



Executive Director's Recommendation Trimble Academy Appeal

Pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated ("T.C.A.") § 49-13-108, sponsors proposing to open a new charter school may appeal the denial of its amended application by a local board of education to the Tennessee Public Charter School Commission ("Commission"). On July 13, 2026, the sponsor of Trimble Academy ("sponsor" or "Trimble Forward Alliance") appealed the denial of its amended application by the Dyer County Schools ("DCS") Board of Education to the Commission.

Based on the procedural history, findings of fact, analysis, and Review Committee Recommendation Report, attached hereto, I believe that the decision to deny the Trimble Academy amended application was not contrary to the best interests of the students, local education agency ("LEA"), or community.¹ Therefore, I recommend that the Commission uphold the decision of Dyer County Schools Board of Education to deny the amended application for Trimble Academy.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Pursuant to T.C.A. § 49-13-108 and Commission Policy 2.000, Commission staff and an independent charter application review committee conducted a de novo, on the record review of the Trimble Academy amended application. In accordance with the Tennessee State Board of Education's Charter School Application Scoring Rubric ("rubric"), for an application to be deemed ready for approval, the summary rating for each of the major sections must meet the standard. In addition, the Commission is required to hold a public hearing in the district where the proposed charter school seeks to locate.²

In order to overturn the decision of the local board of education, the Commission must find that the application meets or exceeds the metrics outlined in the scoring rubric and that approval of the amended charter application is in the best interests of the students, local education agency, or community.³ If the local board of education's decision is appealed, then the Commission can approve the application, and thereby authorize the school, or can affirm the

¹ T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

² T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

³ T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

local board's decision to deny.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On December 2, 2025, the sponsor submitted a letter of intent to Dyer County Schools expressing its intention to file a charter school application.
2. The sponsor submitted its initial application for Trimble Academy to DCS on January 30, 2026.
3. DCS assembled a review committee to review and score the Trimble Academy initial application.
4. On March 12, 2026, the DCS Review Committee conducted a capacity interview with representatives of Trimble Academy.
5. The DCS Review Committee reviewed and scored the Trimble Academy initial application, indicating significant gaps in clarity regarding alignment and design in the academic program design and capacity, a lack of a viable facility plan, and a budget that does not demonstrate financial responsibility in a sustainable manner.
6. On April 14, 2026, the DCS Board of Education voted to deny the Trimble Academy's initial application.
7. The sponsor amended and resubmitted its application for Trimble Academy to DCS on May 18, 2026.
8. The DCS Review Committee reviewed and scored the Trimble Academy amended application based on the scoring rubric and rated the academic section as partially meets the standard and the operations and finance sections as does not meet the standard.
9. On July 7, 2026, the DCS Board of Education voted to deny the amended application of Trimble Academy.
10. The sponsor appealed the denial of the Trimble Academy amended application in writing to the Commission on July 13, 2026, including submission of all required documents per Commission Policy 2.000.
11. The Commission's Review Committee independently analyzed and scored the Trimble Academy amended application using the state's scoring rubric.
12. The Commission's Review Committee conducted a capacity interview with key members of the Trimble Academy leadership team on August 24, 2026, via Microsoft Teams.
13. After the capacity interview, the Commission's Review Committee determined a final consensus rating of the Trimble Academy amended application, which served as the basis

for the Review Committee Recommendation Report, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

14. On August 31, 2026, the Commission staff held a public hearing at DCS Board of Education in Dyersburg, Tennessee. At the public hearing, the Executive Director, sitting as the Commission's designee, heard presentations from the sponsor and DCS and received public comment regarding the Trimble Academy amended application.
15. The Commission staff conducted a full review of the record, which includes the initial and amended applications submitted by the sponsor, documentation submitted by DCS, and the findings of the public hearing and public comment. The Commission's General Counsel conducted a full review and legal analysis of the record.

FINDINGS OF FACT

District Denial of Initial Application

The Review Committee assembled by DCS to review and score the Trimble Academy initial application consisted of the following individuals:

Name	Title
Laura Burroughs	Supervisor, Dyer County Schools
Chuck Cagle	Attorney, Lewis Thomason
Jim Cheatham	Community Member, Universal Contractors
Amy Hester	Supervisor, Dyer County Schools
Stephanie Johnson	Supervisor, Dyer County Schools
Cheryl Mathis	Director, Dyer County Schools
Rena McKnight	Community Member, Retired Supervisor, Dyer County Schools
Wendy Smith	CFO, Dyer County Schools
Angie Stafford	Supervisor, Dyer County Schools
Carolyn Tyler	Supervisor, Dyer County Schools

The Trimble Academy initial application received the following ratings from the DCS Review Committee:

Sections	Ratings
Educational Program Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Does Not Meet Standard
Budget and Finance	Partially Meets Standard
Addenda	Does Not Meet Standard

After the DCS Review Committee completed its review and scoring of the initial application, its analysis was presented to the DCS Board of Education on April 14, 2026. The DCS

Board of Education voted to deny the initial application of Trimble Academy.

District Denial of Amended Application

The Review Committee assembled by DCS to review and score the Trimble Academy amended application mirrored that of the review committee that reviewed the initial application. Upon resubmission, the DCS Review Committee conducted a review of the amended application, and the amended application received the following ratings from the DCS Review Committee:

Sections	Ratings
Educational Program Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Does Not Meet Standard
Budget and Finance	Does Not Meet Standard

After the DCS Review Committee completed its review and scoring of the amended application, its analysis was presented to the DCS Board of Education on July 7, 2026. At the July 7, 2026, board meeting, the DCS Board of Education voted to deny the amended application of Trimble Academy.

Commission Review Committee's Evaluation of the Application

Following the denial of the Trimble Academy amended application and subsequent appeal to the Commission, Commission staff assembled a diverse review committee of internal and external experts to independently evaluate and score the Trimble Academy amended application. This Review Committee consisted of the following individuals:

Name	Title
Katie Bridges	Commission Staff
Beth Elpers	Commission Staff
Autumn Hillis	External Consultant
Grant Monda	External Consultant
Maggie Stampley	Commission Staff

The Commission's Review Committee conducted an initial review and scoring of the Trimble Academy 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 committee's consensus rating of the Trimble Academy application was as follows:

Sections	Ratings
Educational Program Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard

Sections	Ratings
Budget and Finance	Does Not Meet Standard

The Review Committee recommends the denial of the amended application for Trimble Academy because the applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence in the academic, operational, and financial sections to demonstrate the application meets the required criteria of the rubric.

