



**TENNESSEE**  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

# **AUTHORIZER CONNECT**

---

NOVEMBER 9, 2022

PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK REFRESH

# OUR PURPOSE

---

- Create a reoccurring time and space for Tennessee's authorizers to **share resources, successes and lessons learned** with each other.
- Provide **professional development** opportunities for authorizers which centers around high-quality authorizing.
- **Build a community** of authorizers who share the same goal of providing high-quality public school options to students across Tennessee.

# AGENDA

---

- Welcome and Whip Around
- Authorizer Spotlight: Knox County Schools
- Performance Framework Refresh
  - NACSA
  - TN Public Charter School Commission
- Resources and Wrap Up

# WELCOME & WHIP AROUND

---

Please unmute yourself to share the following:

- Name, District and Role
- What is your favorite holiday dinner dish?

# **AUTHORIZER SPOTLIGHT**

---

KNOX COUNTY SCHOOLS



# **KNOX COUNTY SCHOOLS**

## **CHARTER SCHOOL**

### **AUTHORIZATION REFLECTION**

Julie Thompson, Executive Director of  
Academic Supports

Kathy Duggan, Charter School Liaison  
Knox County Schools

## 91 schools

- approximately 59,188 students
- includes elementary, middle, and high schools

## 1 charter school

- Emerald Academy (since 2015)
- approximately 450 students
- elementary and middle school only

## Part-time charter staff

- Julie Thompson, Executive Director of Academic Supports
- Kathy Duggan, Charter School Liaison (part-time)

Knox County relies on experts within the total district to oversee designated aspects of charter work.

At least one new application is expected this year.

We are looking for ways to organize systems efficiently and effectively as new charter schools are approved.

The evaluation process was beneficial in showing us areas in need of improvement. Now we are looking for best practices.



## **SUCCESS—EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

- Revision of the KCS Performance Framework
- Revision of the KCS Charter Authorization Handbook
- Efforts to improve transparency in authorizing practices
- A greater understanding of authorizing
- Better coordination among entities within KCS
- Increased collaboration among other Tennessee authorizers

## TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

Budget

Fee Report

# KNOX COUNTY SCHOOLS CHARTER BUDGET

Knox County Schools			
Charter Budget			
Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2023			
<b>Estimated Revenues:</b>			
Account	Revenue Type	Amount	Description
43548	Charter Authorizer Fee	\$ 35,000	1 charter x \$35,000
<b>Total Estimated Revenues</b>		<b>\$ 35,000</b>	
<b>Estimated Expenditures:</b>			
Account		Amount	Description
72210		\$ 15,000	100% Charter School Liasion
72210		\$ 10,000	KCS Charter Monitoring/Support Services
72210		\$ 500	NACSA Membership
72210		\$ 9,500	Other Consulting services
<b>Total Estimated Expenditures</b>		<b>\$ 35,000</b>	
<i>Note: Personnel costs include salaries and benefits.</i>			

# BUDGET AND FEE REPORT QUESTIONS

*As we discuss the following items, please include comments in the chat when possible.*

- Allocations may vary, depending on the number of new applications received or other issues that may arise. What are the potential consequences if the budget does not align exactly with the fee report?
- Although \$10,000 is allocated for charter monitoring, this money is returned to designated employees' salaries. The number of hours per employee varies and is difficult to monitor. How do we reflect this accurately on the fee report?
- In subsequent years we would like to increase the NACSA allotment to include funds for one or two people to attend the conference. How much should we allot for this?
- How do other authorizers use consulting services to support authorization practices?

