BEFORE THE TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

	)	
	)	
IN RE:	)	**State Board of Education Meeting**
GREEN DOT CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL	)	**October 14, 2016**
Charter School Appeal	)	
	)	
	)	

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION REPORT
OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. (T.C.A.) § 49-13-108, sponsors proposing to open new charter schools may appeal the denial of their amended application by a local board of education to the State Board of Education ("State Board"). On September 1, 2016, Green Dot Public Schools Tennessee ("Sponsor"), the Sponsor of the proposed Green Dot Charter High School ("Green Dot") appealed the denial of their amended application by Shelby County Schools ("SCS") Board of Education to the State Board.

Based on the following procedural history, findings of fact, and Review Committee Report attached hereto, I believe that the decision to deny the Green Dot amended application was "contrary to the best interests of the pupils, school district, or community."[1] Therefore, I recommend that the State Board overturn the decision of the SCS Board of Education and approve the amended application for Green Dot.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Pursuant to T.C.A. § 49-13-108 and State Board policy 2.500, State Board staff and an independent charter application review committee ("Review Committee") conducted a de novo, on the record review of the Green Dot amended application. In accordance with the Tennessee Department of Education's charter application scoring rubric, "applications that do not meet or exceed the standard in all sections (academic plan, operations plan, financial plan, and, if applicable, past performance) . . . will be deemed not ready for approval."[2] In addition, the State Board is required to hold a public hearing in the district where the proposed charter school seeks to locate.[3]

[1] T.C.A. § 49-13-108.
[2] Tennessee Charter School Application Evaluation – Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria, pg. 1.
[3] T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

In order to overturn the decision of the local board of education, the State Board must find that the local board's decision to deny the charter application was contrary to the best interests of the pupils, school district or community.[4] Because Green Dot is proposing to locate in an LEA that contains a school on the current or last preceding priority school list, the State Board has the ability to approve the application, and thereby authorize the school, or to affirm the local board's decision to deny.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On January 30, 2016, the Sponsor submitted a letter of intent to SCS expressing its intention to file a charter school application for Green Dot.

2. The Sponsor submitted its initial application for Green Dot to SCS on April 1, 2016.

3. SCS assembled a review committee to review and score the Green Dot application. The review team recommended denial of the Green Dot initial application.

4. On June 28, 2016, the SCS Board of Education voted to deny the Green Dot initial application based upon the review committee's recommendation.

5. The Sponsor amended and resubmitted its application for Green Dot to SCS on July 28, 2016.

6. SCS's review committee reviewed and scored the Green Dot amended application and again recommended denial.

7. On August 23, 2016, based on the review committee's recommendation, SCS Board of Education voted to deny the Green Dot amended application.

8. The Sponsor appealed the denial of the Green Dot amended application in writing to the State Board on September 1, 2016, including all required documents per State Board policy 2.500.

9. At the time of appeal to the State Board, the Sponsor submitted corrections to the application as allowed under T.C.A. § 49-13-108(a)(4)(C).[5]

10. On September 6, 2016, the State Board sent a letter requesting that SCS provide information regarding its denial of the Green Dot amended application.

11. On September 19, 2016, the State Board requested a complete copy of the Student Handbook and Employee Manual from Green Dot that the amended application stated were available upon request.

---

[4] T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

[5] The Sponsor was notified that certain areas of the application that they intended to correct upon appeal could not be corrected per the statute. As such, the Review Committee only considered those corrections that were permitted by statute.

12. On September 19, 2016, Green Dot provided the Enrollment Policy, the Employee Handbook, and the Student Handbook to the State Board.

13. The State Board's Review Committee analyzed and scored the Green Dot amended application using the Tennessee Department of Education's charter application scoring rubric.

14. On September 26, 2016, the State Board Executive Director and staff held a public hearing in Memphis. At the public hearing, the Executive Director heard presentations from the Sponsor and SCS and took public comment regarding the Green Dot application.

15. The Review Committee conducted a capacity interview with the Sponsor of Green Dot along with key members of the leadership team on October 4, 2016, in Nashville.

16. After the capacity interview, the Review Committee determined a final consensus rating of the Green Dot amended application, which served as the basis for the Review Committee Recommendation Report.

FINDINGS OF FACT

- **District Denial of Application**.

The review team assembled by SCS to review and score the Green Dot initial and amended applications consisted of the following individuals:

Name	Title
Jason Ogle	Accountability & Accreditation Advisor, SCS
Brant Riedel	Director, Assessment & Accountability, SCS
Carin Sanders	Assessment Advisor, SCS
NeShante Brown	Executive Director, Soulsville Charter School
David Burke	Director of Operations, Grizzlies Prep Academy
Terilyn McCriston	Curriculum & Instruction Advisor- Science, SCS
Rita Moore	Curriculum & Instruction Advisor- Science, SCS
Fonda Booker	Curriculum & Instruction Advisor- ELA, SCS
LaTisha Bryant	Curriculum & Instruction Advisor- ELA, SCS
Arnesha Bobo	Senior Accountant, SCS
Angela Buckley	Accounting & Reporting Senior Accountant, SCS
Jeannette Lucas	Accounting & Reporting Senior Accountant, SCS
Tutonial Miller	Accounting & Reporting, SCS
Dorothy Pittman	Accounting & Reporting Senior Accountant, SCS
Bridgette Samba	Senior Accountant, SCS
Carla Smith	Accounting & Reporting, SCS
Abigail Johnson	Human Resources; Talent Acquisition Advisor, SCS
Eddie Jones	Human Resources; Recruiting & Staffing Business Partner, SCS
Cardell Orrin	Parent, Stand for Children
Angela Askew	Principal; Brewster Elementary, SCS
Amelia Anglin	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Mary Berk	Special Education Advisor, SCS

Trudy Brewer	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Marcie Davis	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Bobby Gammel	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Laurie Henderson	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Tiffany Luckett	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Lori Meeks	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Beth Murphree	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Vickie Puff	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Annette Vaughan	Special Education Advisor, SCS
Natalie Wilkins	Special Education Advisor, SCS

The Green Dot initial application received the following ratings from the SCS review committee:

Sections	Rating
Academic Plan Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Portfolio Review/Performance Record	Partially Meets Standard

Upon resubmission, the amended replication application received the following ratings from the SCS review committee:[6]

Sections	Rating
Academic Plan Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Meets or Exceeds the Standard
Portfolio Review/Performance Record	Meets or Exceeds the Standard

After the SCS review committee completed its review and scoring of the amended application, its recommendation was presented to the SCS Board of Education on August 23, 2016. Based on the review committee's recommendation, the SCS Board of Education voted to deny the amended application of Green Dot.

