
BEFORE THE TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

IN RE:)
PATHWAYS IN EDUCATION-TENNESSEE, INC.) State Board of Education Meeting
Charter School Appeal) October 14, 2016
)
)
)

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION REPORT
OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated (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 2, 2016, Pathways in Education (“Sponsor”), the Sponsor of the proposed Pathways in Education-Tennessee, Inc. (“Pathways”) appealed the denial of its 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 Pathways amended application was not “contrary to the best interests of the pupils, school district, or community.”¹ Therefore, I recommend that the State Board affirm the decision of SCS to deny the amended application for Pathways.

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 Pathways 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

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,

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.

school district, or community.⁴ Because Pathways is proposing to locate in a school district 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 29, 2016, the Sponsor submitted a letter of intent to SCS expressing its intention to file a charter school application for Pathways.
2. The Sponsor submitted its initial application for Pathways to SCS on April 1, 2016.
3. SCS assembled a review committee to review and score the Pathways application. The review committee recommended denial of the Pathways initial application.
4. On June 28, 2016, the SCS Board of Education voted to deny the Pathways initial application based upon the review committee's recommendation.
5. The Sponsor amended and resubmitted its application for Pathways to SCS on July 27, 2016.
6. SCS's review committee reviewed and scored the Pathways amended application and again recommended denial.
7. On August 23, 2016, based on the review committee's recommendation, SCS voted to deny the Pathways amended application.
8. The Sponsor appealed the denial of the Pathways amended application in writing to the State Board on September 2, 2016, including submission of all required documents per State Board policy 2.500.
9. At the time of appeal to the State Board, the Sponsor did not submit any corrections to the application as allowed under T.C.A. § 49-13-108(a)(4)(C).
10. The State Board's Review Committee analyzed and scored the Pathways amended application using the Tennessee Department of Education's charter application scoring rubric.
11. 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 Pathways application.
12. The Review Committee conducted a capacity interview with the proposed governing board of Pathways and key members of the leadership team on October 3, 2016, in Nashville.

⁴ T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

- **District Denial of Application.**

The review committee assembled by SCS to review and score the Pathways 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
Tutional 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 Lockett	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 Pathways 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	Does Not Meet Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Does Not Meet Standard
Portfolio Review/Performance Record	Does Not Meet Standard

After the SCS review committee completed its review and scoring of the initial application, its recommendation was presented to the SCS Board of Education on June 28, 2016. Based on the review committee’s recommendation, the SCS Board of Education voted to deny the initial application of Pathways.

Upon resubmission, the amended replication application received the following ratings from the SCS review committee:⁵

Sections	Rating
Academic Plan Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Does Not Meet Standard
Portfolio Review/Performance Record	Does Not Meet 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 Pathways.

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

Following the denial of the Pathways 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 Pathways amended application. This Review Committee consisted of the following individuals⁶:

Name	Title
Meg Cummins	Account Specialist, Individualized Education Account Program, Tennessee Department of Education
Rascoe Dean	Special Assistant U.S. Attorney, U.S. Attorney’s Office, Middle District of Tennessee
Kelly Love	Educator and Reading Specialist, Akiva School of Nashville
Mary Cypress Metz	Chief of Staff, State Collaborative on Reforming Education (SCORE)
Angela Sanders	Practicing Attorney, Former General Counsel for State Board of Education
Tess Stovall	Director of Charter Schools, State Board of Education

⁵ Please see EXHIBIT C for a copy of the SCS review committee report.

⁶ Please see EXHIBIT B for detailed bios of each review committee member.

Name	Title
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 Pathways 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 Pathways amended application was as follows:

Sections	Rating
Academic Plan Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Does Not Meet Standard
Portfolio Review/Performance Record	Does Not Meet Standard

The Review Committee recommended that the application for Pathways be denied because the applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence that it met the required criterion in the academic, operational, financial, and portfolio review sections of the rubric. Specifically, the academic plan presented by the applicant lacked a clear, compelling mission, failed to outline a comprehensive staffing plan to serve all students, and did not articulate a clear plan to correct student or school underperformance.

In addition, the operations plan presented in the application was not aligned with the budget or information presented in the interview in numerous areas. The applicant did not provide a clear, strong model for school governance, and the governing board lacked general knowledge of the school’s governance structure and vendors. The financial plan was misaligned with the written application and information presented in the interview, leaving the Review Committee with significant doubts regarding the ability of the applicant to manage the financial operations of the proposed school.

In the portfolio review section, the application lacked clear, compelling evidence of successful student outcomes for each school in the network and evidence that the operator’s schools are high performing and successful by state and national standards. Specifically, the applicant’s current schools in Memphis were identified in the application as the lowest performing schools in the network. In 2015, PIE-TN Whitehaven had 100% of students scoring basic or below basic on the state’s 2015 TCAP assessments, and both PIE-TN Whitehaven and PIE-TN Frayser had an overall TVAAS composite score of Level 1. Overall, the review committee could not determine that the applicant’s track record was sufficient to justify replication in Tennessee.

In summary, the Review Committee determined that the academic, operational, and financial plans were incomplete and lacking the needed preparation and detail, and the applicant’s track record did not meet the bar for replication. The capacity interview with the Sponsor did not provide further clarification that would have resulted in a higher rating. Therefore, the Review Committee recommended that the Pathways application be denied.