## CONTACT INFORMATION:

Julie Thompson, Executive Director of Academic Supports

[julie.thompson@knoxschools.org](mailto:julie.thompson@knoxschools.org)

Phone: 865-705-5226

Kathy Duggan, Charter School Liaison

[kathy.duggan@knoxschools.org](mailto:kathy.duggan@knoxschools.org)

Phone: 865-441-8683 (cell)

# **PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK REFRESH**

---

DAVID GREENBERG, NACSA

MAGGIE LUND, TN PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION

# Performance Framework Updates



2018 EDITION

---

PRINCIPLES & STANDARDS  
FOR QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORIZING

---



# CORE PRINCIPLES OF CHARTER AUTHORIZING:

- **MAINTAIN HIGH STANDARDS FOR SCHOOLS**
- **UPHOLD SCHOOL AUTONOMY**
- **PROTECT STUDENT AND PUBLIC INTERESTS**



# NACSA Principles & Standards

A Quality Authorizer...

Executes charter contracts that plainly:

- Establish the performance standards under which schools will be evaluated, using objective and verifiable measures of student achievement as the primary measure of school quality;
- Define clear, measurable, and attainable academic, financial, and organizational performance standards and targets that the school must meet as a condition of renewal, including but not limited to state and federal measures;
- Utilize multiple measures to evaluate school quality and student success which include long-used and normed measures of academic performance and rigorous, credible mission-specific performance measures that assess each school's success in fulfilling its mission.



A photograph of a family in a home setting. A man with a beard and grey hair, wearing a light blue button-down shirt, stands behind a wooden table, looking down at two young girls who are sitting and writing in notebooks. The girl on the left is wearing a blue denim jacket, and the girl on the right is wearing a white and blue striped shirt. A woman with dark curly hair, wearing a yellow shirt, is seated on the right side of the frame, looking towards the girls. The background shows a kitchen area with a window and some kitchenware. The text "Updated Performance Framework" is overlaid in white, bold, sans-serif font across the middle of the image.

# Updated Performance Framework

# Three Guiding Principles

These Performance Frameworks are grounded in all that we have learned and know from nearly three decades of practice:

1. *Principles & Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing*, to ensure best practices in oversight;
2. *Leadership, Commitment, and Professional Judgment*, to ensure these researched characteristics of strong authorizers are exercised; and
3. *Communities at the Center*, to ensure schools meet their local needs, aspirations, and context.



## Evolution : What have we learned

- One size does not fit all.
- Every community is unique.
- There's room for judgment.



# Evolution: What Holds True?

- The PFs help authorizers and schools answer essential questions: Is the school academically successful? Is the school financially healthy? Is the school organizationally sound?
- The PFs focus on outcomes for students and their long-term well-being.
- The PFs ensure school autonomy and protect schools from onerous bureaucracy.
- The PFs ensure that all students, especially those who have historically been under-educated, are being educated at high levels.



# Academic Framework ~~current~~ current version

- Indicator 1: State and Federal Accountability Systems
- Indicator 2: Student Progress Over Time (Growth)
- Indicator 3: Students Achievement (Status)
- Indicator 4: Post-Secondary Readiness
- Indicator 5: Mission-Specific Academic Goals



## Academic Framework updated version

- Indicator 1: Student Progress Over Time (Growth)
- Indicator 2: Students Achievement (Status)
- Indicator 3: Post-Secondary Readiness
- Indicator 4: Mission-Specific Academic Goals
- Indicator 5: State and Federal Accountability Systems





# What's Different/Same?

- Emphasize growth in the emerging post-pandemic years
- Continue to emphasize literacy and numeracy. Statewide assessments continue to be an important measure of student growth and performance in reading, math, and science. AND, they don't have to be the only measures of these skills.
- Lean into multiple measures. Consider mission-specific or school-specific goals that assess school quality more broadly.
- Ensure that relevant measures for English learners and students with disabilities are included.
- Stress post-secondary readiness for high schools and consider measures that include and go beyond traditional measures of college readiness (e.g., SAT/ACT, college acceptance).



## Next Steps

- NACSA will be releasing updates to our performance framework guidance after the new year.
- We will have engagement opportunities for the field to consider updates to the guidance and implications for authorizers from varying contexts.
- We are always happy to provide support as you consider updates to your frameworks.