- **State Board Charter Application Review Committee's Evaluation of the Application**

Following the denial of the Green Dot amended application and their subsequent appeal to the State Board of Education, State Board staff assembled a diverse Review Committee of experts to evaluate and score the Green Dot amended application. This Review Committee consisted of the following individuals:[7]

[6] Please see EXHIBIT C for a copy of the SCS review committee report.
[7] Please see EXHIBIT B for detailed bios of each review committee member.

Name	Title
Allyson Hauptman	Lead Faculty for Instructional Practice, Lipscomb University, Nashville
Molly Sears	Senior Director of Finance and Operations, State Collaborative on Reforming Education (SCORE)
Earl Simms	Director of St. Louis Operations, University of Missouri Office of Charter School Operations
Angela Sanders	Practicing Attorney, Former General Counsel for State Board of Education
Tess Stovall	Director of Charter Schools, State Board of Education
Elizabeth Taylor	General Counsel, State Board of Education
Jay Whalen	Coordinator of Charter Schools, State Board of Education

The Review Committee conducted an initial review and scoring of the Green Dot amended application, a capacity interview with the Sponsor, and a final evaluation and scoring of the amended application resulting in a consensus rating for each major section. The Review Committee's consensus rating of the Green Dot amended application was as follows:

Sections	Rating
Academic Plan Design and Capacity	Meets or Exceeds the Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Meets or Exceeds the Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Meets or Exceeds the Standard
Portfolio Review/Performance Record	Meets or Exceeds the Standard

The review committee recommends that the application for Green Dot Charter High School be approved because the applicant provided sufficient evidence in the academic, operations, financial, and portfolio review sections that the application met the required criteria of the rubric. In particular, Green Dot's academic plan included a highly detailed mission and vision with aligned academic goals, as well as robust supports and interventions for special populations, including students with disabilities, English language learners, and gifted students. The application reveals that the Sponsor has a clearly identified geographic area and deep knowledge of the population they intend to serve in the Memphis community.

Moreover, the operations plan presented in the application outlined extensive knowledge and capacity at both the regional and network levels. Green Dot has a strong governing board whose members have significant experience opening and monitoring schools within the Green Dot network. The review committee also noted a strong human capital plan that addressed the recruitment, training, and retention of highly effective staff.

The Review Committee found that Green Dot's financial plan included accurate cost assumptions for the budget, strong internal controls, and comprehensive contingency plans. The development expertise and philanthropic commitments provided were sufficient and further proved the financial strength of the network.

Green Dot provided evidence of strong academic performance and growth in both California and Tennessee in the portfolio review section. In California, the Green Dot schools consistently outperform the local districts in English and in graduation rates. In Tennessee, the applicant has matched or outperformed the local district in two tested subjects and graduation rates, and outperformed surrounding high schools in three subjects and graduation rates. In addition, the review committee found

clear and compelling evidence that the operator has identified and implemented sufficient interventions to address areas of low performance.

For additional information regarding the Review Committee's evaluation of the application, please see **EXHIBIT B** for the complete Review Committee Report, which is fully incorporated herein by reference.

- **Public Hearing**

Pursuant to statute[8] and State Board policy 2.500, a public hearing chaired by the Executive Director was held in Memphis on September 26, 2016. The presentation by SCS representatives at the public hearing focused on the argument that the denial of the Green Dot amended application was in the best interest of the students, school district, and community. SCS grounded its argument in the deficiencies found by the SCS review committee in the amended application. Specifically, SCS found Green Dot's application did not meet the standard for approval in staffing, assessments, performance management, school calendar, and the performance record of the operator's current schools within the Tennessee Achievement School District.[9] SCS also pointed to the 2015 overall TVAAS composite of a Level 2 for Green Dot's Fairley High School as evidence that the application did not meet the standard necessary for approval.[10]

In response, the Sponsor's presentation focused on Green Dot's track record of success with its independent high schools in California that use the same model proposed for Memphis and the academic successes that the operator has experienced at Fairley High School. Specifically, the Sponsor grounded its argument in the increase in one-year and four-year graduation rates since Green Dot transformed Fairley High School and the strong growth shown in Algebra and English I and II as compared to SCS and the state.[11] The Sponsor stated that adjustments have been made at Fairley High School in the 2015-16 school year based on the academic performance, and these adjustments include a change in science curriculum for more alignment with the state standards and a change to the English language arts course offerings in the 11th grade.[12]

A portion of the public hearing was dedicated to taking public comment. A total of nine people made verbal comments at the hearing, including a number of parents, students, Green Dot staff, and a member of the community in Memphis. In addition, State Board staff accepted public comments in writing via e-mail.[13]

ANALYSIS

State law requires the State Board to review the decision of the local board of education and determine whether the denial of the proposed charter school was in the "best interests of the pupils, school district, or community."[14] In addition, T.C.A. § 49-13-108 requires the State Board to adopt national

[8] T.C.A. § 49-13-109.
[9] SCS Public Hearing Presentation.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Green Dot Public Hearing Presentation.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Copies of written public comments received by the deadline have been provided to State Board members.
[14] T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

standards of authorizing. One such standard is to maintain high standards for approving charter applications. In making my recommendation to the Board, I have considered the Review Committee Report, the arguments made by both Green Dot and SCS at the Public Hearing, and the public comments received by State Board staff, and conclude as follows:

The Review Committee's report and recommendations are sound and grounded in evidence contained in the application and gained at the capacity interview. For the reasons stated in the Review Committee Report, I agree that the Green Dot amended application meets or exceeds the standards required for approval.

T.C.A § 49-13-107(e) allows a chartering authority to take into consideration the past and current performance of any charter school operated by the Sponsor. As provided in **Exhibit A** and further described in the review committee's report, the academic performance data for the schools operated by Green Dot indicates success based on state and national standards. The Sponsor's existing school in Tennessee with available data, Fairley High School, outperformed the local district on two tested subjects and graduation rates and outperformed neighboring high schools on Algebra I, Algebra II, English I, and graduation rates in its first year of a full transformation. Additionally, the Sponsor's schools in California consistently perform above the local district in English and graduation rates. Therefore, I agree that the Sponsor's existing schools have met the standard to justify replication of the educational model.

Given the great responsibility of educating students and the amount of taxpayer dollars entrusted to a charter school that is approved by a local district, the State Board expects that only those schools that demonstrate a high likelihood of success and meet or exceed the required criteria in all areas will be authorized. Green Dot has met or exceeded the required criteria in all areas and has shown through its application that it is likely to achieve success in a geographic area where they have identified the need for a quality high school option.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, and for the reasons stated in the Review Committee Report attached hereto, I believe that the decision to deny the amended application for Green Dot Charter High School was contrary to the best interests of the students, the school district, or the community. Therefore, I recommend that the State Board of Education overturn the decision of the SCS Board of Education and approve the amended application for Green Dot Charter High School.