The applicant's Educational Program Design and Capacity partially meets the standard due to significant gaps in academic model coherence, special populations compliance, curriculum and assessment readiness, and staffing viability. Trimble Forward Alliance presents a compelling mission rooted in classical and nature-based learning; however, the application and capacity interview lacked evidence that the model could be implemented with fidelity. Specifically, the team did not clearly explain how daily instruction would integrate with outdoor learning, how multi-tiered interventions would comply with Response to Instruction and Intervention ("RTI²") requirements, or how special education and English learner services would be delivered in compliance with federal and state law. Furthermore, the applicant's staffing model relies on non-certified volunteers and unsupported assumptions that the school's outdoor setting alone would serve as an accommodation to meet student needs, failing to provide a realistic or legally compliant plan for students with disabilities. Finally, the board's reliance on distant, external consultants to explain core academic programming underscores that the applicant does not yet possess the internal academic capacity required to launch and sustain a high-quality charter school.

The applicant's Operations Plan and Capacity partially meets the standard due to significant gaps in governance, staffing, facilities, and operational readiness. Governance structures and reporting lines remain unclear, with substantial responsibilities concentrated on a single school leader. The plan also relies heavily on external mentors, with no formal agreements or implementation plans. Key systems, including staffing, transportation, food service, and facility readiness, remain underdeveloped. Additionally, renovation costs, architectural plans, safety approvals, and financing strategies are incomplete. Collectively, these gaps raise concerns about the applicant's capacity to effectively open and operate the proposed school.

The applicant's Budget and Finance does not meet the standard due to an unsustainable financial model, omitted expenses, and unverified funding. The budget relies on a \$750,000 Charter Schools Program ("CSP") grant that was not received, resulting in a pre-opening deficit exceeding \$300,000. It also omits significant costs for transportation, facilities, food service, instructional materials, and technology while relying heavily on part-time staff and volunteer

labor. Limited projected surpluses offer little protection against fluctuations in enrollment or funding. Overall, the submitted budget and capacity interview responses do not demonstrate a viable or sustainable financial plan.

For the aforementioned reasons, the Review Committee found that the sponsor did not meet or exceed the standard for approval based on the state board's scoring rubric.

For additional information regarding the Review Committee's evaluation of the Trimble Academy amended application, please see **Exhibit A** for the complete Review Committee Recommendation Report, which is fully incorporated herein by reference.

Public Hearing

Pursuant to statute⁴ and Commission Policy 2.000, a public hearing chaired by the Executive Director was held on August 31, 2026. Representatives from Dyer County Schools focused on the quality of its application review process, the support provided to the applicant, and the primary reasons for denying the amended application. Urging the Commission to uphold the local board's decision, DCS framed the application as fundamentally unviable and unsafe, noting that the proposal relies entirely on a single historical property, the former Trimble Elementary School, built in 1934. DCS presented evidence that the facility was closed due to advanced structural deterioration, with the building having outdated wooden support systems rather than modern steel beams. The district stated that, historically, the building was the district's most expensive to maintain, incurring over \$500,000 in repair costs over a five-year period. District officials stated that the structure was so compromised that heavy loads could not be safely rolled across the flooring, posing undeniable safety hazards for young children. Furthermore, DCS emphasized that the property is currently the subject of active litigation between the school district and the Town of Trimble regarding building maintenance obligations.

Beyond structural hazards, DCS highlighted significant operational and statutory deficiencies. The district noted that the building contains unaddressed asbestos, the remediation costs of which were entirely omitted from the sponsor's operating budget. Operationally, DCS pointed out that the applicant lacked finalized agreements for student transportation and food services, noting that the district had formally declined a partnership, and the sponsor had not budgeted realistic amounts to cover ongoing facility and maintenance expenses. Finally, the district detailed broader rubric deficiencies identified by its review committee, including unapproved core curriculum materials, the conflation of Tier II/III

⁴ T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

intervention resources with Tier I core instruction, and an understaffed special education framework relying on only two assistants across seven grade levels.

In the sponsor's opening statement, Trimble Academy's board chair countered the district's statements by presenting Trimble Academy as a vital civic anchor designed to restore educational choice for approximately 150 students, displaced by Trimble Elementary's abrupt closure. The sponsor then outlined the academic model, which pairs traditional classical education with immersive outdoor learning across an eleven-acre campus. Addressing facility concerns directly, the sponsor shared that independent engineering reports did not categorize the building as in imminent danger of collapse or as uninhabitable, noting that it had functioned as an active public school just a year prior. The sponsor projected manageable renovation costs ranging between \$130,000 and \$150,000 (with \$200,000 budgeted). Additionally, the sponsor stated it anticipated monthly lease or loan obligations under \$5,000 and identified two local churches as viable temporary contingency sites. Regarding operational services, the sponsor reported advanced discussions with a Memphis-based food service vendor willing to supply necessary kitchen equipment and personnel, as well as a regional bus provider operating out of Chattanooga and Memphis. Finally, the sponsor clarified that all core academic teachers would hold active Tennessee educator licenses, and the statutory waiver requests were restricted to elective disciplines or candidates completing clinical practice.

During questioning by the Commission, DCS was asked to elaborate on the operational history of the closed facility, how the local community was engaged prior to the school's closure, building access during the application window, out-of-district policies, and the training of its review committee. The district explained that Trimble Elementary was closed due to accelerated structural building deterioration as part of a broader consolidation initiative for operational efficiency. Officials noted the transition was executed swiftly to secure student seats without direct prior community consultation, though public comment was permitted during the final board meeting. In response to the applicant's statement that building access was restricted, DCS clarified that the sponsor did not formally request access until May 2026, after which keys were promptly provided on May 29, 2026. Regarding out-of-district enrollment under T.C.A. § 49-6-3003, DCS confirmed that it currently accepts out-of-county students without charging tuition, subject to capacity and behavior, but noted that students may be returned to their home districts if local space becomes constrained. When questioned about the review committee's qualifications, DCS confirmed that its evaluators possessed 179 combined years of education and supervisory experience, including instructional supervisors, an engineer, and a certified financial officer, but candidly acknowledged that none of the committee members possessed prior experience in charter school authorization, operations, or governance.