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 statute⁷ and State Board policy 2.500, a public hearing chaired by the Executive Director of the State Board was held in Memphis on September 26, 2016. SCS’s presentation at the public hearing focused on the argument that the denial of the Pathways amended application was in the best interests 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 that Pathways’ application did not meet the standard for approval in student schedules, existing academic plan, food service, and the performance record of the operator’s current schools within the Tennessee Achievement School District.⁸ SCS pointed to the 2015 overall TVAAS composite score of a Level 1 for Pathways’ Frayser and Whitehaven campuses as evidence that the application did not meet the standard necessary for approval.⁹

In response, the Sponsor’s presentation focused on the evidence of community need in Hickory Hill and greater Memphis for a school to serve students at risk of not graduating from high school. Pathways agreed with SCS that the academic performance of its existing schools in Memphis was “unacceptable” but stated that the average student enrolling at Pathways had a 3rd grade reading level. The Sponsor also outlined corrective action measures implemented at the existing Memphis schools to mitigate these challenges, including no longer allowing students to self-select the type of courses they take and requiring students to take some foundational courses taught through more traditional small group instruction. Additionally, the Sponsor stated that it has addressed low teacher retention rates at the existing Memphis schools through more focused recruiting of teacher candidates who are ready to serve students in an alternative model. Lastly, the Sponsor stated that the schools have seen an increase in enrollment over the last three months, which reinforces the need for this type of school in the community.¹⁰

A portion of the public hearing was dedicated to taking public comment. A total of ten people made verbal comments at the hearing, including a number of students, a parent, a member of the Pathways staff, and community partner representatives from Memphis. In addition, State Board staff accepted written public comments via e-mail.¹¹

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.”¹² In addition, T.C.A. § 49-13-108 requires the State Board to adopt national

⁷ T.C.A. § 49-13-109.

⁸ SCS Public Hearing Presentation.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Pathways Public Hearing Presentation.

¹¹ Copies of written public comments received by the deadline have been provided to State Board members.

¹² 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 Pathways 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 explicated in the report, I agree that the Pathways amended application did not rise to the level of meeting or exceeding 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 the Sponsor's charter management organization, Pathways Management Group, does not indicate success based on state and national standards. The Sponsor's existing schools in Tennessee have not demonstrated academic success through end of course assessments or graduation rates. Additionally, the Sponsor's schools in California and Louisiana perform significantly below the proficiency rates of the states and the school districts in which the schools are located. Therefore, I agree that the Sponsor's existing schools have not 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. While it appears that the Sponsors of the Pathways application are a dedicated group who wish to serve the students in the Memphis community, I agree with SCS that significant concerns remain about the ability of the Sponsor to successfully open and operate another school that will improve academic outcomes for all students.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, and for the reasons stated in the Review Committee Report attached hereto, I do not believe that the decision to deny the amended application for Pathways in Education-Tennessee, Inc. was contrary to the best interests of the students, the school district, or the community. Therefore, I recommend that the State Board of Education affirm the decision of SCS to deny the amended application for Pathways.



Dr. Sara Heyburn, Executive Director
State Board of Education

10/12/16

Date



EXHIBIT A

**State Accountability Data Comparison
Pathways in Education-Tennessee**

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 data¹ 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 state accountability data available is for the 2014-15 school year, and in that year, Pathways Tennessee had two (2) schools in operation: Pathways Frayser Campus (Frayser) and Pathways Whitehaven Campus (Whitehaven). In the table below, Frayser and Whitehaven are compared to the state of Tennessee, Shelby County Schools (SCS), the Achievement School District (ASD), and the ten (10) high schools the sponsor named in its application based on the location of the proposed school. 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
2015	Frayser	7.1%	-	-	-	46.7%	0.0%	-	3.5%	1
	Whitehaven ³	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.9%	1
	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
	Memphis School of Excellence	77.9%	46.7%	61.0%	15.5%	76.3%	65.2%	-	92.3%	4
	Oakhaven HS	53.2%	54.9%	39.1%	15.9%	39.6%	32.6%	7.7%	89.4%	5
	Overton HS	43.6%	51.2%	48.3%	23.0%	56.8%	52.1%	28.3%	79.6%	4
	Power Center Academy	62.8%	43.6%	64.4%	79.4%	84.7%	77.0%	43.6%	98.5%	5
	Ridgeway HS	47.4%	30.2%	34.6%	14.9%	64.4%	51.1%	13.7%	85.2%	3
	Sheffield HS	53.8%	25.5%	34.8%	21.3%	31.8%	37.1%	12.3%	69.4%	5
	Southwind HS	69.6%	41.4%	35.0%	29.4%	57.3%	51.5%	30.5%	74.5%	5
	White Station HS	57.2%	73.9%	74.8%	61.2%	77.7%	76.7%	55.7%	85.8%	5
Wooddale HS	47.9%	24.7%	29.9%	13.9%	36.9%	30.2%	16.3%	50.1%	4	

¹ Pathways Management Group operated three schools in Illinois, but comparable data for 2014-15 or 2015-16 was not available.

² (n.d.). Retrieved October 11, 2016, from <https://www.tn.gov/education/topic/report-card>.

³ Pathways Whitehaven only had 3-8 TCAP achievement data for the 2014-15 school year. The school achieved 0.0% proficient or advanced in Math, 0.0% in Reading Language Arts, and 4.8% in Science.