_____ 10/12/16

Dr. Sara Heyburn, Executive Director Date
State Board of Education

TENNESSEE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

EXHIBIT A

State Accountability Data Comparison
Green Dot Charter High School

Pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated § 49-13-107(e), in reviewing a charter school application, a chartering authority may take into consideration the past and current performance, or lack thereof, of any charter school operated by the sponsor. This document provides the available state accountability data[1] for any schools currently operated by the sponsor, the state, the school district in which the sponsor proposes to locate or currently locates, and any neighborhood schools specifically mentioned by the sponsor in its amended application.

Tennessee

The most recent Tennessee accountability data available is for the 2014-15 school year, and in that year, Green Dot Tennessee had one (1) school in operation: Fairley High School (Fairley). In the table below, Fairley is compared to the state of Tennessee, Shelby County Schools (SCS), the Achievement School District (ASD), and the three (3) high schools the sponsor named in its application based on the location of the proposed school. For additional comparison, Fairley data is provided from both 2014 (before Green Dot transformation) and 2015 (after Green Dot transformation). The data included in the table is the percent of students scoring proficient or advanced on all EOC tested subjects, graduation rate, and the school's/district's composite TVAAS score.[2]

		Alg. I	Alg. II	Biology	Chemistry	Eng. I	Eng. II	Eng. III	Graduation Rate	TVAAS
2014	Fairley (Pre-Green Dot)	27.1%	13.3%	11.0%	1.0%	27.0%	19.4%	8.3%	70.3%	1
2015	Fairley (Green Dot)	54.0%	45.7%	18.3%	5.7%	44.8%	29.0%	6.4%	75.7%	2
	Tennessee	65.6%	54.2%	65.2%	44.2%	71.8%	64.8%	41.7%	87.8%	-
	SCS	54.1%	37.3%	42.8%	23.7%	55.4%	48.9%	24.1%	75.0%	5
	ASD	26.3%	-	24.5%	-	37.5%	-	-	47.8%	1
	Kirby HS	67.1%	34.5%	37.0%	12.0%	43.5%	40.7%	18.5%	69.7%	5
	Sheffield HS	53.8%	25.5%	34.8%	21.3%	31.8%	37.1%	12.3%	69.4%	5
	Wooddale HS	47.9%	24.7%	29.9%	13.9%	36.9%	30.2%	16.3%	50.1%	4

[1] Green Dot operated a middle school in Washington State in 2015-16; however, since the school does not serve grades 9-12, the accountability data is not included.
[2] (n.d.). Retrieved October 11, 2016, from https://www.tn.gov/education/topic/report-card.

TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

California

The most recent California accountability data available is for the 2015-16 school year, and in that year Green Dot had nine (9) independent high schools in operation in California, which is the school model proposed in the amended application. In the tables below, these nine schools are compared to the state of California and the school districts where the schools are located. The data included in the tables is the percent of students who met or exceeded the standard on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress.[3]

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	LA Unified School District	54%	25%
	Animo South Los Angeles Charter High School	58%	7%
	Animo Venice Charter High School	58%	16%
	Animo Pat Brown Charter High School	77%	34%
	Animo Ralph Bunche Charter High School	71%	19%
	Animo Jackie Robinson Charter High School	71%	26%
	Animo Watts College Preparatory Academy	50%	10%
	Oscar De La Hoya Animo Charter High School	66%	24%

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	Inglewood School District	30%	5%
	Animo Inglewood Charter High School	83%	43%

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	Lennox School District[4]	N/A	N/A
	Animo Leadership Charter High School	84%	35%

[3] (n.d.). Retrieved October 10, 2016, from http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/.

[4] Test results from the California Assessment of Student Performance Progress for 11th grade ELA and math in Lennox School District were not available on the California Department of Education's website as of October 10, 2016.

EXHIBIT B

Charter Application Review Committee Recommendation Report

October 12, 2016

School Name: Green Dot Charter High School

Sponsor: Green Dot Public Schools Tennessee

Proposed Location of School: Shelby County Schools

Evaluation Team:

Allyson Hauptman
Angela Sanders
Molly Sears
Earl Simms
Tess Stovall
Elizabeth Taylor
Jay Whalen

This recommendation report is based on a template from the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

© 2014 National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA)

This document carries a Creative Commons license, which permits noncommercial re-use of content when proper attribution is provided. This means you are free to copy, display and distribute this work, or include content from the application in derivative works, under the following conditions:

Attribution You must clearly attribute the work to the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, and provide a link back to the publication at http://www.qualitycharters.org/.

Noncommercial You may not use this work for commercial purposes, including but not limited to any type of work for hire, without explicit prior permission from NACSA.

Share Alike If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

For the full legal code of this Creative Commons license, please visit www.creativecommons.org. If you have any questions about citing or reusing NACSA content, please contact us

Introduction

Tennessee Code Annotated (T.C.A) § 49-13-108 allows the sponsors of a public charter school to appeal the denial of an application by the local board of education to the State Board of Education. In accordance with T.C.A. § 49-13-108, the State Board of Education shall conduct a de novo, on the record, review of the proposed charter school's application, and the State Board of Education shall adopt national authorizing standards. As laid out in State Board Policy 6.200 – Core Authorizing Principles, the State Board is committed to implementing these authorizing standards aligned with the core principles of charter school authorizing including setting high standards for the approval of charter schools in its portfolio.

The State Board of Education's charter application review process is outlined in T.C.A. § 49-13-108, State Board Policy 2.500 – Charter School Appeals, and State Board Policy 6.300 – Application Review. The State Board assembled a charter application review committee comprised of highly qualified internal and external evaluators with relevant and diverse expertise to evaluate each application. The State Board provided training to all review committee members to ensure consistent standards and fair treatment of all applications.

Overview of the Evaluation Process

The State Board of Education's charter application review committee developed this recommendation report based on three key stages of review:

1. Evaluation of the Proposal: The review committee independently reviewed the amended charter application, attachments, and budget submitted by the sponsor. After an independent review, the review committee collectively identified the main strengths, concerns, and weaknesses as well as developed specific questions for the applicant in the four sections of the application: Academic Plan Design and Capacity, Operations Plan and Capacity, Financial Plan and Capacity, and Portfolio Review and Performance Record.
2. Capacity Interview: Based on the independent and collective review of the application, the review committee conducted a 90 minute in-person interview with the sponsor, members of the proposed governing board, and identified school leader (if applicable) to address the concerns, weaknesses, and questions identified in the application, and to assess the capacity to execute the application's overall plan.
3. Consensus Judgment: At the conclusion of the review of the application and the capacity interview, the committee submitted a final rubric and developed a consensus regarding a rating for each section of the application.