The Commission then questioned the sponsor regarding its financial solvency, enrollment

projections, facilities readiness, and governance structure. The primary point of questioning centered on the immediate financial standing caused by the denial of the sponsor's federal CSP grant on June 1, 2026. Because the submitted operating budget and pre-opening cash flow model relied entirely on the anticipated \$750,000 CSP grant, the denial created an immediate, unaddressed funding deficit. Although the Tennessee Department of Education issued formal notification of the CSP denial on June 1, 2026, the sponsor stated during the hearing that they were still unaware that a final determination had been made. Nonetheless, the sponsor outlined a revised Year 0 budget reduced to \$475,000. This reduction relied on deep cuts to administrative onboarding, technology infrastructure, equipment, and furniture, alongside utilizing used or donated items and delaying seventh through eighth grade purchases. With local philanthropic fundraising yielding between \$114,000 and \$147,000, a verified pre-opening funding gap of over \$300,000 remained. When pressed on how this deficit would be bridged, the sponsor stated that if additional philanthropic grants or commercial credit could not be secured, the school would lack the capital to open and would be forced to request a formal postponement from the Commission. When questioned about facilities and contingency plans, the sponsor confirmed that, although no binding lease or transfer contract exists, the Town of Trimble passed a supportive resolution allowing the school to use the former elementary building. If the property remains inaccessible due to pending litigation, the sponsor identified two local church facilities, including Trimble Baptist Church, as temporary contingency locations.

Additional questioning addressed out-of-district enrollment projections and structural capacity. The sponsor noted that out-of-district students from Gibson and Obion counties are projected to comprise roughly 10% of total enrollment, operating under current district policies where no tuition is charged. To mitigate potential enrollment under-performance, the sponsor proposed utilizing multi-grade split classrooms (such as kindergarten and first grade combinations) as an operational staffing contingency. When questioned about complex organizational lines, the sponsor explained that the Trimble Forward Alliance was established to spearhead broader community and economic revitalization, while the Commission emphasized that legal accountability must remain squarely with the single governing board holding the charter agreement. Regarding special populations and federal compliance, the sponsor maintained that the outdoor learning model serves as an inherent accommodation for conditions like Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder ("ADHD"), though statements during the hearing indicated the school would operate as a standard education setting with accommodations rather than providing a full Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA") compliant continuum of placements.

The public hearing concluded with closing statements by both parties and the receipt of twelve in-person comments, with two speaking in support of DCS and ten speaking in support of

Trimble Academy. The Commission also accepted written comments, and the Commission received 170 written comments, with two writing in support of DCS and 168 writing in support of Trimble Academy.

Analysis

State law requires the Commission to review the decision of the local board of education and determine if the application “meets or exceeds the metrics outlined in the Tennessee State Board of Education’s application-scoring rubric and,” whether “approval of the application is in the best interests of the students, LEA, or community.”⁵ In addition, pursuant to T.C.A. § 49-13-108, the Commission adopted the State Board of Education’s Quality Charter Authorizing Standards set forth in State Board Policy 6.111 and utilizes these standards to review charter applications received upon appeal. In making my recommendation to the Commission, I have considered the Review Committee’s Recommendation Report, the documentation submitted by both the sponsor and DCS, the arguments made by both parties at the public hearing, and the public comments received by Commission staff, and conclude as follows:

The Review Committee’s report and recommendations are thorough, citing specific examples in the application and referencing information gained during the capacity interview to support its findings. For the reasons explained in the report, I agree that the Trimble Academy amended application did not rise to the level of meeting the standards required for approval.

There is a clear vision from the sponsor to create a charter school in Trimble to replace the school closed by Dyer County Schools. The record contains significant evidence of community involvement and the sponsor responding to a need within Trimble. I applaud the community’s efforts to put this application forward and their passion for bringing a school back to Trimble. However, the educational, operational, and financial plans contain significant gaps that must be addressed before the application is ready for approval.

First, the sponsor selected an academic model, nature-based classical education, which is currently being implemented by charter schools in Hamilton County, but the educational plan contained significant gaps in the implementation of this model at Trimble Academy. The sponsor, both in the application and the capacity interview, relies heavily on the expertise of an external consultant to implement the school model with fidelity. While I acknowledge the work of Skillern Elementary and Tennessee Classical Academies in Hamilton County, significant questions remain about who will implement the proposed model and how it will be implemented with fidelity in Trimble. There is no established contract or agreement between the

⁵ T.C.A. § 49-13-108.

external consultant and the governing board delineating the roles and responsibilities of the two parties. This is particularly concerning given the significant reliance on the external consultant for the educational plan. Most day-to-day implementation questions in the capacity interview were answered by the external consultant, providing little evidence that the governing board can implement the proposed plan without the consultant.

The application lacks evidence of a compliant plan to serve special populations and to implement a robust, ongoing assessment and intervention plan. The plan to serve special populations, including students with disabilities and English learners, was non-compliant with state and federal regulations. This applicant's plan is underdeveloped and includes reliance on volunteers. While I appreciated the acknowledgment in the capacity interview of the need to hire additional staff to provide support and services, this is not accounted for in the budget. Specifically, the proposed staffing model for special populations is legally and operationally inadequate. Budgeting only one full-time equivalent ("FTE") special education teacher across seven grade levels cannot support compliance and caseload management for the projected student population. Furthermore, by suggesting that the outdoor classical setting would constitute an inherent accommodation and that parents should determine whether the school is an appropriate fit, the applicant demonstrates a concerning misunderstanding of federal obligations under IDEA to provide a full continuum of alternative placements and to maintain open-enrollment access for all students. During the capacity interview, the sponsor was asked about the assessment plan, and, while several potential options were listed, none were mentioned in the application or included in the budget. Moreover, the intervention plan is non-compliant with state regulations, and the math intervention plan is completely omitted from the application. These plans are foundational to a school's success, yet they remain underdeveloped.