California

The most recent California accountability data available is for the 2015-16 school year, and in that year, Pathways Management Group, the charter management organization for Pathways in Education-Tennessee, had five high schools over 31 sites in operation in California. In the tables below, these five 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 Smarter Balance assessment.⁴

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	San Gabriel Unified District	80%	59%
	Options for Youth – San Gabriel	46%	5%

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	Burbank Unified District	70%	38%
	Options for Youth – Burbank	42%	3%

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	San Bernardino District	44%	16%
	Options for Youth – San Bernardino	30%	3%

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	San Juan Unified District	57%	30%
	Options for Youth – San Juan	38%	7%

		11th Grade ELA	11th Grade Math
2016	California	59%	33%
	Victor Valley Union District	45%	17%
	Options for Youth – Victorville	37%	4%

⁴ (n.d.). Retrieved October 10, 2016, from <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>.

Louisiana

The most recent Louisiana accountability data available is for the 2015-16 school year, and in that year, Pathways Management Group, the charter management organization for Pathways in Education-Tennessee, had two high schools in operation in Louisiana. In the tables below, these two schools are compared to the state of Louisiana and the school district where the schools are located. The data included in the tables is the percent of students who scored “excellent” or “good” on the End of Course assessments.⁵

		Algebra I	Biology	English II	English III	Geometry	US History
2016	Louisiana	58%	53%	70%	63%	58%	67%
	Caddo Parish	50%	41%	60%	58%	44%	67%
	Pathways in Education-Louisiana	17%	9%	50%	44%	22%	32%
	Pathways in Education-North Market	37%	19%	25%	47%	11%	32%

⁵ (2016, June 16). Retrieved October 10, 2016, from <https://www.louisianabelieves.com/resources/library/high-school-and-college-and-career-data-center>.



EXHIBIT B

Charter Application Review Committee Recommendation Report

October 12, 2016

School Name: Pathways in Education-Tennessee (Hickory Hill)

Sponsor: Pathways in Education-Tennessee

Proposed Location of School: Shelby County Schools

Evaluation Team:

Meg Cummins
Rascoe Dean
Kelly Love
Mary Cypress Metz
Angela Sanders
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 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.

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.

Rating	Characteristics
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.

Summary of the Application

School Name: Pathways in Education-Tennessee (Hickory Hill)

Sponsor: Pathways in Education-Tennessee

Proposed Location of School: Shelby County Schools

Mission:¹ The mission of Pathways in Education-Tennessee is to provide Shelby County’s at-risk students with curriculum, instruction, and support services that will help these students re-engage with their education and graduate high school prepared to attend college or pursue a career.

Number of Schools Currently in Operation by Sponsor:

- Memphis: Pathways in Education-Tennessee (Frayser Campus and Whitehaven Campus)
- Outside of Tennessee operated by the charter management organization (“CMO”), Pathways Management Group: 31 campuses in California; Three (3) campuses in Illinois; Two (2) in Louisiana; One (1) in Arizona.

Proposed Enrollment:²

Grade Level	Year 1 (2017)	Year 2 (2018)	Year 3 (2019)	Year 4 (2020)	Year 5 (2021)	At Capacity (2017)
9	75	75	75	75	75	75
10	75	75	75	75	75	75
11	75	75	75	75	75	75
12	75	75	75	75	75	75
Total	300	300	300	300	300	300

Brief Description of the Application:

Pathways in Education-Tennessee (“PIE-TN”) is proposing to open a high school in Memphis, Tennessee and serve students in grades 9 through 12. The school is a replication of the Pathways in Education model and would be the third PIE-TN school in Memphis. The school proposes to locate in the Hickory Hill community in southeast Memphis.³ The core instructional model for the school includes a blended learning model targeting at-risk students in a non-traditional, flexible environment focused on personalized education and graduation.⁴

The proposed high school will be organized under the existing non-profit entity of PIE-TN, and the PIE-TN Board of Directors will govern the school. The school will contract with the CMO Pathways Management Group (“PMG”) for a variety of services.⁵

¹ Pathways in Education Charter Application, pg. 1.

² Ibid, pg. 3.

³ Ibid, pg. 2-3.

⁴ Ibid, pg.1.

⁵ Ibid, pg. 46.



PIE-TN projects the school will have \$2,324,400 in revenue in Year 1 and \$2,317,860 in expenses in Year 1, resulting in a positive ending fund balance of \$31,190. In Year 5, the school projects to have \$2,660,269 in revenue and \$2,352,522 in expenses, resulting in a positive ending fund balance of \$1,120,696.⁶ The school assumes that 81% of the student population will qualify as Economically Disadvantaged and 10% of the student population will be students with disabilities.⁷

⁶ Pathways in Education Charter Application, Attachment P-Planning and Budget Worksheet.

⁷ Pathways in Education Charter Application, p. 3.



Summary of the Evaluation

The review committee recommends that the application for PIE-TN Hickory Hill be denied because the applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence in the academic, operations, financial, and portfolio review sections that the application met the required criteria of the rubric. The academic plan presented by the applicant lacked a clear, compelling mission, failed to outline a comprehensive staffing plan to serve all students, and did not articulate a clear plan to correct student or school underperformance.