This recommendation report includes the following information:

1. Summary of the application: A brief description of the applicant's proposed academic, operations, and financial plans, and performance record.
2. Summary of the recommendation: A brief summary of the overall recommendation for the application.
3. Analysis of each section of the application: An analysis of the four sections of the application and the capacity of the team to execute the plan as described in the application.
    a. Academic Plan Design and Capacity: school mission and goals; enrollment summary; school development; academic focus and plan; academic performance standards; high

school graduation standards (if applicable); assessments; school schedule; special populations and at-risk students; school culture and discipline; marketing, recruitment, and enrollment; community involvement and parent engagement; existing academic plan; performance management; and the capacity to implement the proposed plan.

b. Operations Plan and Capacity: governance; start-up plan; facilities; personnel/human capital; professional development; insurance; transportation (if applicable); food service; additional operations (if applicable); waivers; network vision and growth plan; network management; network governance; charter management contracts (if applicable); network personnel/human capital; staffing management and evaluation; and the capacity to implement the proposed plan.
c. Financial Plan and Capacity: budget narrative; budgets of network and school; cash flow projections; related assumptions; financial policies and procedures; and the capacity to implement the proposed plan.
d. Portfolio Review and Performance Record: evidence of successful student outcomes in network; evidence that schools within network are high-performing; detailed narrative of high-performing and low-performing schools; latest audit presented without findings; and organization in good standing with authorizers.

The State Board's charter application review committee utilized the Tennessee Department of Education's Charter School Application Evaluation Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria ("the rubric"), which is used by all local boards of education when evaluating an application. The rubric states:

> An application that merits a recommendation for approval should present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate; be detailed in how this school will raise student achievement; and inspire confidence in the applicant's capacity to successfully implement the proposed academic and operations plans. In addition to meeting the criteria that are specific to that section, each part of the proposal should align with the overall mission, budget, and goals of the application.

The evaluators used the following criteria and guidance from the scoring rubric to rate applications:

Rating	Characteristics
Meets or Exceeds the Standard	The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It clearly aligns with the mission and goals of the school. The response includes specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation.
Partially Meets Standard	The response meets the criteria in some aspects, but lacks sufficient detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas.
Does Not Meet Standard	The response is significantly incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation; is unsuited to the mission and vision of the district or otherwise raises significant concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant's ability to carry it out.

TENNESSEE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Summary of the Application

School Name: Green Dot Charter High School

Sponsor: Green Dot Public Schools Tennessee

Proposed Location of School: Shelby County Schools

Mission:[1]

The mission of Green Dot Charter High School will be to prepare students for success in college, leadership, and life by providing a small, college-preparatory educational program.

Number of Schools Currently in Operation by Sponsor:

- Memphis: Fairley High School (transformation); Wooddale Middle School (transformation); Hillcrest High School (transformation); Kirby Middle School (transformation)
- Outside of Tennessee: 19 schools in California (9 independent high schools; 10 transformation schools); one (1) independent middle school in Washington

Proposed Enrollment:[2]

Grade Level	Year 1 (2017)	Year 2 (2018)	Year 3 (2019)	Year 4 (2020)	Year 5 (2021)	At Capacity (2021)
9	154	154	154	154	154	154
10	0	154	154	154	154	154
11	0	0	154	154	154	154
12	0	0	0	154	154	154
Total	**154**	**308**	**462**	**616**	**616**	**616**

Brief Description of the Application:

Green Dot Charter High School is a high school proposing to locate in Memphis, Tennessee and serve students in grades 9 through 12. The proposed school intends to provide a college preparatory academic program that promotes leadership and life skills and includes significant parent and community engagement.

Green Dot Charter High School will be organized under the existing non-profit entity of Green Dot Public Schools Tennessee and governed by the existing Green Dot Tennessee Board of Directors. Green Dot Public Schools Tennessee currently operates four transformation schools under the Achievement School District in Shelby County: two (2) middle schools and two (2) high schools.

Green Dot Charter High School assumes that 93% of their student population will be economically disadvantaged and 15% will be students with disabilities.[3] Additionally, Green Dot Charter High School has multiple committed community partners and projects a positive fund balance every year.

[1] Green Dot Public High School Application pg. 1.
[2] Ibid, pg. 2.
[3] Ibid.

Summary of the Evaluation

The review committee recommends that the application for Green Dot Charter High School be approved because the applicant provided sufficient evidence in the academic, operations, financial, and portfolio review sections that the application met the required criteria of the rubric. The academic plan included a highly detailed mission and vision with aligned goals. The operator presented a strong academic plan that included robust supports and interventions for students with disabilities, English language learners, and gifted students. It is clear that the applicant has a deep knowledge of the population they intend to serve.

The operations plan presented in the application detailed expertise and capacity at both the regional and network levels with a strong governing board that has significant experience opening and monitoring schools in the network. The review committee also found a strong human capital plan that addressed the recruitment, training, and retention of highly effective staff.

The financial plan included accurate cost assumptions for the budget, strong internal controls, and comprehensive contingency plans. The development expertise and philanthropic commitments provided were sufficient and proved the financial strength of the network.

In the portfolio review section, the applicant provided evidence of strong areas of academic performance and growth in both California and Tennessee. The applicant has outperformed the local district and surrounding high schools in both California and Tennessee in many areas. Additionally, the review committee found clear and compelling evidence that the operator has identified and implemented sufficient interventions to address areas of low performance.

Summary of Section Ratings

In accordance with the Tennessee Department of Education's charter application scoring rubric, "applications that do not meet or exceed the standard in all sections… will be deemed not ready for approval,"[4] and strengths in one area of the application do not negate material weaknesses in other areas. Opening and maintaining a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan and identifying highly capable individuals to execute that plan.

Sections	Rating
Academic Plan Design and Capacity	Meets or Exceeds the Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Meets or Exceeds the Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Meets or Exceeds the Standard
Portfolio Review and Performance Record	Meets or Exceeds the Standard

[4] Tennessee Charter School Application – Evaluation Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria, pg. 1.

Analysis of the Academic Plan Design and Capacity

Rating: Meets or Exceeds the Standard

Strengths Identified by the Committee:

The Academic Plan Design and Capacity meets or exceeds the standard because the sponsor presented a complete and detailed academic plan aligned to a clearly defined mission and vision. Since the applicant already operates four (4) schools in Memphis, they have a clear knowledge of the student population they intend to serve, as well as the special education and English language supports they will need to provide. Additionally, the applicant's strategic use of data to inform instruction and decision-making aligns with the stated goals of the application.