There is evidence that students within the community will enroll in the school, but there are insufficient contingencies in place to implement the academic model with fidelity at lower enrollment levels. In the capacity interview, the applicant discussed combining grades if enrollment is lower, which raises questions about how teachers will meet multiple grade-level standards at once. Since the sponsor proposes a smaller school model to mirror the original Trimble Elementary, this size leaves the school highly vulnerable to enrollment shifts.

In totality, I agree that the educational plan partially meets the standard for approval. While I support the community's efforts, significant gaps remain that must be addressed before the educational plan meets the standard for approval.

Operationally, I agree with the Review Committee that Trimble Academy partially meets the standard for approval. While the sponsor has identified a potential site with deep historical

significance to the community, it has not demonstrated a viable, legally secure, or safe facility plan. Having identified the former Trimble Elementary, the sponsor benefits from its familiarity within the proposed community. As evidenced in the record, the town mayor and other elected officials have indicated that the applicant may use the former Trimble Elementary, with the sponsor assuming financial responsibility for renovations. However, the property remains subject of active litigation, and the facility agreement with the town is still in development, so there is insufficient evidence to determine that the school could financially support the renovations or ongoing costs. There is little evidence that the sponsor has both the timeline and the budget to complete the necessary renovations before Fall 2027. Further, the sponsor failed to evidence how the intended facility would accommodate, or be adjusted to accommodate, the outdoor learning environment.

Throughout the record, significant gaps remain regarding the proposed governing board's and the school leader's capacity to operate a charter school. The individuals identified as prospective board members show a strong commitment and varied expertise that will be vital to the governance and oversight of the school. The strongest boards are those fully committed to the success of the students and the school as an institution and business. However, the organizational chart surrounding the leadership team is confusing. Specifically, there is no clarity in the hierarchy regarding Trimble Forward Alliance, the Trimble Academy School Board Committee, and the school leadership. The Commission's legal relationship is with the governing board of a charter school, and it is imperative that it be clear to all parties who are responsible for the obligations set forth in the charter agreement. The proposed chair, who showed great passion and capability as a board leader throughout the appeal, identified aspirations during the capacity interview for the board and/or Trimble Forward Alliance that extend beyond the Trimble Academy charter school. While these ambitions are admirable and demonstrate a clear dedication to the success of Trimble Academy, the application lacks a strong, well-defined proposed governance structure for the school.

The sponsor's staffing plan is also severely lacking in readiness. In both the application and the capacity interview, the sponsor mentioned using volunteers in a variety of positions, including teaching core content and providing special education services. Beyond best practices concerns, this plan is prohibited by state and federal law. All teachers must be licensed and properly endorsed. During the capacity interview, the applicant stated that they planned to hire licensed staff rather than volunteers; however, this plan is not supported by the school's budget. The school's plan for operations, including staff hiring and professional development, also relies on the external consultant's expertise. This relationship is imperative for the board to successfully implement such an academic model. However, without any signed or proposed agreements, fee structures, or memoranda of understanding ("MOUs"), it is difficult to

determine the specific role the external consultant will play in the school's pre-opening and operations.

The named concerns about the sponsor's academic and operations plans are in addition to the large fiscal concerns. The school received notification that it was not awarded the CSP grant. This fact necessitated that all applicants adjust their budgets in response to the significant decrease in anticipated funds. In the amended application, the entirety of Trimble Academy's Year 0 and a significant portion of the Year 1 budgets were sourced from the CSP grant. In the application, the sponsor states that the school cannot open without the CSP grant. While the applicant demonstrated ongoing progress toward securing local contributions for its Year 0 expenses, including fundraising and financing, a significant financial gap remains. Within the written comments and the public hearing, the sponsor stated a plan potentially to cover this shortfall through financing. This remains speculative, and any debt service requirements are not supported within the budget.

Moreover, the financial plan does not meet the standard with or without the CSP grant. The proposed budget is exceptionally tight, leaving no cushion for enrollment fluctuations. Additionally, key line items in the budget such as staff salaries, instructional materials, assessments, food service, transportation, and facility renovations are either understated or omitted completely. While I appreciate the sponsor's continued efforts to perfect its plan including exploring vendors for food service and transportation and hiring licensed teachers over volunteers, none of this is reflected in the budget. These items would quickly overwhelm the budget as it stands.

In both the capacity interview and the public hearing, the sponsor asked for a chance to try to open the school and stated that the governing board would request a delay if the financing and philanthropic dollars did not materialize. However, an authorizer cannot approve applications on hopes, contingencies, or a plan to delay.

I am encouraged that rural counties are embracing the prospect of school choice. Charter schools are public schools, and the circumstances in Trimble could create an environment that benefits from a high-quality charter option. However, it is the responsibility of authorizers to ensure that any public charter school application approved has a strong likelihood of success. Unfortunately, the application does not yet meet the standard for approval. As outlined in my recommendation, there are significant gaps in the application that must be filled, clarified, and corrected. Based on the amended application and the entirety of the record, I cannot recommend approval at this time.

Any authorized public charter school is entrusted with the great responsibility of educating students and a significant amount of public funds. For these reasons, the Commission



expects that only those schools that have demonstrated a high likelihood of success and meet or exceed the required criteria in all areas will be authorized.

For the reasons expounded on in this report, I recommend that the Commission deny the Trimble Academy amended application.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, and for the reasons stated in the Review Committee Recommendation Report attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, I do not believe that the decision to deny the amended application for Trimble Academy was contrary to the best interests of the students, the LEA, or community. Therefore, I recommend that the Commission affirm the decision of the DCS Board of Education to deny the amended application for Trimble Academy.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tess Stovall". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Tess Stovall, Executive Director
Tennessee Public Charter School Commission

October 8, 2026
Date



EXHIBIT A:
Charter Application Review Committee Recommendation Report

October 8, 2026

School Name: Trimble Academy

Sponsor: Trimble Forward Alliance

Proposed Location of School: Dyer County Schools

Evaluation Team:

- Katie Bridges
- Beth Elpers
- Autumn Hillis
- Grant Monda
- Maggie Stampley



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 sponsor of a public charter school to appeal the denial of an application by the local board of education to the Tennessee Public Charter School Commission (“Commission”). In accordance with T.C.A. § 49-13-108, the Commission shall conduct a de novo, on the record review of the proposed charter school’s application, and the Commission has adopted national and state quality authorizing standards to guide its work. As laid out in Commission Policy 3.000 – Core Authorizing Principles,¹ the Commission is committed to implementing these authorizing standards that are aligned with the core principles of charter school authorizing, including setting high standards for the approval of charter schools in its portfolio.

In accordance with T.C.A. § 49-13-108, the Commission adopted Commission Policy 2.000 – Charter School Appeals. The Commission has outlined the charter school appeal process to ensure the well-being and interests of students are the fundamental value informing all Commission actions and decisions. The Commission publishes clear timelines and expectations for applicants, engages highly competent teams of internal and external evaluators to review all applications, and maintains rigorous criteria for approval of a charter school. In addition, the Commission plans to evaluate its work annually to ensure its alignment to national and state standards for quality authorizing and implements improvement when necessary.

The Commission’s charter application review process is outlined in T.C.A. § 49-13-108, Commission Policy 2.000 – Charter School Appeals, and Commission Policy 2.100 – Application Review. The Commission assembled a charter application review committee comprised of highly qualified internal and external evaluators with relevant and diverse expertise to evaluate each application. The Commission provided training to all committee members to ensure consistent standards and fair treatment of all applications.

Overview of the Evaluation Process

The Commission’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

¹ All [Commission rules and policies](#) may be found on the [Commission's website](#).

three sections of the application: Educational Program Design and Capacity, Operations Design and Capacity, and Budget and Finance.

2. **Capacity Interview:** Based on the independent and collective review of the application, the Review Committee conducted a ninety-minute interview with the sponsor, members of the governing board, and identified school leadership 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.
2. **Summary of the Evaluation:** A brief summary of the overall recommendation for the application.
3. **Analysis of each section of the application:** An analysis of the major sections of the application and the capacity of the team to execute the plan as described in the application.
 - a. **Educational Program Design and Capacity:** School overview; school mission and model; anticipated student population; family and community engagement and support; school culture and discipline; curriculum and instruction; special populations; student assessment and evaluation; educational program capacity; and the capacity to implement the proposed plan.
 - b. **Operations Plan and Capacity:** Governance; staffing; facilities; transportation; health and safety; insurance; food service; start-up plan; operations capacity; and the capacity to implement the proposed plan.
 - c. **Budget and Finance:** planning and budget worksheet; operating budget; budget and finance capacity; and the capacity to implement the proposed plan.

The Commission's charter application Review Committee utilized the Tennessee State Board of Education's Charter School Application Scoring Rubric ("rubric"), which is used by all local boards of education when evaluating an application. The rubric states that authorizers should adopt the State Board of Education's ("SBE") Quality Authorizing Standards, which establishes rigorous decision-making criteria. Specifically, SBE Policy 6.111 states a "quality

authorizer requires all applicants to present a clear and compelling mission, a quality educational program, a demonstration of community support, a solvent and sustainable budget and contingency financial plans, a clear demonstration of the effectiveness of the model for the target student population, effective governance and management structures and systems, founding team members demonstrating diverse and necessary capabilities in all phases of the school's development, and clear evidence of the applicant's capacity to execute its plan successfully. An application that merits a recommendation for approval should satisfy each of these criteria."²

Each individual question will be rated "Meets," "Partially Meets," or "Does Not Meet." The rubric provides guidance within each question to aid reviewers in determining the extent to which each response meets the standard. Each major subsection will then be assigned an overall rating of "Meets," "Partially Meets," or "Does Not Meet" by averaging the ratings for each individual question within the subsection. Section summaries will then be determined by averaging subsection ratings.³

² Tennessee State Board of Education Policy 6.111

³ Tennessee State Board of Education's Charter School Application Scoring Rubric, pg. 3

Summary of the Application

School Name: Trimble Academy

Sponsor: Trimble Forward Alliance

Proposed Location of School: Dyer County Schools

Mission: The mission of Trimble Academy is to cultivate the body, mind, and heart of each student in a traditional setting and an immersive outdoor environment through a classical, content-rich education that nurtures moral and civic virtue.⁴

Number of Schools Currently in Operation by Sponsor: There are no schools currently in operation by the sponsor.

Proposed Enrollment:⁵

Grade Level	Year 1: 2027-2028	Year 2: 2028-2029	Year 3: 2029-2030	Year 4: 2030-2031	Year 5: 2031-2032	At Capacity:
K	18	18	18	18	18	18
1	18	18	18	18	18	18
2	18	18	18	18	18	18
3	18	18	18	18	18	18
4	20	20	20	20	20	20
5	20	20	20	20	20	20
6	25	25	25	25	25	25
7	0	25	25	25	25	25
8	0	15	25	25	25	25
Totals	137	177	187	187	187	187

Brief Description of the Application

The sponsor, Trimble Forward Alliance, is proposing to open a charter school in Dyer County and serve students in kindergarten through eighth grade. The school, Trimble Academy, is a new-start school and would be the sponsor's first school. The school intends to operate in the town of Trimble to cultivate the body, mind, and heart of each student in "a traditional setting and an immersive outdoor environment through a classical, content-rich education that nurtures moral and civic virtue." The school proposes to deliver a content-rich classical

⁴ Trimble Academy Amended Application, pg. 22

⁵ Trimble Academy Amended Application, pg. 46



curriculum paired with nature-based learning to provide students in northern Dyer County and surrounding rural communities with an expanded educational option.

