to give input on the development of the school (curriculum, extra-curricular activities, etc.). Multiple engagement activities, a full-time Parent Organizer, Parent University nights, monthly breakfasts and quarterly parent conferences promote parental involvement. Friday “Community Meetings” highlight successes and challenges and further promote continuous family engagement. (Pages 27-28)			

9. FISCAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (Up to 6 Points)		
A. Internal Controls over Expenditure & Record Maintenance (up to 2 points, for Part A)		
0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is generally described, but some pieces are partial, vague or unclear	2 Points A plan or process for maintaining internal controls over expenditures and record maintenance is clearly articulated
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.6		
Comments: Page 28 articulates plan for maintaining internal controls and record maintenance (with at least dual steps for review and approval). More details needed in descriptions of segregation of duties, GAAP and Board oversight.		
B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management (up to 2 points, Part B)		
0 Points No description provided in narrative; or applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Grant management process is described, but not fully-developed. Charter school leaders mentioned as responsible for grant, but EMO/CMO explanation not fully-developed (if applicable)	2 Points Grant management process fully-described for decision-making, budget & tracking purchases. Charter school leaders are demonstrated to be responsible for all aspects of grant, and not EMO/CMO (if applicable).
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.6		
Comments: Grant management process is described and charter leaders are shown as responsible for all aspects of the grant (no EMO). Details of the decision-making process are less well documented; purchasing and tracking procedures are very broadly described.		
C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations (up to 2 points)		
0 Points No description provided or cited within Application; applicant only cites pages in Charter Application	1 Point Minimal/disjointed explanation for how State/federal funds will support school operations & student achievement	2 Points Solid descriptions for how other State and federal funds will support school operations and student achievement
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 1.3		
Comments: Pages 28-29 specify that other State and federal funds will support school operations and achievement (basic tuition support, State/federal special education grants, Title I and Title II, and		

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

Federal School Lunch & Breakfast reimbursement programs).

10. FACILITIES and TRANSPORTATION (Up to 3 Points)			
<p>0 points Applicant opts not to address these elements, OR narrative provided does not focus upon the facility or transportation plan</p>	<p>1 point <i>One</i> of the three anticipated elements is provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; or (c) transportation plan</p>	<p>2 points <i>Two</i> of the three anticipated elements are provided, i.e., (a) safe, secure & sustainable facility; and/or (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; and/or (c) transportation plan</p>	<p>3 points All <i>three</i> elements are described: (a) how the facility is safe, secure and sustainable; (b) how enrollment impacts facility needs; <u>and</u> (c) a transportation plan that is aligned with the needs of the school</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 2.6</p>			
<p>Comments: Pages 29-30 describe the new building facility and reference the 5-year pro-forma that “proves that the funding for meeting enrollment targets will enable us to fund the facility needs.” Facility passed all final inspections and was approved by the Mayor’s Office. Transportation not provided –and, for safety reasons, applicant requires families to come in and sign-out their children each day at the classroom door (Note this is the <i>only reference</i> to safe/secure environment for students, staff, families). After-school program via YMCA available for working parents. Bus card passes for any student/accompanying adult if they must rely on the city bus for school transportation (also gas cards). Applicant assures compliance with transportation expectations for students with disabilities or homeless.</p>			

11. SIGNED CHARTER SCHOOL ASSURANCES (Up to 3 Points)			
<p>0 points None of the required signatures have been obtained and submitted with the proposal</p>	<p>1 point <i>One</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, or project contact person, or board president</p>	<p>2 points <i>Two</i> of the three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, and/or project contact person, and/or board president</p>	<p>3 points All three required signatures submitted, i.e., charter authorizer, project contact person, <u>and</u> board president</p>
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3</p>			
<p>Comments: Signatures are not provided within the narrative section. However, they are included within the appendices: Authorizer signature on p 215. Project contact person & board president signatures are shown on page 216 (although these signatures are <i>not attached to the assurances</i> they have signed).</p>			

12. REQUIRED APPENDICES (Up to 8 Points)	
<p>Eight Required Appendix Elements (1 point for each element, items A-H below)</p>	
A.	Charter Application to Authorizer (for new or replication proposals) <i>or</i> Amendment to Existing Charter (for expansion proposal)
B.	Budget Worksheet
C.	Most recent <i>Expanded Annual Performance Report</i> (IDOE Compass) <i>NOT APPLICABLE to new charter schools (scored as automatic point).</i>
D.	Proof of Non-Profit Status of governing board, <i>or</i> proof that application for such status has been made
E.	Enrollment or Student Admissions Policy
F.	Agreement/contract between governing body and management organization. <i>NOT APPLICABLE if applicant does not use an EMO or CMO (scored as automatic point).</i>
G.	School’s Discipline Policy (promotes retention/reduces overuse of practices that remove students from classroom)
H.	School’s Safety Plan is attached in the appendix and evidence that it was submitted to the State Board of Education is present
<p>Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 7.6</p>	
<p>Comments: Emergency procedures for the school are attached – but not evidence of submission to SBOE/IDOE. School opened for students July 2017. Minor point reduction for Appendix H.</p>	

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

13. OVERALL ORGANIZATION of PROPOSAL (Up to 3 Points)			
0 points	1point	2 points	3 points
Information was not provided in anticipated sequence; and/or information was nearly always difficult to locate.	Information requested was provided, but not consistently in the anticipated sequence. OR applicant exceeded 30-page narrative limit.	Applicant followed requested sequence and stayed within page limitations. Generally, information was easily located.	Applicant’s proposal narrative clearly presented, following prescribed format, making the location of information and anticipated key elements readily available. Applicant did not exceed 30-page narrative limit.
Averaged Peer Reviewer Score = 3			
Comments: Applicant followed prescribed format and did not exceed 30-page narrative limit.			

Quality Counts Charter School Program (CSP Grant)
Summary of Peer Reviewer Scores, Cohort 2, August 2018

Summary of Averaged Peer Reviewer Scores	Points Possible	Averaged Score of Peer Reviewers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Optional Competitive Preference Priority 	3	0 Did not apply
1. Charter School Vision & Expected Outcomes	6	3.3
2. Expertise of the Charter School Developers	6	3.6
3A. Charter School Goals	7	4.3
3B. Goals Communication Plan	2	2
4A. Detailed Budget Narrative & Budget Worksheets	4	2
4B. School's Capacity to Continue Implementation & Operation	1	1
4C. Costs are Reasonable, Allocable and Necessary	1	1
5. School Governance Plan & Administrative Relationships	6	5.3
6. Student Recruitment & Admissions Processes	3	1.3
7. Needs of Educationally Disadvantaged Students	6	3
8. Community Outreach Activities	3	3
9A. Internal Controls Over Expenditures & Record Maintenance	2	1.6
9B. Charter School Leadership Responsible for Grant Management	2	1.6
9C. Other State & Federal Funds Support School Operations	2	1.3
10. Facilities & Transportation	3	2.6
11. Signed Charter School Assurances	3	3
12. Required Appendices	8	7.6
13. Overall Organization of Proposal	3	3
TOTAL POINTS	71 Total Points Possible	50.5