In the application, the applicant identified the Southeast area of Memphis as the proposed location of the school, stating that the proposed Green Dot Charter High School would provide a needed alternative to three local high schools. The applicant currently operates both Wooddale Middle School and Kirby Middle School as Achievement School District (ASD) transformation schools in the community. Placement of the proposed school grew out of parent requests for another high school option for their students from these two middle schools. Additionally, Green Dot operates two ASD transformation high schools in South Memphis: Fairley High School and Hillcrest High School. By operating four (4) schools in Memphis, with two (2) middle schools in the proposed neighborhood, the review committee found that the applicant had very sound enrollment and demographic projections, as well as experience and established relationships in the community. The operator has already begun community engagement and outreach for the proposed school and has held multiple open meetings for parent and student input on the academic plan design.

The applicant states that the proposed school would enroll approximately 15% of students with disabilities and 10% English language learners. In addition to an inclusive college preparatory academic model, the applicant outlined clear diagnostic and screening processes for students with disabilities and English language learners. The applicant provided a detailed intervention plan and addressed how students would be supported in all tiers of the RTI^2 process both in the application and the capacity interview. Green Dot will also support students by leveraging their existing community partnerships and contracted services with Le Bonheur Health Services, Life Enhancement Services, Youth Villages, and Communities in Schools.

Throughout the application, the applicant referenced multiple mission-aligned goals and strategies for monitoring school achievement and culture. The leadership team routinely assesses a school's performance on their "Hot Schools" dashboard, analyzing 25-30 academic, operational, and financial data points to identify areas where additional supports are needed. The applicant stated in the capacity interview that new start schools generally stay "hot" for about three years, ensuring that they receive adequate support in the early years of operation. Under this framework, the applicant has been able to address areas that are in need of improvement. The applicant was very honest in both the application and the capacity interview about inadequate science and reading achievement at Fairley High School in 2014-15, and provided multiple corrective action measures they have already put in place to support those content areas. The review committee found sufficient evidence that the applicant has addressed areas of concern and the Academic Plan Design and Capacity would meet the needs of the proposed student population.

Analysis of the Operations Plan and Capacity

Rating: Meets or Exceeds the Standard

Strengths Identified by the Committee:

The Operations Plan and Capacity meets or exceeds the standard because the sponsor provided sufficient evidence in both the application and capacity interview that the region, network, and governing board have the experience and capacity to open the proposed school. The applicant presented a complete and detailed plan for operations that addressed talent recruitment and retention, professional development, facilities, school operations, and governing board expertise.

The sponsor outlined a detailed plan for attracting and hiring a pool of qualified leaders and teachers. In addition to regional support, the proposed school will have support from the network in the recruitment of staff. Additionally, the sponsor's application outlined a comprehensive professional development plan that includes summer training, individual coaching, and full-staff professional development days. During the capacity interview, the applicant adequately addressed how the region provided professional development that was targeted for students with disabilities, English language learners, and gifted students.

In the application, the sponsor provided a timeline for finding and renovating a facility for the proposed school. During the capacity interview, the applicant addressed adequate adjustments they have made to those timelines, including contingency plans for finding a suitable facility. The applicant has identified five (5) possible sites in the local community to locate the school. If approved, the sponsor stated that it would move forward in the facilities acquisition process with support from their national real estate team, and the network has proven capacity to acquire and renovate a facility in a short time. The sponsor also described the contingency plans for a facility that they have in place, including possibly co-locating the proposed school for an incubation period at one of their existing facilities in the community that has additional space. Additionally, those existing facilities are available to use for summer professional development for teachers or the Summer Bridge program for students.

In addition to human capital and facilities, the applicant has shown a strong capacity to execute non-academic, support services. They have extensive experience supplying food service, transportation, technology services, and health services to schools in the community. The sponsor has shown the ability to provide student services through internal capacities or external vendor contracting.

Finally, the applicant's governing board has extensive experience and expertise to ensure the success of the organization. The regional governing board has overseen the operations of four (4) transformation schools in Tennessee. There is a clear delineation of responsibilities of the national governing board and regional governing board in Tennessee, and sufficient evidence that the sponsor has a complete Operations Plan and Capacity that meets or exceeds the standard.

Analysis of the Financial Plan and Capacity

Rating: Meets or Exceeds the Standard

Strengths Identified by the Committee:

The Financial Plan and Capacity presented in the application meets or exceeds the standard because the applicant presented a clear and detailed budget with adequate assumptions, an ability to fundraise and support schools, and the network's strong fiscal health and contingencies. While the exact facility location of the school is still unknown, the review committee felt the facilities plan presented by the sponsor in both the application and the capacity interview was adequate to ensure financial stability.

Throughout the application and the capacity interview, it was clear that the applicant outlined a very detailed financial plan with robust internal controls to ensure compliance and sound auditing and monitoring procedures. There is extensive support from the network including a development and finance team that has ample experience in grant writing and fundraising. The applicant is successfully funding and operating four (4) transformation schools in Memphis currently and has provided accurate assumptions for the proposed school based on current costs at other sites.

The applicant provided sufficient evidence that its network development team was able to raise money to adequately support the region. In the application, the sponsor states that its network development team raises between $7-10 million annually. The applicant has established philanthropic relationships with the Walton Foundation, Poplar Foundation, and Charter School Growth Fund, in addition to the Charter Schools Program's Replication and Expansion grant they have already received.

The applicant has a deep understanding of their financial position, which is strong with a current ratio of 4.07 and 71 days cash on hand. In the proposed budget, the school would end the year with a surplus ever year, and there are adequate contingency plans in place to address unforeseen costs, including a $2 million line of credit. Additionally during the capacity interview, the applicant team detailed clear contingencies to account for an authorizer fee, if approved. All contingency plans and changes are brought before the School Advisory Council for recommendation to the governing board.

The Financial Plan and Capacity for the proposed school is very strong. Both the network and region have sound financial principles and procedures in place, along with the capacity to raise any additional funds needed to execute their academic and operation plans. For these reasons, the review committee found that the Financial Plan and Capacity meets or exceeds the standard.

Analysis of the Portfolio Review and Performance Record

Rating: Meets or Exceeds the Standard

Strengths Identified by the Committee:

The Portfolio Review and Performance Record of the applicant meets or exceeds the standard because the applicant has proven academic success in many areas including academic achievement, growth, graduation rates, and college acceptance. The review committee also found sufficient evidence that the sponsor has identified and addressed areas for improvement.

In California, Green Dot Public Schools operates nine (9) independent, fresh-start charter high schools. This independent school model is the proposed model for Green Dot Charter High School. It will more closely resemble the school design and plan than the applicant's currently operating Tennessee transformation schools. These independent charter high schools in California have routinely outperformed local district averages. In 2015, eight of nine Green Dot California independent schools scored higher than the district in 11th grade English language arts on the Smarter Balanced Assessment. Additionally, Green Dot's independent schools in California had a 95% graduation rate for the 2014-15 school year and have raised college acceptance rates. While the applicant's math scores in California were not as strong, the sponsor was very candid about those results and gave sufficient evidence of the corrective actions and interventions they have put in place to support math growth.

In Tennessee, the sponsor saw gains in their first year of a full-scale transformation at Fairley High School, outpacing the gains made by Shelby County Schools in all but one End-of-Course tested subjects. During the capacity interview, the applicant team addressed the differences and challenges they encountered at Fairley during the first year as a full transformation. While they showed above average gains on End-of-Course exams and a Level 5 TVAAS score in Math, they have identified and addressed the areas in need of improvement that led to a composite TVAAS of a Level 2.

The applicant team was very reflective about their performance in Tennessee and addressed many specific changes and interventions they have put in place including better alignment of their science curriculum, exploring the iReady curriculum, additional reading support classes for 9th graders, redesigned professional development for teachers, and stronger 9th grade math interventions.

While the applicant is not yet performing at the high levels they intend in their Tennessee transformation schools, they outperformed the local district, Shelby County Schools, and the neighboring high schools in multiple assessments. As the only Green Dot Tennessee school with state accountability data, Fairley High School has met all performance requirements of the Achievement School District and has not been identified for additional monitoring. The applicant has shown success with their independent school model in California, which is the proposed school model for Green Dot Charter High School. Based on the sponsor's past academic success, as well as the corrective actions it has already implemented to improve student performance, the Portfolio Review and Performance Record meets or exceeds the standard.

Evaluation Team

Allyson Hauptman is the Lead Faculty for Instructional Practice at Lipscomb. She has a Ph.D. in Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education from the University of Nebraska, and has taught first and fifth grades as well as Special Education. She also has experience as a literacy and math coach. Her research interests include reading and writing motivation and best practices in literacy instruction.

Angela Sanders previously served as the General Counsel for the Tennessee State Board of Education. In this role, she advised board members and staff on all legal matters relating to public K-12 education in Tennessee. As General Counsel, Ms. Sanders worked closely with the Director of Charter Schools to manage the charter school appeals and authorization process and prepared board-approved rules for review by the Attorney General and filing with the Secretary of State. Prior to joining State Board staff, Ms. Sanders was an Associate Attorney in the Nashville office of Lewis, Thomason, King, Krieg & Waldrop, P.C., working primarily in the Education Law and Business Law practice groups. In this role, Ms. Sanders advised and represented education clients in a variety of legal matters and litigation including employment issues related to licensed and classified employees, employee and student discipline, employee and student rights, special education and disability accommodations, civil rights matters, tort liability, and first amendment issues. Currently, Ms. Sanders resides in Austin, Texas and works as a contract attorney while caring for her one-year-old son, Jack. Ms. Sanders graduated Magna Cum Laude from Saint Louis University School of Law and received her Bachelor's Degree in Communication from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Summa Cum Laude

Molly Sears serves as the Senior Director of Finance and Operations for the State Collaborative on Reforming Education (SCORE). In her role, Molly manages the financial and business operations of SCORE to support the execution of the organization's and its key partner's strategic efforts. Prior to joining SCORE, Molly served as Director of Finance and Operations for the Division of Curriculum and Instruction at the Tennessee Department of Education. She graduated in 2009 with a bachelor's degree in business administration and is currently pursuing a master's degree in business administration, both at the University of Arkansas.

Earl Simms is the Director of St. Louis Operations for the University of Missouri's Office of Charter School Operations. He has eight years of experience in Missouri's education reform sector with five of those years focused on charter school policy and authorizing. Simms is a 2015 graduate of the National Association for Charter School Authorizers' Leaders Program and has presented at numerous conferences on charter school policy and authorizing.

Tess Stovall serves as the Director of Charter Schools for the Tennessee State Board of Education. In this role, she manages the charter school application process and authorization duties of the State Board, and she was a member of the 2015 National Association of Charter School Authorizer's Leaders Program. Prior to joining the staff of the Board, she served as the Transformation Facilitator at Cameron Middle School, the first district-led conversion of a traditional public school to a charter school in Metropolitan Nashville

Public Schools. While in Washington, DC, Tess worked for Congressman Jim Cooper (TN-05) and a centrist think tank, Third Way, on economic and education policy. She is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of The George Washington University earning a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science and Sociology and a graduate of the London School of Economics with a Master of Science Degree in Political Sociology.

Elizabeth Taylor is the General Counsel of the Tennessee State Board of Education. As General Counsel, she is responsible for advising the Board on legal matters and advises board staff on pending education legislation in the General Assembly. She also manages charter school appeals, develops charter school contracts, and provides guidance on the charter school authorization process. In addition, Elizabeth works with other organizations to draft or revise board policies and regulations. Elizabeth earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Fisk University, a Master of Business Administration from the University of Phoenix, and a Juris Doctorate from the Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law at the University of Memphis. Prior to joining the State Board of Education, Elizabeth was a Staff Attorney and Director of the Office of Civil Rights for the Tennessee Department of Education and an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Tennessee in the Civil Rights and Claims Division.

Jay Whalen serves as Coordinator of Charter Schools for the Tennessee State Board of Education. In this role he works on the charter school application process and authorization duties of the State Board. Prior to joining State Board staff, Jay was the Data Analyst at KIPP Nashville, a charter school organization operating multiple schools in Metro Nashville Public Schools. He was responsible for all data management, collection, analysis, and reporting for the region. Jay is a former high school social studies teacher, spending time in both rural and urban Title I public schools, and has also done consulting work for the Tennessee Department of Education. He holds Bachelor of Arts degrees in Secondary Education and History from the University of Rhode Island.

EXHIBIT C

CHARTER SCHOOL APPLICATION EVALUATION 2016

Name of the Proposed Charter School:	**Green Dot Charter High School**
Sponsoring Organization:	**Green Dot Public Schools Tennessee**
Review Date(s):	**May 2016 and August 2016**

An application that merits a recommendation for approval should present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate; be detailed in how this school will raise student achievement; and inspire confidence in the applicant's capacity to successfully implement the proposed academic and operational plans. In addition to meeting the criteria that are specific to that section, each part of the proposal should align with the overall mission, budget, and goals of the application.