The application states that the proposed school will be governed under the umbrella of the Trimble Forward Alliance 501(c)(3) Board of Directors, which will oversee a specialized school board committee and subcommittees dedicated to academic performance, finance and operations, and school governance. In Year 0, Trimble Academy budgeted \$750,000 from the Charter Schools Program ("CSP") grant and projects \$750,000 in expenses for the school. In Year 1, Trimble Academy projects the school will have \$1,774,524 in revenue and \$1,764,717 in expenses, resulting in a balance of \$9,807. By Year 5, the school projects to have \$2,567,904 in revenue and \$2,517,325 in expenses, resulting in a positive ending fund balance of \$211,447.⁶ The school anticipates that 25% of the student population will qualify as economically disadvantaged, 17% of the student population will be students with disabilities, and less than 10% of the student population will be English learners.⁷

⁶ Trimble Academy Amended Budget

⁷ Trimble Academy Amended Application, pg. 47

Summary of the Evaluation

The Review Committee recommends the denial of the amended application for Trimble Academy because the applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence in the academic, operational, and financial sections to demonstrate that the application meets the required criteria of the rubric.

The applicant's Educational Program Design and Capacity partially meets the standard due to substantial gaps in academic model coherence, special populations compliance, curriculum and assessment readiness, and staffing viability. While Trimble Forward Alliance articulates a compelling mission rooted in classical and nature-based learning, the application and capacity interview lacked evidence that the model could be implemented with fidelity. The team did not demonstrate a clear understanding of several key areas. Specifically, Trimble Academy did not show how daily instruction would integrate outdoor learning. The sponsor also did not explain how multi-tiered interventions would meet Response to Instruction and Intervention ("RTI²") requirements, or how special education and English learner services would be delivered in compliance with federal and state law. Additionally, the applicant's staffing model did not demonstrate a realistic plan for delivering required services to students with disabilities, relying on non-certified volunteers and unsupported assumptions about how special education needs would be met within the school's instructional framework. The cumulative deficiencies, combined with the board's reliance on distant external consultants to explain core academic programming, underscore that the applicant does not yet possess the academic capacity required to launch and sustain a high-quality public school.

The applicant's Operations Plan and Capacity partially meets the standard due to material weaknesses across governance, staffing, facilities, and core operational systems. Governance structures are unclear with blurred reporting lines, a complicated dual-board model, and an unsustainable concentration of operational duties on a single school leader. The plan relies heavily on external mentors from Skillern Elementary and Tennessee Classical Academy, yet no formal contract, scope of work, performance metrics, or implementation plan exists. Key operational systems, including staffing, recruitment, transportation, food service, and facility readiness, remain underdeveloped or incomplete. Although the applicant provided additional details regarding the facility plan during the capacity interview, the full extent, scope, and cost of the required renovations remain unclear, and essential architectural plans, safety approvals, and financing strategies are still not in place. Taken together, these gaps indicate that the applicant has not demonstrated the operational capacity, internal infrastructure, or readiness required to open the proposed school effectively.

The applicant's Budget and Finance does not meet the standard due to structural insolvency, omitted expenditures, and a lack of verified funding. The financial model depends on a \$750,000 CSP grant that was not received, leaving an unfunded pre-opening deficit exceeding \$300,000. The operating budget omits critical costs such as transportation, facility repairs, food service infrastructure, instructional materials, and technology. It also relies on unrealistic assumptions about part-time staffing and volunteer labor. With projected annual surpluses of only \$10,000 to \$52,000, the school lacks the fiscal cushion necessary to absorb enrollment fluctuations, delayed state disbursements, or the newly acknowledged need to fund staff previously represented as volunteers. Proposed contingency strategies, such as reducing instructional staff or combining grade levels, would violate compliance requirements and further compromise academic quality. Neither the submitted budget nor the revised capacity interview narrative demonstrates a viable or sustainable financial plan.

Summary of Section Ratings

In accordance with the Tennessee State Board of Education's charter application scoring rubric, applications that do not meet or exceed the standard in all sections will be deemed not ready for approval and strengths in one area of the application do not negate 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. The Review Committee's consensus ratings for each section of the application are as follows:

Sections	Ratings
Educational Program Design and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Operations Plan and Capacity	Partially Meets Standard
Budget and Finance	Does Not Meet Standard

Analysis of the Educational Program Design and Capacity

Rating: Partially Meets Standard

Weaknesses Identified by the Committee

The applicant's Educational Program Design and Capacity partially meets the standard due to deficiencies in academic model integration, non-compliant special populations programming, assessment and curriculum gaps, and unviable staffing plans.

While the applicant presents a unique mission that combines classical education with nature-based learning, the narrative fails to demonstrate how these models will be applied cohesively in daily classroom instruction. The application alternately describes outdoor learning as central and as a secondary add-on, creating ambiguity regarding its academic role. Furthermore, the proposal lacks measurable goals, benchmarks, or assessment rubrics to evaluate student learning in outdoor spaces or progress toward moral and civic virtues. When questioned during the capacity interview about daily outdoor instruction, the applicant team deferred to its external consultant, highlighting the local team's reliance on external partners to manage the model's implementation. While an identified school leader is not required for approval, the proposed governing board provided little evidence of its ability to implement the complex and unique academic model. The board deferred most questions regarding the day-to-day implementation of the model, such as daily teacher supports, weather contingencies, and academic rigor on campus, to the external consultant. While the external consultant operates a nature-based classical charter school in Hamilton County and has demonstrated knowledge of how the model is implemented there, the application contains insufficient evidence of how this model will be implemented with fidelity at Trimble Academy.

The plan for special populations and intervention programming raised significant questions regarding compliance and alignment with Tennessee's RTI² framework. Under state guidelines, Tier 3 interventions must be distinct, intensive, and research-based to remediate specific deficits. The applicant proposes using Literacy Essentials simultaneously as Tier 1 foundational instruction and Tier 3 intervention, incorrectly asserting in the application and capacity interview that group size alone differentiates the tiers. In mathematics, RTI² intervention structures are entirely omitted.

Additionally, staffing allocations are insufficient to implement the necessary supports for students. For example, the application budgets one full-time equivalent ("FTE") special education teacher to manage instruction, compliance, and gifted caseloads across grades kindergarten through sixth for a projected 17% special education population. During the capacity interview, the applicant acknowledged that outdoor models often attract a higher percentage of special

populations (up to 30%) yet suggested managing caseload overages through non-certified volunteers or by hiring a second teacher who is unsupported by the budget. The combination of these concerns highlights critical gaps in both the applicant's knowledge of compliance and capacity to implement, preventing this component of the academic plan from meeting the standard for approval.

Furthermore, the proposed continuum of services and accommodations for students with disabilities and English learner ("EL") programming did not meet statutory requirements. Under Section 504 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act ("IDEA"), accommodations must be tailored to each student's unique needs rather than applied broadly across an entire diagnosis, meaning the outdoor setting cannot serve as an automatic accommodation for every child with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder ("ADHD"). During the capacity interview, the applicant confirmed special education instruction would occur almost entirely in general education classrooms, leaving it unclear how the school will ensure access to more restrictive placements, such as self-contained settings, if required by an Individualized Education Plan ("IEP"). Additionally, narrative statements suggesting that parents evaluate whether the school is an appropriate "fit" conflict with open-enrollment laws for students with significant physical, medical, or sensory needs. Lastly, the EL plan proposes push-in support, which is not an approved standalone delivery model in Tennessee, and references non-compliant identification procedures and an outdated screener. When questioned during the capacity interview about compliance with Tennessee's EL identification protocols, screening tools, and required direct service minutes, the applicant, along with the external consultant, acknowledged that the screener listed in the application was outdated and said the school would switch to the appropriate screener and ensure students receive supports. However, the applicant did not explain how these requirements would be met or what staffing would be in place to deliver services. The response lacked a clear plan for providing compliant EL services to students.

The committee also identified deficiencies in the assessment framework and curriculum selection. The application lacks standardized, nationally normed benchmark assessments beyond universal reading screeners and Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program ("TCAP") testing, completely omitting benchmark tools for mathematics and middle school grades. While representatives verbally referenced several diagnostic tools such as i-Ready during the capacity interview, these tools are neither described within the application nor budgeted.

Furthermore, the staffing plan's reliance on non-certified volunteers to deliver core instruction fails to provide a viable or compliant plan for academic delivery. During the capacity interview, the team stated that volunteers, who are not licensed educators, would assist in classrooms, provide accommodations, and offer feedback for IEP development, despite

Tennessee law requiring certified teachers for all instructional roles. Although the applicant later indicated they would revise budgets and hire licensed part-time staff for fine arts and PE, these adjustments were not reflected in the submitted application or budget. As proposed, the plan did not demonstrate that the school is fully prepared or understands the requirement to employ appropriately credentialed personnel or to meet instructional compliance standards.

Strengths Identified by the Committee

The Review Committee commends Trimble Forward Alliance for its authentic community mobilization, grassroots commitment, and dedication to restoring a local educational option in the city of Trimble following the sudden closure of Trimble Elementary School. The applicant demonstrated significant stakeholder engagement, gathering extensive petition support and submitting customized letters of support from municipal leaders, state legislators, and local business owners who emphasize the economic and civic necessity of a school within the municipality. Furthermore, the application provides a clear rationale for community need, highlighting that the school would expand choice and eliminate the extended bus rides currently required for elementary students in the town.

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 the standard due to concerns related to governance and leadership structures, staffing and hiring plans, facility readiness, and underdeveloped operational services.

A primary operational concern involves the proposed governance and leadership structure. The application presents a complicated dual-board framework in which the school director reports to an internal committee chair rather than directly to the governing board of directors, blurring the lines of legal authority and public accountability. This structure is directly misaligned with the rubric, which requires the governing board to maintain a clear, direct relationship and proper oversight. Interposing an internal committee layer circumvents these core governance responsibilities, blurs the distinction between board oversight and daily operations, and fails to meet the rubric's standard for executive accountability. Additionally, the operational plan places an unsustainable administrative burden on a single school leader responsible for simultaneous instructional leadership, compliance, operations, and community outreach. Given these internal capacity limitations, the board proposal relies heavily on distant external consultants from Tennessee Classical Academies and Skillern Elementary to execute the model. While the consultants operate nature-based classical schools in Hamilton County, the capacity interview revealed that no formal service agreement, scope of work, performance metrics, or accountable fee structure exists between the sponsor and these external partners. During the capacity interview, the applicant described an informal mentorship arrangement consisting of periodic Zoom meetings and occasional visits, with the consultant being located more than five hours away. Without a binding contract or a detailed plan outlining the frequency, method, and deliverables of support, the school lacks a guaranteed mechanism for that support, demonstrating substantial dependence on external assistance and insufficient internal capacity to execute the model independently.

The proposed staffing and human capital plans present significant vulnerabilities regarding recruitment, retention, and budgetary alignment. Operating within a constrained labor market experiencing documented teacher shortages, the applicant proposes a lean salary scale that falls below local market rates and lacks competitiveness with Dyer County Schools. Although the application notes that recruitment will be supported by sign-on and performance bonuses, these financial incentives are omitted from the operating budget worksheet, creating a misalignment between the narrative strategy and fiscal planning. During the capacity interview, the applicant clarified that all core teachers will hold active Tennessee educator licenses, a

change from the initial proposal and budget, which stated the use of volunteers for academic instruction. However, the plan lacks a concrete strategy for recruiting qualified part-time educators for specialized subjects. Finally, the human capital plan lacks adequate contingency measures should the school face challenges recruiting fully certified educators or licensed special education professionals prior to launch.

Finally, in the application and capacity interview, the applicant stated its plans to occupy the former Trimble Elementary School. In the capacity interview, the applicant provided an update that the town now owns the building. While this update does give the school a clearer path to occupancy, significant timeline and financial vulnerabilities remain related to the facility. The vacant building requires extensive code and life-safety upgrades. While undergoing facility renovations is not uncommon for older properties, the primary concern is that critical architectural plans, safety layouts, and fire marshal approvals remain incomplete. Because the full scope of required work remains unclear, significant uncertainty persists regarding project feasibility, total renovation costs, and student safety. Furthermore, the operating budget lacks evidence of sufficient allocations to cover these required repairs. While the applicant suggested during the capacity interview that facility updates could be financed through commercial loans, the proposal lacks a clear strategy for securing financing or a sustainable repayment structure. Without these financial mechanisms and critical safety clearances, the facility and start-up plans lack the operational and financial viability required to ensure a safe, compliant school opening.