## Contact Us

David Greenberg: [davidg@qualitycharters.org](mailto:davidg@qualitycharters.org)



# THANK YOU



# TENNESSEE

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION

**AUTHORIZER CONNECT:  
SCHOOL PERFORMANCE  
FRAMEWORK**

**NOVEMBER 9, 2022**

# WHY UPDATE?

- Effects of COVID-19 pandemic
  - Fundamental changes in accountability data
  - Need to build in additional measures for school performance outside of state accountability
  - School culture indicators fundamentally changing
  - New research and best practices
- Changes in portfolio with new ASD pathway to Commission
  - High growth model schools
  - Is our current framework contextualized for different school models and different populations served?



# PROCESS

- Engage Stakeholder – Information Gathering Sessions
  - Stakeholders include:
    - Other authorizers across Tennessee and other states
    - Current (and future) school operators
    - Commissioners
    - Tennessee Department of Education Colleagues
- Use Feedback – Propose Changes
  - Review with internal stakeholders
  - Review with school operators
- Finalize Proposal
- Pressure-Test the Framework
  - Re-engage school operators for feedback
- Adjust any pieces necessary and finalize the framework.



# ACADEMICS

- Reallocation of weight within the academic section of the framework to **contextualize** the framework.
  - Inclusion of mission-specific goal within the framework created by each school
  - Comparative performance holding 40% of the framework.
    - Adding subgroup comparative performance
  - Celebrating growth in the framework with a TVAAS indicator





# NEW ACADEMIC FRAMEWORK

Section	Indicator	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Percentage of Section Score	Percentage of Overall Score
Student Outcomes	School academic performance, as measured by the Tennessee Department of Education	1	2	3	4	100%	25%-35%
Mission-Specific Goal	Each school authorized by the Commission will define a mission-specific goal within their charter agreement to be evaluated within the School Performance Framework	1	2	3	4	100%	10%
Comparative Performance	Comparative Performance to Resident District					50%	40%
	School comparative performance to resident district in ELA	1	2	3	4	25%	
	School comparative performance to resident district in Math	1	2	3	4	25%	
	School comparative performance to resident district in Science	1	2	3	4	25%	
	School comparative performance to resident district in Social Studies	1	2	3	4	25%	
	Comparative Subgroup Performance to Resident District					50%	
	Students with disabilities comparative performance to resident district in ELA and Math	1	2	3	4	25%	
	English Learners comparative performance to resident district in ELA and Math	1	2	3	4	25%	
	Economically disadvantaged students comparative performance to resident district in ELA and Math	1	2	3	4	25%	
	Black, Hispanic, Native American students comparative performance to resident district in ELA and Math	1	2	3	4	25%	
TVAAS	Overall Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Composite Index (10%)	1	2	3	4	100%	15%-25%
Average Total Rating							



# WEIGHTED FRAMEWORK

- Celebrates growth – Student Outcomes

Measure	Description	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
1a*	School academic performance, as measured by the Tennessee Department of Education	D	C	B	A	25%-35%

- TVAAS Composite Indicator

Measure	Description	Falls Far Below Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Total Weight
4a	The <a href="#">Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System</a> (TVAAS) measures student growth year over year, regardless of whether the student is proficient on the state assessment. In calculating a TVAAS score, a student's performance is compared relative to the performance of his or her peers who have performed similarly on past assessments.	TVAAS Composite Score of 1	TVAAS Composite Score of 2	TVAAS Composite Score of 3	TVAAS Composite Score of 4 or 5	15%-25%



# SUBGROUP COMPARISON

- Comparative Performance to Resident District for Academic Achievement – 50%
  - School must fall within 5% of academic performance of resident district to meet standard
- Subgroup Comparative Performance to Resident District for Academic Achievement – 50%
  - School's subgroup must fall within 3% of academic performance of resident district for the same subgroup to meet standard
  - Subgroups included:
    - SWD
    - ELL
    - BHN
    - ED



# MISSION-SPECIFIC GOAL

- School creates and it is baked into framework as appendix to charter agreement
  - Must be consistent over time and cannot change each year
  - Must be outcomes driven and not include inputs such as teacher actions
  - Can be a place for schools to capture nationally normed growth assessments or other internal data
  - Can be a place to capture unique models such as arts models or Montessori.