T.C.A. 49-13-108 (a)(3) states, "The grounds upon which the local board of education based a decision to deny a public charter school application must be stated in writing, specifying objective reasons for the denial." The district identifies deficiencies where applicable in each application. However, this is not an exhaustive list, as it is not the role of the district to serve as technical editor of applicants' submissions. It is the responsibility of all applicants to demonstrate authentic knowledge and capacity in each area of the application and to be conversant with the content and expectations set forth in the Tennessee State Department's Charter School Application.

Applications that do not meet or exceed standard in every area will be deemed not ready for approval.

SECTION 1 ACADEMIC PLAN DESIGN AND CAPACITY

1.1 SCHOOL MISSION AND GOALS		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
By setting goals from future baselines the proposed school should have attainable and reasonable goals.	1-2

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.2 ENROLLMENT SUMMARY		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
"The acceptance list and waitlist will be made public as soon as practicable, posted in public locations." This is not acceptable and violation of student privacy protections.	92

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

1.3 School Development		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The design team has a good range of experience.	3-4

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.4 Academic Focus and Plan		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
• "Green Dot's basic learning environment will be classroom-based with target student-teacher ratios of 20:1" in section 2.4, Green Dot shows, at scale, 19 core content teachers to teach 616 students. This is a 32:1 ratio. Even adding in the 9 non-core teachers in the staffing plan only brings this ratio down to 22:1. • More information is needed on differentiated instruction. The section does not provide the appropriate level of detail.	4-9

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

1.5 Academic Performance Standards		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The plan is concise and straightforward.	10-11

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.6 HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION STANDARDS – IF APPLICABLE		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The applicant demonstrates knowledge of Tennessee's graduation standards and presents a coherent plan to assess students' performance, award credits, and ensure students meet graduation requirements.	11-13

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.7 ASSESSMENTS		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The SRI assessment seems similar to the district's formative assessment which should provide a great deal of information about students and teachers. Regional supports are available to the proposed school.	13-16

Concerns/Questions	Page
Indicator #1 on page 14 asks "Is the school meeting its goals on internal assessments, state standardized tests, and student growth?" However, the goals are not listed. More information is needed about the use of Carnegie Math as an assessment.	13-16

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.8 School Calendar and Schedule		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
More information is needed on the number of early release days (also called minimum days). Schools are only allowed 3 abbreviated days unless prior approval has been given by the Tennessee Commissioner of Education.	16-19 Attachment A

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

1.9 Special Populations and At-Risk Students		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
• Students with Disabilities (SWD) will receive direct and related services.	21
• Components required by IDEA, such as progress reports, three-year reevaluations, were cited to be included in the plan to serve SWD appropriately.	20-21
• Process for 504 plan when students do not qualify as SWD is included and is often needed.	20
• Executive Director has worked in schools with SPED populations. However, direct experience is not mentioned.	19
• Director of School Services has 11 years working with SPED programs.	19

Concerns/Questions	Page
• The process for identification of Students with Disabilities (SWD) is very vague. Missing information includes the connection between RTI2 and evaluation, the required components for eligibility, etc.	19
• The process for RTI2 is vague and does not include enough specificity about the required components, including intervention tools, progress monitoring tools, data points, parent notification, fidelity checks, etc.	20 & 8
• No indication for process to identify gifted students.	
• No indication for following IEPs for students already identified as gifted	
• No mention of teacher who is certified to teach gifted.	
• P. 21 refers to "2 SPED teachers and 1 SPED aide to support appropriate implementation of practices from the first year." However, the budget shows 1 SPED teacher in the first two years of implementation, 2 in the years following that, and no aide until the second year.	21 & Budget
• Application refers to members of SST including "outside service providers." Who are they? Should list at least some examples.	19-20
• Application says that "Students with mild/moderate and/or moderate/severe disabilities will be included within our general education classroom environment….unless the IEP requires otherwise." While this is a worthy goal, students with moderate/severe disabilities usually require extensive supports, such as nurses, PT/OT, specialized instruction, often with assistive technology; a teacher with special training, often extra aides; and usually require extra costs, much more than other students. The budget does not reflect a plan for high costs to educate students with moderate/severe disabilities.	19 & Budget

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

1.10 School Culture and Discipline		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The application includes a coherent set of policies and procedures.	22-26 Attachment B

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.11 MARKETING, RECRUITMENT, AND ENROLLMENT		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The enrollment policy is outlined in attachment C.	26-27

Concerns/Questions	Page
The application lacks a detailed timeline that includes all activities surrounding the plan.	26-27

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.12 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARENT ENGAGEMENT		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The community involvement plan meets the standards and the attachments provide additional detail.	27-28

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.13 Existing Academic Plan (for Existing Operators)		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The plan outlines the contrast between the operator's existing schools and the proposed new school.	28-29

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

1.14 Performance Management (for Existing Operators)		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
This section is missing the needed detail as outlined in the application requirements.	29-30

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

SECTION 1 ACADEMIC PLAN DESIGN AND CAPACITY

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Summary Rating for Entire Academic Plan Design and Capacity		
Initial Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: This application is concise, clearly written, and well-organized. The applicant describes a vision for the proposed school. Weaknesses/Questions: The overall academic plan lacks critical detail in key areas such as assessments, SPED and Performance Management.		
Final Rating after Interview, if applicable		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: The team has charter experience and the management provides its own residence program for their leaders. The board is active and engaged in the governance of the school. (If Any) Weaknesses: Green Dot currently operates (or will operate) 4 additional schools with the Achievement School District; in their first year of data managing Fairley High School, Green Dot received a level 2 TVAAS. With additional schools coming on line and with the significant organizational capacity required for turnaround, we question bringing on a 5th school for this CMO at this time. In our interview, Green Dot referenced their success in other communities as evidence for why they can manage the pace of change effectively; in an amended application, we would like to see that data so as to make a more informed decision. Moreover, there are also remaining questions about outstanding balances with SCS for the services rendered to their ASD schools.		
AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: The proposed school will post the acceptance and wait lists using a confidential numbering system assigned to each applicant ensuring privacy for students and families. The student teacher ratio has been changed to reflect 22:1 across the application. The applicant added more detail and description around differentiated instruction and the use of Carnegie Math. The school calendar has been changed allowing for two (2) abbreviated days of instruction which meets the State Board Rules for school calendars. The use of RTI2, including student identification, has been clarified. The applicant also aligned the changes to the budget and provided information on partners and plans for gifted students and students with moderate/severe disabilities. A plan outlining the timeline of marketing activities and enrollment has been added. (If Any) Weaknesses: The section still lacks critical detail as to how the organization will monitor and evaluate the academic progress of individual students, student cohorts and the network as whole. The application only outlines the use of a Hot Schools Dashboard for individual schools. The applicant was extremely vague about the specifics surrounding their challenge areas of Biology, Chemistry and English 1. The applicant did not provide scores for any of the areas, hence, it is difficult to ascertain whether the proposed supports will address the deficient areas.		

SECTION 2 OPERATIONS PLAN AND CAPACITY

2.1 GOVERNANCE		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The roles and responsibilities of the board are outlined and the required documents are attached.	31-34

Concerns/ Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.2 START-UP PLAN		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The plan includes a timeline for the activities that will need to be completed in order for the proposed school to open successfully.	35-37

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.3 FACILITIES		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The application outlines the facility needs including classrooms, labs and office space.	37-38

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.4 PERSONNEL/ HUMAN CAPITAL		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
"Green Dot's basic learning environment will be classroom-based with target student-teacher ratios of 20:1" in section 1.4, Green Dot shows, at scale, 19 core content teachers to teach 616 students. This is a 32:1 ratio. Even adding in the 9 non-core teachers in the staffing plan only brings this ratio down to 22:1.	38-52

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

2.5 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The professional development plan allows for regular staff training throughout the school year.	52-55

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.6 INSURANCE		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
The application contains insurance for their current schools. The plan must address how the proposed school will meet the requirements set forth by SCS. The required information was distributed at the applicant meeting which was attended by a representative of this organization.	55 Attachment K

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☒ Does Not Meet Standard

2.7 TRANSPORTATION – IF APPLICABLE		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The applicant has an existing relationship with Durham, so compliance should not be in issue in this area.	55-56

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.8 Food Service		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The applicant plans to issue an RFP for food service.	56

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.9 Additional Operations – If Applicable		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
Plans are included for technology integration, student information management, school health and nursing services and safety and security.	56-59

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.10 WAIVERS		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The waiver requests are appropriate.	60-63

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.11 Network Vision, Growth Plan, & Capacity (For Existing Operators)		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
Green Dot's aggressive growth plan which includes 10 approvals in the ASD along with its marginal performance in the ASD is a cause for concern. An emphasis on turnaround efforts may have an impact on the opening of new start charters.	63-66

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.12 Network Management (For Existing Operators)		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
• The organizational leadership team along with their roles and responsibilities are outlined. • The required organization charts are included.	66-70

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.13 Network Governance (For Existing Operators)		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The governance structure is clearly defined and outlined.	70-71

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.15 PERSONNEL/HUMAN CAPITAL – NETWORK-WIDE STAFFING PROJECTIONS (FOR EXISTING OPERATORS)		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The plan for the overall network in growth is to add academic positions first.	71-72

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

2.16 PERSONNEL/HUMAN CAPITAL – STAFFING PLANS, HIRING, MANAGEMENT, AND EVALUATION (FOR EXISTING OPERATORS)		
Application Review		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The organization structure is clearly addressed.	72-73

Concerns/Questions	Page

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Summary Rating for Entire Operations Plan and Capacity		
Initial Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: The operations plan is generally sound and has been clearly explained. Weaknesses/Questions: The concerns for the operations of a new start charter with SCS include personnel, insurance and the growth plan.		
Final Rating after Interview, if applicable		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: (If Any) Weaknesses:		
AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: The student teacher ratio has been changed to 22:1 across the application. The applicant included the required insurance information. (If Any) Weaknesses: The explanation for the aggressive growth plan outlines the benefits of economies of scale for the network however, it does not address how the network will ensure the academic success of each individual school.		

SECTION 3 FINANCIAL PLAN AND CAPACITY

3.1 & 3.2 CHARTER SCHOOL FINANCING		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
• Reasonable assumptions detailed in its financial procedures • Familiar with school operations based on history in the ASD	Budget and Narrative

Concerns/Questions	Page
• Management fees per pupil are 14.5% of public funds • Contingency plans are not detailed for philanthropic funds.	Budget and Narrative

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

3.3 Financial Plan (For Existing Operators Completing Sections 3.1 and 3.2)		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page

Concerns/Questions	Page
A plan to resolve the outstanding delinquency with SCS must submitted.	

Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Summary Rating for Entire Financial Plan and Capacity Section		
Initial Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: The overall financial plan is sound. Weaknesses/Questions: The outstanding issues with SCS require resolution.		
Final Rating after Interview, if applicable		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: (If Any) Weaknesses:		
AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths: The management fees are in line with national averages due to the centralized support that will be given to each school in the network. More detail was given on the contingency plans including a $2 million dollar line of credit. The organization has resolved the delinquency with the SCS. (If Any) Weaknesses:		

SECTION 4 PORTFOLIO REVIEW/PERFORMANCE RECORD

4.1 PAST PERFORMANCE (FOR EXISTING OPERATORS)		
Application Review		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths	Page
The performance data for all of the schools in the network appears to be above the average for proficiency rates.	Attachment U

Concerns/Questions	Page
A copy of the unaudited financial statements are included but the application requires a copy of the audit.	Attachment X

Interview (if applicable)
Strengths
Concerns/Questions

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
☐ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☒ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
☒ Meets or Exceeds Standard	☐ Partially Meets Standard	☐ Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths:

Audit information is in the application.

(If Any) Weaknesses:

Shelby County Schools Additional Information - SCORING RUBRIC

A strong response will have the following characteristics:

- A clear, viable and comprehensive education plan for improving the proficiency rate and percentile rank in reading language arts
- A detailed and well developed strategy for raising ACT scores (if applicable)
- A feasible and viable plan for attaining and maintaining a graduation rate of 75% or more (if applicable)
- Specific measureable goals on how the school will improve their percentile rank each year while maintaining a level 4 or 5 TVAAS
- A comprehensive outline surrounding compliance with the scorecard
- A meaningful successful organizational history that demonstrates the capacity necessary to operate a charter school

Initial Application Review

☐ **Meets or Exceeds Standard**	☐ **Partially Meets Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below Standard**

Strengths	**Concerns/Questions**
The sponsoring organization has many years of charter experience and has a plan in place to improve the graduation rate.	The TVAAS score of a 2 for 2014-15 forecasts possible challenges.

After Capacity Interview (if applicable)

☐ **Meets or Exceeds Standard**	☐ **Partially Meets Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below Standard**

Interview Notes	**Revised Analysis**

Amended Application

☐ **Meets or Exceeds Standard**	☐ **Partially Meets Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below Standard**

Changes to the Original Application	**Revised Analysis**
	There was no evidence of change made in this section. The subject was addressed inadequately on p. 89. See comments under Summary Section 1.