Lastly, operational plans for transportation and food service are underdeveloped. The application assumes the local district will provide bus routes without a memorandum of understanding ("MOU"), despite the district formally declining partnerships. During the capacity interview, the sponsor acknowledged that the local district would not partner for transportation or food service. The applicant stated that it has conducted preliminary outreach to private providers, including discussing cluster pickup options with an out-of-town bus company and consulting with state education officials regarding food service procurement. However, despite these preliminary steps, the transportation plan remains underdeveloped, lacking a clear provider model, specific operational details, or sufficient budget alignment. Similarly, the food service strategy lacks a clear operational delivery model, a defined procurement process, or concrete implementation steps to demonstrate how meals will be managed effectively.

Strengths Identified by the Committee

The founding board includes dedicated local leaders with deep community roots and diverse professional backgrounds spanning corporate accounting, higher education administration, mental health, facilities management, and municipal government. Furthermore, robust school safety planning is demonstrated and led by a local law enforcement officer and a



constable on the founding team. Additionally, the committee noted the applicant's structured teacher professional development framework, which uses a learning model that provides digital coaching modules on classical pedagogy.

Analysis of the Budget and Finance

Rating: Does Not Meet Standard

Weaknesses Identified by the Committee

The applicant's Budget and Finance section does not meet the standard because the operating budget relies on unsecured funding to remain solvent, omits essential operational expenditures, projects razor-thin operating margins, and lacks viable contingency plans to absorb financial risks.

The Year 0 financial model relies on unsecured and unawarded startup funds. The submitted operating budget and narrative explicitly state that pre-opening operations, Year 0 staffing, curriculum acquisition, and technology infrastructure depend upon receiving \$750,000 from the federal CSP startup grant, noting that the school cannot open without it. On June 1, 2026, the Tennessee Department of Education formally notified the sponsor that the CSP grant was denied, creating an immediate, unaddressed deficit in the pre-opening cash flow model. During the capacity interview, the applicant reported a revised startup estimate of \$475,000 in expenses and \$115,000 in local philanthropic donations. While the committee recognizes the applicant's fundraising efforts, a verified funding gap of over \$300,000 remains to cover necessary pre-opening costs, including Year 0 staffing, equipment, instructional supplies, and facilities. Because the applicant has not secured alternative philanthropic commitments, corporate contributions, or an executed commercial line of credit, the school faces pre-opening fiscal insolvency.

Furthermore, the operating budget omits and severely understates critical expenditure line items. As noted in the operational analysis, daily student transportation is underrepresented in the five-year budget, with projected costs limited to occasional field trips. As such, contracting with an independent provider for daily routes would quickly overwhelm operating margins. Additionally, the budget fails to allocate adequate funds for facility repairs. Although the applicant estimates building repairs at \$200,000, the budget contains no capital outlay in Year 0 and maintains unrealistically low annual reserves, omitting costs for construction overruns, mechanical replacements, or continued building improvements needed in future years to maintain the facility. Crucial line items for food service operations, kitchen warming equipment, instructional supplies, assessments, and student technology are either substantially understated or omitted entirely. While the applicant suggested financing these gaps through commercial loans, the budget provides no debt service allocations and no viable repayment mechanism, given the lack of operating margins.



Overall, the solvency risk is severely compounded by these underrepresented budget items and limited financial margin. Given that the operating budget projects annual surpluses of only \$10,000 to \$52,000 across the five-year term, the school has no fiscal cushion to absorb enrollment declines, delays in state disbursements, or unexpected costs, including now having to fund instructional and support staff previously described as volunteers.

When questioned during the capacity interview regarding financial risk and budget shortfalls, the applicant proposed reducing instructional personnel and combining classrooms into multi-grade splits. Because instructional staffing is already budgeted at absolute minimum operational thresholds, cutting personnel would degrade the core classical curriculum and compromise mandatory special education compliance. While the committee recognizes the difficult circumstances surrounding the CSP grant denial, neither the original financial plan nor the revised proposal described in the capacity interview demonstrates structural solvency or fiscal sustainability. Consequently, the Budget and Finance section does not meet the standard for approval.



Evaluation Team

Katie Bridges is the Exceptional Education Coordinator for the Tennessee Public Charter School Commission. She has 14 years of experience serving in teaching and administrative roles in charter schools in Nashville, Tennessee. Before her work at the Commission, Katie was a founding Assistant Principal of Student Supports at a charter middle school. Katie received a M. Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction from Trevecca University and a B.A. in psychology and communications from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

Beth Elpers is the Director of Authorizing for the Tennessee Public Charter School Commission. She is a Certified Public Accountant and has spent the last 15 years specializing in school finance and charter school oversight. Before working at the Commission, Beth worked as an administrator and charter school authorizer in California. She has also had the opportunity to serve as the Chief Business Officer of a charter school, an Executive Director of Fiscal Services for a school district with an annual budget of over \$500 Million, and an auditor of charter schools and non-profit organizations. She earned her Master of Business Administration degree from California Baptist University, where she also received her B.S. in Business Administration.

Autumn Hillis has spent her career serving students as a classroom teacher, curriculum writer, instructional coach, and a school principal. She has worked in both traditional public schools and in charter schools throughout her career. Her career interests and projects include effective science instruction for K-12 students and restorative justice practices in schools as a response to decreasing the school to prison pipeline. Dr. Hillis is a product of Nashville public schools and is excited to continue serving students in Nashville and across the state.

Grant Monda joined the Aurora Collegiate Academy Team in 2015, currently serving as its Executive Director. Aurora is a tuition- free public charter elementary school serving students from all over Shelby County. Grant joined Aurora after completing the prestigious Ryan Fellowship. In addition to his work at Aurora, Grant has previously taught in Memphis City Schools as a Teacher For America Corps member and served as a district level coach and evaluator with Shelby County Schools. Grant has reviewed charter applications for the state and Shelby County Schools. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from Rhodes College and a Master's in Education from Christian Brothers University.

Maggie Stampley is the Director of School Programs and Supports for the Tennessee Public Charter School Commission. She is an educator who has worked in both traditional public and public charter schools in the Nashville area. Throughout her time in teaching, Maggie has specialized in teaching math and special populations. She has worked as an administrator in both the instructional and operational fields, serving middle and high school students. Maggie received her M.A.E from Belmont University and B.A. from Auburn University.