The operations plan presented in the application was not aligned with the budget or information presented in the interview in numerous areas. The review committee found that the proposed governing board was overly reliant on the charter management organization and school leaders, and lacked general knowledge of the school's governance structure and vendors. The financial plan was misaligned with the written application and information presented in the interview, and the applicant group was wholly unable to provide answers to the review committee's budget questions, leaving the committee with significant doubts regarding the ability of the applicant to manage the financial operations of the proposed school.

In the portfolio review section, the application lacked clear, compelling evidence of successful student outcomes for each school in the network and evidence that the operator's schools are high performing and successful by state and national standards. Specifically, the applicant's current schools in Memphis were identified in the application as the lowest performing schools in the network. In 2015, PIE-TN Whitehaven had 100% of students scoring basic or below basic on the state's 2015 TCAP assessments, and both PIE-TN Whitehaven and PIE-TN Frayser had an overall TVAAS composite score of Level 1. Overall, the review committee could not determine that the applicant's track record was sufficient to justify replication in Tennessee.

Summary of Section Ratings

In accordance with the Tennessee Department of Education's charter application scoring rubric, "applications that do not meet or exceed standard in every area... will be deemed not ready for approval,"⁸ 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	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Financial Plan and Capacity	Does Not Meet Standard
Portfolio Review and Performance Record	Does Not Meet Standard

⁸ Tennessee Charter School Application – Evaluation Ratings and Sample Scoring Criteria, pg. 1.

Analysis of the Academic Plan Design and Capacity

Rating: Partially Meets Standard

Weaknesses Identified by the Committee:

The applicant's Academic Plan Design and Capacity partially meets standard because the applicant lacked a clear compelling mission, failed to outline a comprehensive staffing plan to serve all students, and could not articulate a clear plan to correct student or school underperformance. The mission for the proposed school as outlined in the application was unclear. Specifically, the review committee could not determine if the mission of the school was to serve students seeking credit recovery who then wished to return to their previous schools to graduate, or if the mission was to keep students and graduate them from PIE-TN. In the interview, board members' description of the mission conflicted with the description of the mission given by school leaders. Ultimately, the review committee found that the applicant lacked a clear, compelling mission and goals that provided a strategic vision for the school.

The review committee also found insufficient evidence of a comprehensive staffing plan geared toward serving all students. The written application predicts 300 students with a staff of only eight core teachers. At the interview, the applicant could not provide a detailed rationale for how a staff of eight teachers could effectively serve an at-risk population of 300 students, especially given that the school will target students who have traditionally found little success in the academic setting. In addition, the applicant's plan to have the same principal and director of instruction cover all three PIE-TN schools was especially concerning to the review committee given the struggles the two current schools are facing. In the interview, the applicant discussed the creation of an assistant principal position to provide additional oversight to the proposed school; however, the assistant principal position is not mentioned anywhere in the application or budget.

The review committee also found that the academic plan gave little consideration to special education or English language learner students. The applicant did not provide a clear plan to serve these students especially given the small size of the proposed staff. It was explained at the interview that the special education contractor discussed in the application would only provide consulting services rather than provide services directly to students. This conflicted with the information in the application, and the cost for these consulting services was not included in the budget. Overall, the plan presented by the applicant in the interview conflicted with the budget and written application, and therefore failed to outline a clear, viable plan to serve special education and English language learner students.

The application also failed to outline a clear plan to correct school and student underperformance. When asked at the interview to outline specific steps that would be taken should the proposed school begin to struggle, the applicant's board members were not able to give a detailed description of a corrective action plan or the plan that is currently in place to remediate the poor performance of their two current schools in Memphis. The applicant was also unable to articulate a clear plan to ensure that the proposed school will not encounter the same issues as their current schools. The applicant's responses during the interview demonstrated that they are still in the process of figuring out how to turnaround their current schools in Memphis. Given the poor performance of the current schools operated by the applicant, the review committee could not determine that the applicant is prepared to open a new school or that there is a well-defined corrective action plan in place should the proposed school begin to struggle.



Strengths Identified by the Committee:

While the Academic Plan Design and Capacity only partially meets the standard because of the weaknesses described above, the review committee did find evidence of strengths within the section. Specifically, the applicant outlined a number of established community partnerships, a comprehensive school calendar that aligned with the description of the academic plan in the application, and a comprehensive plan to ensure students meet Tennessee graduation requirements.

Analysis of the Operations Plan and Capacity

Rating: Partially Meets Standard

Weaknesses Identified by the Committee:

The applicant's Operations Plan and Capacity partially meets standard because the applicant failed to outline a plan that was aligned with the budget or information presented in the interview in numerous areas. During the interview, the proposed governing board appeared to be overly reliant on the management of PMG and school leaders to handle school operations. The proposed board members failed to demonstrate knowledge of the budget or vendor issues that were raised, demonstrated a lack of knowledge regarding the governance structure with PMG, and lacked the ability to articulate how the board is autonomous and capable of holding PMG accountable. The relationship between numerous proposed vendors and PMG was concerning to the review committee given that the vendors are affiliates of PMG's sole member, Education in Motion. The applicant also failed to outline a clear plan to add a required parent to the board despite acknowledging that this will be a challenge given the student population they plan to serve. Given these issues, the review committee could not find that the governance structure for the proposed school would provide meaningful oversight or that it would be free of conflicts.

The application also did not contain a robust and aligned staffing plan that would be conducive to the proposed school's success. The staffing plan presented in the application for the start-up year conflicted with the budget, and the applicant was unable to provide a clear description of its start-up year staffing plan at the interview. In addition, the applicant's plan to have the same principal and director of instruction cover all three PIE-TN schools was especially concerning to the review committee given the struggles the two current schools are facing. In the interview, the applicant discussed the creation of an assistant principal position to provide additional oversight to the proposed school, however, the assistant principal position is not mentioned anywhere in the application or budget. Additionally, the applicant provided conflicting information in the application and at the interview regarding the calculation of the CMO fee. The CMO agreement with PMG provided in the application outlines a monthly flat rate fee; however, during the interview the applicant stated that the CMO fee would be calculated on a per-student basis. The review committee found that the applicant failed to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the food service program, and no funds are allocated in the budget to support the program outlined in the application. At the interview, the applicant explained the food service program would be provided to the proposed school by Shelby County Schools free of cost; however, no documentation was provided to confirm this arrangement.

The applicant was also unable to articulate a compelling description of its organizational capacity to open and operate a successful third school in Tennessee. While the applicant was honest during the interview and in the application regarding the challenges it has faced with its current Memphis schools, the review committee did not find that the applicant provided any compelling reason to justify replication in Tennessee given the current issues.

Strengths Identified by the Committee:

While the Operations Plan and Capacity only partially meets the standard, the review committee did find evidence of strengths within the operations plan. Specifically, the applicant presented a sound facilities plan including the identification of three possible locations within the target area. Strengths of



the applicant's plan also included financing renovations via a loan from PMG, a plan for obtaining insurance, and proposed school leadership who have experience working with the target population.

Analysis of the Financial Plan and Capacity

Rating: Does Not Meet Standard

Weaknesses Identified by the Committee:

The Financial Plan and Capacity does not meet standard because the applicant's budget was misaligned with the application, contained internal inconsistencies, and the applicant was unable to resolve these issues during the capacity interview. During the interview the applicant group was wholly unable to provide answers to the review committee's budget questions, leaving the committee with significant doubts regarding the ability of the applicant to manage the financial operations of the proposed school. Specifically, the applicant's budget relies almost exclusively on BEP payments and uses a 4% inflation adjuster in BEP calculations although the budget assumption states that a 1.4% inflation adjuster was used. When asked during the interview to describe the reasoning for the discrepancy, the applicant was unable to provide a rationale.

Further, the applicant relied heavily on the budget surplus to pay for unforeseen costs such as the enrollment of a high needs special education student and fluctuations in funding. Without knowing if the applicant's BEP budget calculations were overstated as a result of the use of a 4% inflation adjuster, the review committee could not determine if the stated surplus would actually exist, and therefore, whether this was a viable contingency plan. Without more information regarding whether the correct inflation adjuster was used in budget calculations, the review committee could not find sufficient evidence that the applicant provided a complete, realistic, and viable start-up and five-year budget.

The review committee also found that the application, budget, and information presented during the interview did not align in numerous areas, especially with regard to the applicant's staffing projections during the start-up year. Specifically, the budget includes no expenses for personnel during the start-up year, while the staffing chart provided in the application reflects a full staff. The applicant could not provide a clear answer regarding the projected staff during the start-up year and mentioned during the interview the possibility of hiring an assistant principal, a position which is not included anywhere in the application or budget. Other areas of misalignment included the applicant's plan to provide food service, the calculation of the CMO fee, and the plan to contract with a third party for special education consulting services. In addition, the applicant's board members did not demonstrate any knowledge of the budget or budget oversight, leading the review committee to question the ability of the board to hold PMG accountable. Given these issues the review committee found insufficient evidence that the applicant's budget was complete, realistic, and viable, or that the applicant group could implement the financial plan.

Analysis of the Portfolio Review and Performance Record

Rating: Does Not Meet Standard

Weaknesses Identified by the Committee:

The Portfolio Review and Performance Record does not meet standard because there is a lack of clear, compelling evidence of successful student outcomes for each school in the network and evidence that the operator's schools are high performing and successful by state and national standards. Specifically, the applicant identified its current PIE-TN schools in Whitehaven and Frayser as its lowest performing schools in the network. Based on 2015 state accountability data, 100% of PIE-TN Whitehaven's students scored basic or below basic on the state's TCAP exams. PIE-TN Frayser's scores were only slightly better with 3.8% of students scoring proficient or advanced in 3-8 Math, 11.5% proficient or advanced in 3-8 Reading Language arts, 7.1% proficient or advanced in Algebra I, 11.5% proficient or advanced in English I, and 0.0% proficient or advanced in English II. Further, in 2015 both PIE-TN Whitehaven and PIE-TN Frayser had an overall TVAAS composite score of Level 1.

During the interview, the applicant explained some of the reasons why their current PIE-TN schools are struggling and discussed how they are working to address those issues. While the candor of the applicant during the interview was appreciated, the review committee felt that the applicant was still working to find a solution to its issues in Memphis, especially with regard to school culture. Further, while the applicant addressed what it is doing to remedy teacher and leader turnover issues, little was discussed regarding specific plans to increase student achievement at their current Tennessee schools.

While the applicant mentioned some bright spots in terms of its California, Illinois, and Louisiana schools, the review committee found that the overall data for the applicant's schools outside of Tennessee were not sufficient evidence of successful student outcomes. California CAASPP assessment data from 2015 shows between 4% and 10% of students meeting or exceeding standards in Math, between 22 and 41% meeting or exceeding standards for English Language Arts and between 25 and 38% of students meeting or exceeding the standard for Science. In addition, PIE's Caddo Parish Louisiana school received an F on the state's grading scale in 2015 with only 8% of students scoring proficient on state assessments as compared to 55% of students in the district and 62% of students in the state. The graduation rates provided for the applicant's California and Illinois schools show that only three out of seven schools demonstrated positive gains, while four schools showed a decrease in graduation rates from the previous year. Given these issues, the review committee could not find compelling evidence of student success by either state or national standards to warrant replication of the applicant's model in Tennessee.

The written application also outlined six pending lawsuits involving the PMG network and/or schools including a pending \$45.4 million judgment against some of the network's California schools. The review committee found the number and significance of pending lawsuits cause for concern regarding the network's future viability and strength of internal controls.



Evaluation Team

Meg Cummins oversees finance for the Individualized Education Account Program at the Tennessee Department of Education. Previously, she has worked in public accounting in Memphis, Tennessee. A native of Clinton, Mississippi, Meg earned a Bachelor's degree in accountancy and a Master's degree in taxation, both from the University of Mississippi.

Rascoe Dean is a recent graduate of Vanderbilt Law School and, beginning in September, a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney at the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Middle District of Tennessee. Previously, Rascoe served as a law clerk for Judge Gilbert S. Merritt on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and as a high school English teacher at East High School in Memphis, TN. Since leaving the classroom, Rascoe has remained passionate about ensuring that all students have the opportunity to receive a high quality education.

Kelly Love is a reading specialist who received her B.S. from University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) in 2001. She has a wide range of teaching experience that includes traditional, charter and private schools. She was a model teacher in the El Paso schools where she trained teachers in Reader's Workshop and Writer's Workshop as part of a district mandate. In 2007, she moved to the Nashville area and worked as a language arts teacher at LEAD Academy. She eventually became the reading specialist/coach to LEAD's middle school team. Mrs. Love is currently in her sixth year as an educator at Akiva School of Nashville.

Mary Cypress Metz serves as the Chief of Staff for the State Collaborative on Reforming Education (SCORE), where she coordinates the work across SCORE's programs and leads special projects for the organization. In her previous role as SCORE's Director of Outreach, she led the organization's efforts in outreach and engagement, coalition building, and advocacy. Before joining SCORE, Mary Cypress taught seventh-grade math as a Teach for America corps member in Nashville. Originally from Mississippi, she earned a bachelor's degree in journalism and history from the University of Alabama and her master's in education from Lipscomb University. Additionally, Mary Cypress serves as a board member of Intrepid College Prep Charter School in Nashville.

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.

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:	Pathways in Education – Tennessee
Sponsoring Organization:	Pathways in Education
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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
The vision is clearly stated.		1-3
Concerns/Questions		Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mission lacks measurable attributes. Goals are not listed in this section. 		1-3
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard

1.2 ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

Application Review

<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
--	---	---

Strengths	Page
------------------	-------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The description of community is clear. • The rationale is sound. 	4-5
---	-----

Concerns/Questions	Page
---------------------------	-------------

<p>The graduation table displayed is accurate for each school listed. However, the final row listing the averages of the schools is not sound. As each school has a different number of students, it is not a good practice to average the percentages together.</p> <p>How will the proposed school meet projected enrollment of 300? Neither of the current schools in our area, according the State Report Card, have that many students. (One only had 50.)</p>	4-5
---	-----

Interview (if applicable)

Strengths

--

Concerns/Questions

--

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview

<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
--	---	---

1.3 SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Application Review

Meets or Exceeds Standard

Partially Meets Standard

Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths

Page

Concerns/Questions

Page

- A summary of key design team participants, including specific roles and responsibilities is not included.
- A clear summary of how teachers, staff, administrators, parents, community stakeholders, and students participated in the design of the school is not addressed.

5

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

- The credit requirements are consistent with State Standards.
- Multiple models for instruction are available for students.
- RTI has been taken into account and plans are in place.

6-17

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

1.5 ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Application Review

Meets or Exceeds Standard

Partially Meets Standard

Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths

Page

- STAR goals are well thought out, meaningful and attainable. The growth percentile goals are strong.
- The STAR formative assessment will serve many purposes by providing feedback and identifying at risk students.
- The grading scale and promotion requirements are addressed.

17-21

Concerns/Questions

Page

The goal for only half the students to earn 6 credits per year may be realistic, but for most students, especially the students the proposed school targets, the students are already behind and this pace will not lead to on-time graduates.

The TCAP Passage goal needs to be worded differently – as students do not pass or fail the TCAP or now TN Ready.

The 1-year graduation rate of 60% for only those students who begin the year already in grade 12 seems very low. At other SCS schools this 1-year rate is 95% or higher. If a student is already in grade 12, then they should expect to graduate by the end of the year, as they are not behind. A 60% cohort graduation rate may be more realistic.

Even the long-term goal of 80% for the 1 year rate seems low. Other schools will exceed this by a large margin.

17-21

Interview (if applicable)

Strengths

Concerns/Questions

--

Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview

<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> 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

- Credits and electives are clearly listed.
- Online and non-traditional routes will likely help meet graduation requirements for at-risk students.

21-22

Concerns/Questions

Page

GPA, student readiness, entering workforce explanations are all listed in other sections but should have been addressed in this section.

21-22

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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates participation in state mandated assessment and details formal formative assessment structure and plan (STAR). • STAR reports will be used to evaluate progress for at-risk students – this type of formal formative assessment and screener can provide a great deal of information to a variety of stakeholders. 		22-24
Concerns/Questions		Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training is mentioned, but more detail is required. • A more defined schedule for principal, teacher and data team is needed. 		22-24
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> 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

The proposed school states that students may choose to attend either morning, afternoon or both. Unless all students plan to attend both the morning and afternoon blocks, no student will meet the State Board of Education's requirements for a full student day which is 6.5 hours for students in grades K-12 and 4 hours for adult learners.

24-25

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

There is a plan for identifying students and for the use of RTI2.

25-36

Concerns/Questions

Page

- More information is needed on the offering of a modified diploma for students with disabilities.
- How will the proposed school use the Alternate Performance Based Assessment (APBA) process for students with disabilities with a low EOC score who fails the course because of the average of the course grade and EOC score?

25-36

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

Concerns/Questions

Page

Attachment B refers the reviewer to Attachment D which simply lists a website address. The student discipline policy must be included as an attachment.

36-38
Attachment
B

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 plan includes a timeline and the enrollment policy.

38-41
Attachment
C

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

1.12 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARENT ENGAGEMENT

Application Review

Meets or Exceeds Standard

Partially Meets Standard

Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths

Page

Concerns/Questions

Page

The required student handbook is not included as an attachment. The applicant included a single page that refers the reviewer to a website.

41-44
Attachment
D

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

Concerns/Questions

Page

There is no description of the existing academic plan.

45

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

- An appropriate, well-defined corrective action plan if one school, student cohort, or entire network of schools falls below state and/or district academic achievement expectations is not outlined.
- Clear and concise contingency plans that describe in great detail how the organization will react in the event academic targets are not met, and how the organization will react to adversity through delayed or modified growth is not addressed.

45-48

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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths: The application outlined a clear vision, an academic focus and plan, and reflected the required high school graduation standards.</p> <p>Weaknesses/Questions: The application did not outline the CMO’s existing academic plan, provide an appropriate level of detail relating to school development, and will not meet the State Board minimum requirements for the school day.</p>		
Final Rating after Interview, if applicable		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths: The applicant clearly articulated their vision and the plans for the proposed school. The panel was well versed on the role of the sponsoring CMO.</p> <p>(If Any) Weaknesses: There was no clearly articulated description of the board’s function related to academic accountability outside of financial oversight.</p> <p>The CMO’s growth plan is aggressive and past performance of the existing ASD schools is a concern as current schools have level 1 TVAAS after one year of performance; given this, we do not believe this applicant has yet demonstrated the capacity to take on additional schools at this time.</p>		
AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths: The mission was expanded and includes specific activities that can be measured. An overview of the goals from section 1.5 was provided. The proposed school plans to locate in Hickory Hill. Their current schools are in Frayser and Whitehaven, so the feeder schools for the three (3) schools will not be the same, hopefully ensuring an enrollment of close to capacity. Additional information on professional development and promoting data driven instruction is included. The proposed school will offer the Alternate Performance Based Assessment (APBA) and a modified diploma for special needs students. The student handbook has been added to the attachment section.</p> <p>(If Any) Weaknesses: The involvement of parents, students and community stakeholders in the development of the school is lacking. Only two (2) people were named as part of the design team. Current families served by PIE – TN were given an opportunity to share their experiences with prospective families but their authentic inclusion in the design process was not outlined. The pace of earning of 5.5 credits for 50% of students (if they are behind) in year one will not lead to on-time graduation. According to the sample student schedules in section 1.8, the applicant appears to be proposing a high school and an adult high school combination that includes very little on site class time. Most of the daily schedules include hours of independent academic work without assignment to a specific course. Specific corrective actions for schools falling below state and/or district academic achievement expectations is not adequately addressed.</p>		

SECTION 2 OPERATIONS PLAN AND CAPACITY

2.1 GOVERNANCE		
Application Review		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
The governance structure is well outlined and the required attachments are complete and detailed.		49-51
Concerns/ Questions		Page
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard

2.2 START-UP PLAN		
Application Review		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
The plan includes a timeline and a description of the activities that would need to occur before the opening of the proposed school.		52-54
Concerns/Questions		Page
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard

2.3 FACILITIES		
Application Review		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
Several facility options were included and the needs were clear and outlined.		54-56
Concerns/Questions		Page
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard

2.4 PERSONNEL/ HUMAN CAPITAL		
Application Review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
Concerns/Questions		Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How and when will the pre-employment process confirm that candidates hold the appropriate teacher licensure and demonstrate highly qualified status? • Despite discussion of retention strategies, evidence was not shown of steps to be taken should unsatisfactory leadership/teacher performance and turnover occur. 		56-59
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard

2.5 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Application Review

Meets or Exceeds Standard

Partially Meets Standard

Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths

Page

Concerns/Questions

Page

The plan did not contain the required detail for professional development activities.

60-61

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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
Concerns/Questions		Page
<p>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.</p>		61-62
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard

2.7 TRANSPORTATION – IF APPLICABLE		
Application Review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
Concerns/Questions		Page
<p>The plan contains conflicting information. The application states they will not provide transportation in the initial year but then mentions that bus passes will be given to students. A thorough and detailed plan is required.</p>		62
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard

2.8 FOOD SERVICE		
Application Review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
Concerns/Questions		Page
The proposed school does not plan to offer food service. This is not acceptable for students in grades 9-12.		62
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

Concerns/Questions

Page

The plan for school health and school nursing is insufficient. The required information was not addressed.

62-63

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		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
Concerns/Questions		Page
The waivers for school nurse and school meals will not be approved.		63-72
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

- The plan does not include the required projected enrollments for each of the planned growth sites. The application stated they plan to open 5 facilities in Shelby County but list new school sites in 6 zip codes where they plan to open schools. The language is very unclear in this section.
- Strong, compelling evidence of organizational capacity to open and operate high quality schools in Tennessee and elsewhere, including specific timelines for building organizational capacity, is not presented.
- The required attachment M – a comprehensive and complete annual report for the network and the individual schools was not included. The applicant submitted a copy of the annual financial audit only.

72-73

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

Concerns/Questions

Page

A clear, compelling network strategy that includes any shared or centralized support services, along with their costs, across the network is not adequately addressed.

73-76

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 network governance structure is outlined and the by-laws are attached.

76-77

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

2.14 CHARTER SCHOOL MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS (IF APPLICABLE; FOR EXISTING OPERATORS)

Application Review

Meets or Exceeds Standard

Partially Meets Standard

Does Not Meet Standard

Strengths

Page

The CMO contract is attached.

Attachment
L and O

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

Concerns/Questions

Page

The required staffing chart does not include the projections for the entire network. The projections are for one school only.

77-78

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

Concerns/Questions

Page

The plan does not sufficiently address the required elements of this section.

78-79

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 2 OPERATIONS PLAN AND CAPACITY

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Summary Rating for Entire Operations Plan and Capacity		
Initial Application Review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>The operations section includes a strong plan for the governance of the proposed charter school, including a detailed contract with the CMO.</p> <p>Weaknesses/Questions:</p> <p>The overall operations plan is insufficient and lacks critical detail in most of the required sections.</p>		
Final Rating after Interview, if applicable		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>(If Any) Weaknesses:</p>		
AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant clarified when a potential employee’s credentials will be verified. Professional development activities are detailed. A letter detailing the insurance coverage has been added. The transportation plan has been described and added to the budget. The proposed school will provide nursing services. The applicant clarified the growth plan (if demand aligns with projections) to include four (4) sites – one in 2018; one in 2019; one in 2020 and one in 2021. The network staffing plan has been updated. Details describing the responsibilities of school staff have been added.</p> <p>(If Any) Weaknesses:</p> <p>A discussion of the steps to be taken should unsatisfactory leadership/teacher performance occur is not included. The plan for providing breakfast and lunch remains unclear. The capacity to open the proposed school much less four (4) additional sites while working on improving student achievement in their existing schools is not adequately explained.</p>		

SECTION 3 FINANCIAL PLAN AND CAPACITY

3.1 & 3.2 CHARTER SCHOOL FINANCING		
Application Review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
<p>The proposed school will be able to participate in shared expenses via the network.</p>		Budget and Narrative
Concerns/Questions		Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Net assets are not showing a positive position. The liabilities exceed the assets and there are negative operating activities. A contingency plan if the school does not meet enrollment and/or obtain philanthropic funds should be considered. 		Budget and Narrative
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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

The network audit showed over 9 litigations, some of which threaten to cause insolvency.

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

SECTION 3 FINANCIAL PLAN AND CAPACITY

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Summary Rating for Entire Financial Plan and Capacity Section		
Initial Application Review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Support from the management group would be helpful to the proposed school.</p> <p>Weaknesses/Questions:</p> <p>The issues with the pending litigation, net position and contingency plan do not make for a strong financial plan.</p>		
Final Rating after Interview, if applicable		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>(If Any) Weaknesses:</p>		
AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>(If Any) Weaknesses:</p> <p>The issues with pending litigation, net position and contingency plans are not adequately addressed.</p>		

SECTION 4 PORTFOLIO REVIEW/PERFORMANCE RECORD

4.1 PAST PERFORMANCE (FOR EXISTING OPERATORS)		
Application Review		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
Strengths		Page
<p>The Options for Youth Schools in California show results better than the state in all but one school for 2014-15.</p>		Attachment U
Concerns/Questions		Page
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is pending litigation that may result in negative outcomes. The application states that the results for the PIE-TN school is unacceptable and the reasons cited are staffing and student make up. 		81-83
Interview (if applicable)		
Strengths		
Concerns/Questions		
Final Rating—Initial Application Review & Capacity Interview		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
AMENDED APPLICATION REVIEW		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>(If Any) Weaknesses:</p> <p>The pending litigation that may result in negative outcomes is problematic.</p>		

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below Standard
---	--	--	--

Strengths

Concerns/Questions

The organization's aggressive growth plan and below performance expectations at one of their existing ASD schools do not meet the capacity requirements of SCS.

After Capacity Interview (if applicable)

<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below Standard
---	--	--	--

Interview Notes

Revised Analysis

Amended Application

<input type="checkbox"/> Meets or Exceeds Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Meets Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below Standard
---	--	--	--

Changes to the Original Application

Revised Analysis

The organization's aggressive growth plan and below performance expectations at one of their existing ASD schools do not meet the capacity requirements of SCS.