# SCHOOL CULTURE INDICATORS

- We closely examined the school culture indicators and determined that they should no longer hold weight in the academic section of the framework given the changes we have seen with teacher retention, chronic absenteeism, and discipline rates.
  - These are now in the organizational performance section of the framework and align to the School Improvement Plan



# ADJUSTMENTS TO ORG PERFORMANCE

- **4(b). Is the school meeting suspension rate goals?**

- Meets Standard

- The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to suspension rate goals, including but not limited to:
  - Meeting suspension rate goals outlined in the School or LEA plan (if applicable)
  - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.

- **4(c). Is the school meeting attendance goals?**

- Meets Standard

- The school materially complies with applicable laws, rules, regulations, LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to attendance goals, including but not limited to:
  - Meeting attendance goals outlined in the charter agreement
  - Meeting attendance goals outlined in the School or LEA plan (if applicable)
- If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.



# ADJUSTMENTS TO ORG PERFORMANCE

- **4(g). Is the school retaining teachers?**
- *\*Note - Teachers who are non-renewed by the school/network are not included as part of the teacher retention rate. This metric will also hold harmless teachers who move into a different role at the school or in the charter management organization.*
- Meets Standard
  - School maintains a teacher retention rate of 75% or higher annually.
- Does Not Meet Standard
  - School maintains a teacher retention rate of 65% - 74.9% annually.
- Falls Far Below Standard
  - School maintains a teacher retention rate of less than 65% annually.



# CAPTURE COUNSELING OUT

- **1(d). Is the school retaining students (students are staying enrolled throughout the year and year over year)?**
- Meets Standard
  - The school materially complies with applicable LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to retention rate goals, including but not limited to:
    - Meeting retention rate goals outlined in the School or LEA Plan (if applicable); and/or
    - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.
- **1(e). Is the school retaining students that fall within special populations subgroups including students with disabilities, English Learners, economically disadvantaged students, and Black, Hispanic, and Native American subgroups at a similar rate to their overall student retention rate?**
- Meets Standard
  - The school materially complies with applicable LEA policies and procedures, and provisions of the charter agreement relating to retention rate goals by subgroup, including but not limited to:
    - Meeting retention rate goals outlined in the School or LEA Plan (if applicable); and/or
    - If shortcomings were identified, the school promptly came into compliance.





# PRESSURE TEST

- After approval on first read of the framework, we ran all available data through the framework for each school.
  - Made adjustments to n-size counts
  - Made adjustments to thresholds for subgroup comparison
  - Made adjustments for overall weight to ensure that schools could meet standard for certain indicators





**TENNESSEE**

PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION

# RESOURCES & WRAP UP

---

# RESOURCES

---

- [“What Can Tell Us More? Multiple Measures Can.”](#) NACSA blog series by David Greenberg
- [TN Public Charter School Commission’s](#) website
- Department of Education’s [Model Performance Framework](#)
- [Charter Authorizers & Agency Contacts](#)
  - Email Ali (Ali.Reid@tn.gov) if any information needs to be updated.

# UPCOMING MEETINGS

---

DATE	SPOTLIGHT	TOPIC
January 2023 *in-person*	Hamilton County Schools	Revisions to the Quality Authorizing Standards
March 2023	Metro Nashville Public Schools	Topic by Memphis-Shelby County Schools
May 2023	Achievement School District	Authorizing Policies with TSBA

# THANK YOU!



**TENNESSEE**  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION