AMENDED AGENDA

METROPOLITAN BOARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION
2601 Bransford Avenue, Nashville, TN 37204
Regular Meeting – August 11, 2015 - 5:00 p.m.
Sharon Dixon Gentry, EdD, Chair

TIME

5:00  I. CONVENE and ACTION
A. Establish Quorum
B. Pledge of Allegiance

5:05  II. AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS
A. Reward Schools
B. Introduction of New District Leadership

5:15  III. AND THE GOOD NEWS IS...
A. Jere Baxter Middle Prep - Dr. Iris Johnson-Arnold Tennessee State University

5:15  IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
The Board will hear from those persons who have requested to appear at this Board meeting. In the interest of time, speakers are requested to limit remarks to three minutes or less. Comments will be timed.
A. Erica Lanier – Director of Schools Search
B. Inez Williams - Looking Beyond TCAP
C. Rev. Enoch Fuzz – Director of Schools Search
D. Anna Barnes - Walkers/Rosebank ES
E. Tanisha Hart-Love –
F. Erick E. Huth – Teacher Concerns

5:25  V. GOVERNANCE ISSUES
A. Actions
1. Consent
   a. Approval of Minutes – 04/30/2015 – Regular Meeting
   c. Recommended Award of Contract for Architectural Services – Hillsboro High School Renovations – ARTifice, LLC
   d. Recommended Award of Contract for Architectural Services – Nashville School of the Arts Renovations – Tuck-Hinton Architects, PLC
   e. Recommended Award of Contract for Architectural Services – Pennington Elementary School Additions – Melvin Gill and Associates
   g. Recommended Award of Contract for Architectural Services – New Cane Ridge Cluster Elementary School – EOA Architects
   h. Recommended Award of Contract for Architectural Services – Overton High School Additions and Renovations – TMPartners, PLLC
   i. Recommended Award of Contract for Architectural Services – Southeast Early Learning Center – Allard Ward Architects
   j. Recommended Award of Contract for Architectural Services - Martin Luther
King, Jr. Magnet School Renovations Phase II – Bauer Askew Architecture PLLC
k. Recommended Award of Contract for Roof Restoration at J. E. Moss Elementary
   School – TLC Pro-Roofing, LLC
l. Recommended Approval of Change Order #4 for Granbery Elementary School
   Additions – Orion Building Corporation
m. Recommended Approval of Change Order #3 for Henry Maxwell Elementary
   School Additions - Bomar Construction Company, Inc.
n. Recommended Approval of Supplement #1 for Bransford Health Center – Jack
   Freeman and Associates
o. Recommended Approval of Supplement #2 for Waverly-Belmont Elementary
   School – Tuck-Hinton Architects
p. Recommended Approval of Request #30 for District-wide Maintenance,
   Repairs, and General Construction (McGavock High School Metal Wall Panels) -
   Southland Constructors, LLC
q. Recommended Approval of Request #15 for Asbestos Abatement Services
   (Martin Luther King, Jr. Magnet School) – Levy Industrial Contractor
r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts
   (1) Adecco USA
   (2) Alignment Nashville
   (3) Am Tab Manufacturing Corp.
   (4) BAC Paving Company, Inc.
   (5) Camcor, Inc.
   (6) Card Integrators Corporation
   (7) CDW Government Inc.
   (8) Crosslin & Associates, P.C
   (9) Dell Marketing LP
   (10) Dell Marketing LP
   (11) Imagine Learning
   (12) Interface Flooring Systems, Inc. LLC
   (13) Leonard Stevens
   (14) Noser Consulting, LLC
   (15) Oasis Center
   (16) PENCIL Foundation
   (17) Pitney Bowes Global Financial Services Agreement
   (18) Praters, Inc.
   (19) Public Consulting Group, Inc.
   (20) Rush Trucking Corporation
   (21) Southern Word, Inc.
   (22) TRA, Inc.
   (23) Trane
   (25) Awardees from MNPS Invitation to Bid (ITB) #16-4
   (26) Awardees from MNPS Request for Proposals (RFP) #15-19
s. Approval of Compulsory Attendance Waiver
t. Special Textbook Adoption for New Courses: American Sign Language:
   Signing Naturally and Heritage Arabic: IAhlan wa Sahlan: Functional
   Modern Standard Arabic for Beginners
u. Legal Settlement Claim #C-33304 ($13,500.00)

2. CLASS update

3. Director of Schools Motion

4. Charter Application Resubmissions
6:15  V.  REPORTS
   A.  Director’s Report
       1.  School Improvement Grant (SIG) Award
       2.  Proposed Paragon Mills/Glencliff Rezoning
   B.  Committee Reports
       1.  CLASS
       2.  Naming of Schools
   C.  Board Chairman’s Report
       1.  Announcements

7:00  VI.  WRITTEN INFORMATION TO THE BOARD (not for discussion)
   A.  Naming of Parts of Buildings and Programs
   B.  Upcoming Committee Meetings

7:00  VII.  ADJOURNMENT
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools  
Board of Education  
Regular Meeting  
Minutes  
April 30, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Roll Call | Present: Dr. Jo Ann Brannon  
Amy Frogge  
Dr. Sharon Gentry, Chair  
Tyese Hunter  
Elissa Kim, Vice-Chair  
Mary Pierce  
Will Pinkston  
Anna Shepherd  
Jill Speering  
Dr. Jesse Register, Director of Schools | Dr. Gentry called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. |
| Pledge of Allegiance | Led by Hank Clay, Assistant to the Director – Government Relations |

**GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Consent Agenda – continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Public Accountability for Charter Schools Resolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shepherd made a motion to approve the Public Accountability for Charter Schools Resolution.</td>
<td>Ms. Shepherd read the following resolution: WHEREAS, traditional districts and charter schools should work together to ensure a coordinated approach that serves all children; and WHEREAS, school governance should be representative and transparent; and WHEREAS, it is the duty of the Metropolitan Board of Public Education to ensure Metro Nashville Public Schools provides strategic growth and expansion of its schools to better serve students and the community while protecting taxpayers; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, The Metropolitan Board of Public Education supports independent accountability and transparency standards for all of Metro Nashville's Public Schools as recommended by the Annenberg Institute for School Reform and as proscribed by Tennessee State Laws; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The Metropolitan Board of Public Education and the Director of Schools apply these standards, pending legal analysis, when making decisions regarding school expansion.</td>
<td>VOTE: 9-0 – Unanimous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Frogge made the following comments: I support the adoption of the Annenberg standards, which in my opinion is the bare minimum step we should take to ensure transparency and accountability for our charter schools. These standards create a clear set of expectations and rules under which all schools should operate. The goal is to protect the health of the school system overall, and to ensure that every child in every school has an opportunity to succeed. I’ve had several experiences that indicate a great need for transparency around charter schools. A few meetings ago, I asked about the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public Accountability for Charter Schools Resolution – continued</td>
<td>services we are providing free of cost to our charters, and I received a dishonest answer. I was told that we do not provide services free of cost to charters. I know this answer was inaccurate because two days later we met with our independent auditors, who led off the meeting by stating that we do indeed provide indirect services free of cost to charters. The auditors emphasized that we need to recoup these indirect costs in order to offset the growing negative fiscal impact that charter schools are having on the district. I was subsequently provided a list by the district that details indirect services we offer charter schools free of charge. However, some items appeared to be missing from the list, so I filed an open records request to ascertain the accuracy of the information. I was concerned that the list sent out to the Board is not comprehensive. Here are some of the items included by head administrators in their summary of charter costs that did not make the final list we received: (1.) A full-time special ed coach for all charter schools - $81K per year, (2.) Time devoted by an existing discipline coordinator, who works with charter schools on expulsions, (3.) Employee time spent on student records and charter applications, (4.) Two part-time data coaches (RTT funds), (5.) Services regarding students records and charter applications, (6.) EL services from an existing employee. In addition, there are several other services that did not make the list which charter schools may be receiving free of cost: (1.) Athletic costs, (2.) Participation in the MNPS teacher fair, for which MNPS recruits, (3.) Participation in the MNPS First Choice Festival, which MNPS fully funds, (4.) Food services that include food delivery, set-up, and employee time, (5.) Learning Technology services. What happened on this occasion reflects my previous experiences in trying to get information about charter schools. When I asked questions in the past, I have had a very difficult time getting answers from the Office of Innovation, and sometimes my requests have been completely ignored. So the question here is not what we could or should charge charter schools for indirect services. That is something the Board and administration can debate, and sometimes the answers will be murky. The issue here is that there is limited transparency when it comes to charter schools. Information about charter schools such as capacity, waiting lists, and costs should be readily available to Board members and to the public in general who fund these schools. A Board member should not have to file an open records request to get the information needed. Charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>DISCUSSION/MOTION</td>
<td>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Accountability for Charter Schools Resolution – continued</td>
<td>schools are funded by tax dollars and should be required to follow the same rules as other public schools with regard to sharing information. An agreement to follow the Annenberg standards would be a big step in the right direction for greater transparency and accountability for charter schools in Nashville. Ms. Pierce asked, will Annenberg Standards be taken to Policy Governance for review and to align the policies with state law, etc.? Also, will charter leaders be invited to have input in the process? Ms. Shepherd said, yes those discussions would be held in community meetings. Ms. Kim stated that she wondered how do the Annenberg Standards compare with other national governing standards that target transparency and accountability. She asked if the standards could be reviewed and revised to meet MNPS and state qualifications, and then brought back to the Board for vote. Mr. Pinkston said the Annenberg Standards represent a model set of standards. But parts that do not conform with state law will not be integrated into the process. It may also be a good idea to have Annenberg revisit the district and the standards after revisions are made. Ms. Pierce stated that she would prefer that the Board vet the policies in committee and also include affected stakeholders. Dr. Gentry said, if the Board is adopting all the standards, then the Board should agree that the next step in the process is to have Metro Legal review the standards to ensure there is no conflict with state law. Secondly, are the processes in place to obtain the information the standards require? In the committee meeting, the Board and the administration need to work together to ensure that collaboration happens and also develop how the policies will be implemented in current and future schools. Mr. Pinkston said, he did not think it was necessary for the Board to handle the policy review in committee, but was rather a job for the administration. Future charter applicants should be informed of standards prior to future charter applications being presented to the Board. Dr. Brannon asked, what steps can we take to ensure the standards are consistent with state law? Mr. Pinkston said, the administration and Metro Legal can undergo that work. Dr. Gentry said, the Board should “own” the process of vetting the standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mr. Pinkston made a motion to amend the resolution to read as follows:**

WHEREAS, traditional districts and charter schools should work together to ensure a coordinated approach that serves all children; and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public Accountability for Charter Schools Resolution -continued</td>
<td>WHEREAS, school governance should be representative and transparent; and WHEREAS, it is the duty of the Metropolitan Board of Public Education to ensure Metro Nashville Public Schools provides strategic growth and expansion of its schools to better serve students and the community while protecting taxpayers; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, The Metropolitan Board of Public Education supports independent accountability and transparency standards for all of Metro Nashville's Public Schools as recommended by the Annenberg Institute for School Reform and as prescribed by Tennessee State Laws; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, The Metropolitan Board of Public Education and the Director of Schools apply these standards, <em>pending legal analysis</em>, when making decisions regarding school expansion. (amendments italicized)</td>
<td>VOTE: 5 - Yes (Brannon, Shepherd, Pinkston, Speering, Frogge) 3 – No (Hunter, Kim, Pierce)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Approval of the Naming of Creswell Middle Prep School of the Arts – *Naming of Schools Committee* | Dr. Brannon gave a brief explanation for the name modification of Isaiah T. Creswell Middle School.  

**Dr. Brannon made a motion to modify the name of Isaiah T. Creswell Middle School to Creswell Middle Prep School of the Arts. Ms. Shepherd seconded.** | VOTE: 9-0 – Unanimous |
| • BEP Funding – A Motion to Hire Counsel for Legal Advice | Ms. Frogge made a motion to suspend the rules to reconsider the motion to hire counsel for legal advice. Ms. Speering seconded. | VOTE: 5 – Yes (Shepherd, Speering, Pinkston, Frogge, Hunter) 3 - No (Kim, Pierce, Brannon) |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• BEP Funding – A Motion to Hire Counsel for Legal Advice – continued</td>
<td>Ms. Frogge made a motion that the Board engage in legal counsel to advise the Board regarding the lawsuit recently filed for adequate school funding for the Board to seek legal advice on the pending BEP lawsuit. Mr. Pinkston seconded.</td>
<td>VOTE: 8-1 –(Brannon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Frogge made the following comments: I have distributed information on John Borkowski, who I’ve suggested to advise us as to the funding adequacy lawsuit that was recently filed. I would like to address a few points raised at our last meeting: 1. Mr. Borkowski has represented MNPS over the last six years on several matters, including on an extensive case regarding the constitutionality of MNPS student assignment plan and Office of Civil Rights complaints. As such, he served as our attorney of record, working alongside Metro Legal. 2. Mr. Borkowski is well-qualified for this work. He specializes in trial and appellate litigation, with an emphasis on education law issues arising under the U.S. Constitution, state constitutions, and federal statutes and regulations. The lawsuit filed by Hamilton County, and other school districts, alleges that the state has breached its constitutional duty to provide “a system of free public education” for children in Tennessee. 3. I’d like to address questions regarding the fees MNPS paid last year to Mr. Borkowski for his representation. Those fees totaled approximately $165,000. The vast majority of that cost - $106,000, went towards defense against an Office of Civil Rights complaint. The remainder of the cost went toward several other matters, including changes in student assignment plans, implementation of the Diversity Management Plan, and challenges to the charter school law and the state’s funding formula. It is also noteworthy that Mr. Borkowski will change firms next month, which will reduce his cost by about $200 per hour. 4. Legal representation involves a dialogue between the client and the attorney concerning pending legal issues. MNPS has not received legal advice on the lawsuit that has been filed regarding adequacy of school funding in Tennessee. Because time is of the essence on this lawsuit, I suggest an initial meeting with Mr. Borkowski to review the pending lawsuit and assess our interests. If we ultimately decide to join the lawsuit, we can then decide whether to engage Mr. Borkowski for this work or consider other representation. So to clarify my motion, I am asking merely that we engage Mr. Borkowski to advise us regarding the pending lawsuit. Mr. Pinkston stated that he supported the
### TOPIC
- **BEP Funding – A Motion to Hire Counsel for Legal Advice - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>motion. Ms. Shepherd stated that she is opposed to the motion due to timing. The laser focus of the Board should be the Director of Schools search. This legal conversation could cause a distraction from important activities that require Board involvement. It may be proper to delay the motion until another time. Ms. Frogge said, an attorney’s legal counsel would help the Board decide whether immediate action is needed or if a delay would be more appropriate. Dr. Brannon said she believes the Board should stay focused on the Director search, and is in favor of delaying seeking legal counsel. Ms. Pierce asked if Metro Legal could provide the Board with advice. Ms. Harkey said, yes. Ms. Hunter said the distractions that the Board is facing are constant, and Metro Legal may be able to provide services. Ms. Kim asked, does Metro Legal have expertise in BEP discussions? Ms. Harkey said, yes. Ms. Frogge made motion to amend her motion to say, motion for the Board to seek legal advice on the pending BEP lawsuit. Mr. Pinkston seconded. Ms. Frogge made a motion that the Board engage Mr. Borkowski to provide the Board with only initial advice regarding the BEP lawsuit. Ms. Speering seconded. Ms. Frogge rescinded her motion. Ms. Frogge asked Ms. Harkey to report to the Board at the May 26th Board meeting on the BEP funding lawsuit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOTE: 9-0 – Unanimous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Director’s Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Committee Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CLASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shepherd gave a CLASS report. Ms. Shepherd said the last CLASS conference call would be held April 29th.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Community Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Pinkston announced that the Community Engagement Committee would postpone meetings until after the Director of Schools search.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Director of Schools Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gentry gave a brief Director of Schools Search Committee report. The next meeting will be held May 14th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Board Chairman’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Announcements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Healing Communities Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blue Ribbon Teacher Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tennessee State University (TSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TCAP Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parent Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>DISCUSSION/MOTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP/OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Conexión Americas</td>
<td>Mr. Pinkston thanked Conexión Americas, and all stakeholders involved, for honoring students at Glencliff High School who are first generation Americans and first generation college students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overton High School</td>
<td>Mr. Pinkston thanked Mayor Dean for funding the Capital Budget request for Overton High School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mayor Dean Budget Approval</td>
<td>Ms. Pierce thanked Mayor Dean for funding the MNPS Operating Budget and Capital Budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notice of Motion</td>
<td>Ms. Frogge made notice that she would bring a motion at the next Board meeting to terminate the appeal in the SEIU/MOU case.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRITTEN INFORMATION TO THE BOARD**

- Sales Tax Collections as of April 20, 2015
- Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Operating Budget Financial Reports
- Upcoming Committee Meetings
- Adjournment

Ms. Frogge adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

**Signatures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris M. Henson</td>
<td>Sharon Dixon Gentry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Secretary</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

b. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – HILLWOOD HIGH SCHOOL RENOVATIONS – HASTINGS ARCHITECTURE ASSOCIATES, LLC

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Hillwood High School Renovations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillwood High School Renovations</td>
<td>Hastings Architecture Associates, LLC</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80405516

August 11, 2015

c. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – HILLSBORO HIGH SCHOOL RENOVATIONS – ARTIFICE, LLC

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Hillsboro High School Renovations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro High School Renovations</td>
<td>ARTifice, LLC</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80405416

August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

d. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – NASHVILLE SCHOOL OF THE ARTS RENOVATIONS – TUCK-HINTON ARCHITECTS, PLC

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Nashville School of the Arts Renovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nashville School of the Arts Renovation</td>
<td>Tuck-Hinton Architects, PLC</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80405316

August 11, 2015

e. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – PENNINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITIONS – MELVIN GILL AND ASSOCIATES

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Pennington Elementary School Additions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennington Elementary School Additions</td>
<td>Melvin Gill and Associates</td>
<td>$182,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80406116

August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

f. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – ROSEBANK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL RENOVATIONS – CENTRIC ARCHITECTURE, INC.

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Rosebank Elementary School Renovations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosebank Elementary School Renovations</td>
<td>Centric Architecture, Inc.</td>
<td>$378,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80406316

August 11, 2015

g. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – NEW CANE RIDGE CLUSTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – EOA ARCHITECTS

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the New Cane Ridge Cluster Elementary School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Cane Ridge Cluster Elementary School</td>
<td>EOA Architects</td>
<td>$813,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80406616

August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

h. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – OVERTON HIGH SCHOOL ADDITIONS AND RENOVATIONS – TMPARTNERS, PLLC

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Overton High School Additions and Renovations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overton High School Additions</td>
<td>TMPartners, PLLC</td>
<td>$1,837,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Renovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80406816

August 11, 2015

i. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES – SOUTHEAST EARLY LEARNING CENTER – ALLARD WARD ARCHITECTS

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Southeast Early Learning Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Early Learning Center</td>
<td>Allard Ward Architects</td>
<td>$120,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80405716

August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

j. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES - MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. MAGNET SCHOOL RENOVATIONS PHASE II – BAUER ASKEW ARCHITECTURE PLLC

In accordance with the Board of Education’s policy for selecting architects on the basis of past performance, the following architectural firm is being recommended for the Martin Luther King, Jr. Magnet School Renovations Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
<th>FIRM:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr. Magnet School Renovations Phase II</td>
<td>Bauer Askew Architecture PLLC</td>
<td>$1,630,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80404416

August 11, 2015

k. RECOMMENDED AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR METAL ROOF RESTORATION AT J. E. MOSS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – TLC PRO-ROOFING, LLC

Bid Date: June 11, 2015  Bid Time: 2:00
Architect: Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder:</th>
<th>Base Bid:</th>
<th>Alt 1:</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLC Pro-Roofing, LLC</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$162,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.D. Herbert and Sons</td>
<td>$133,469</td>
<td>$46,668</td>
<td>$180,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Kennedy Roofing</td>
<td>$187,328</td>
<td>$48,057</td>
<td>$235,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is recommended that this contract be awarded to TLC Pro-Roofing, LLC on the basis of their low bid for the total sum of $162,100.

It is recommended that this contract be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45016.80406716

August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

i. RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CHANGE ORDER #4 FOR GRANBERY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITIONS – ORION BUILDING CORPORATION

We are requesting approval to make the following changes to this contract:

1. Add 12 parking spaces
2. Replace failed asphalt
3. Install new aluminum fence
4. Rework grade and grass at basketball court
5. Add 40’ x 60’ basketball court

Total $67,342.00

It is recommended that this change order be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45014.80404414

August 11, 2015

m. RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF CHANGE ORDER #3 FOR HENRY MAXWELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ADDITIONS - BOMAR CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, INC.

We are requesting approval to make the following changes to this contract:

1. Build a retaining wall to bring grade up to ADA compliance for new Pre-K playground $25,827.10
2. Perform asphalt repairs due to new retaining wall installation $5,155.16

Total $33,982.26

It is recommended that this change order be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

FUNDING: 45014.80404714

August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

n. RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF SUPPLEMENT #1 FOR BRANSFORD HEALTH CENTER – JACK FREEMAN AND ASSOCIATES

We are requesting approval to make the following changes to this contract:

1. Additional compensation due to increase in scope of project and estimated construction cost

   Total $185,591.00

   It is recommended that this supplement be approved.

   Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

   FUNDING: 55145.80501044

   August 11, 2015

o. RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF SUPPLEMENT #2 FOR WAVERLY-BELMONT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL – TUCK-HINTON ARCHITECTS

We are requesting approval to make the following changes to this contract:

1. Additional compensation due to increase in construction cost

   Total $127,506.00

   It is recommended that this supplement be approved.

   Legality approved by Metro Department of Law.

   FUNDING: 45014.80404914

   August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

p. RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF REQUEST #30 FOR DISTRICT-WIDE MAINTENANCE, REPAIRS, AND GENERAL CONSTRUCTION (MCGAVOCK HIGH SCHOOL METAL WALL PANELS) - SOUTHLAND CONSTRUCTORS, LLC

We are requesting approval to issue a purchase order against the existing contract for District-wide Maintenance, Repairs, and General Construction for McGavock High School Metal Wall Panels in the amount of $57,581.

It is recommended that this request be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law

FUNDING: 45015.80405715

August 11, 2015

q. RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF REQUEST #15 FOR ASBESTOS ABATEMENT SERVICES (MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. MAGNET SCHOOL) – LEVY INDUSTRIAL CONTRACTORS

We are requesting approval to issue a purchase order against the existing contract for Asbestos Abatement Services for the recently purchased Moore Building adjacent to M.L. King, Jr. Magnet School in the amount of $44,000.

It is recommended that this request be approved.

Legality approved by Metro Department of Law

FUNDING: 45015.80404415

August 11, 2015
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(1) VENDOR: Adecco USA

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111104 for the purchase of temporary staffing. This purchase piggybacks the Metropolitan Government contract with Adecco USA.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Fixed Assets and Inventory

COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $180,000.

OVERSIGHT: Fixed Assets and Inventory

EVALUATION: Quality of service support.

MBPE Contract Number: Metro contract #19658
Source of Funds: Operating Budget

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(2) VENDOR: Alignment Nashville

SERVICE/GOODS: Contractor develops and manages efforts that align non-profit agencies in support of Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools (MNPS) Strategic Plan and Initiatives.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Director of Schools

COMPENSATION: Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $200,000.

OVERSIGHT: Director of Schools

EVALUATION:

- The Contractor will produce a monthly review of reports for each strategic initiative or project illustrating its progress toward the timeline completion.
- Contractor will provide MNPS with copies of the monthly Alignment Nashville Board Meeting minutes, as well as the Board’s Annual Report.
- Contractor performance will be evaluated based upon the successful completion of yearly projects and strategic efforts that it pursues.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-608577-02
Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

   r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

      (3) VENDOR: Am Tab Manufacturing Corp.

      SERVICE/GOODS: Requisitions #111669 and #111670 to purchase furniture for Antioch High School and Hillsboro High School. These purchases piggyback The Interlocal Purchasing System (TIPS) contract with Am Tab Manufacturing Corp.

      TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

      FOR WHOM: MNPS students and staff at Antioch High School and Hillsboro High School

      COMPENSATION: Total purchases are not to exceed $75,859.92.

      OVERSIGHT: Facility Planning and Construction

      EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery

      MBPE Contract Number: TIPS contract #2012215

      Source of Funds: Capital Funds - Furniture

   r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

      (4) VENDOR: BAC Paving Company, Inc.

      SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #112031 for the restoration of damaged asphalt at Jere Baxter Middle School. This purchase piggybacks the Metro Government contract with BAC Paving Company, Inc.

      TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

      FOR WHOM: MNPS students and staff at Jere Baxter Middle School

      COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $99,275.

      OVERSIGHT: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

      EVALUATION: Quality of products and installation, and timeliness of delivery.

      MBPE Contract Number: Metro contract #19663

      Source of Funds: Capital Funds – Maintenance
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(5) VENDOR: Camcor, Inc.

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111557 to purchase sixteen (16) 77-inch interactive smartboards for DuPont-Hadley Middle School. This purchase piggybacks The Interlocal Purchasing System (TIPS) contract with Camcor, Inc.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: MNPS students and teachers at DuPont-Hadley Middle School

COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $34,660.80.

OVERSIGHT: Technology and Information Services

EVALUATION: Quality of products and installation, and timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: TIPS contract #1121914
Source of Funds: Operating Budget

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(6) VENDOR: Card Integrators Corporation

SERVICE/GOODS: ID card printers and printing supplies. This contract is awarded from MNPS Invitation to Bid #B12-14.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through July 16, 2017

FOR WHOM: Technology and Information Systems

COMPENSATION: Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $200,000.

OVERSIGHT: Technology and Information Systems

EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-00376-01
Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

   r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(7) VENDOR: CDW Government Inc.

   SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111453 to purchase five (5) VBRICK Single Channel Encoders for video conferencing. This purchase piggybacks the Association of Educational Purchasing Agencies (AEPA) contract with CDW Government Inc.

   TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

   FOR WHOM: All MNPS

   COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $26,975.

   OVERSIGHT: Technology and Information Services

   EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

   MBPE Contract Number: AEPA contract #014
   Source of Funds: Capital Funds - Technology

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(8) VENDOR: Crosslin & Associates, P.C.

   SERVICE/GOODS: Contractor assists MNPS in developing a Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) strictly for MNPS (disaggregated from the annual Metro Government CAFR). The MNPS report is used for recognition application to national associations such as the Association of School Business Officials.

   TERM: August 12, 2015 through August 11, 2020

   FOR WHOM: Budgeting and Financial Reporting

   COMPENSATION: Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $132,750.

   OVERSIGHT: Budgeting and Financial Reporting

   EVALUATION: Timeliness and quality of services provided.

   MBPE Contract Number: Pending
   Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(9) VENDOR: Dell Marketing LP

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111281 to purchase sixty (60) OptiPlex 3020 microcomputers and monitors. This purchase piggybacks the Wilson County contract with Dell Marketing LP.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: MNPS libraries

COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $36,039.60.

OVERSIGHT: Technology and Information Services

EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: Wilson County contract #13ABX

Source of Funds: Reimbursement from Metro Nashville Public Library

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(10) VENDOR: Dell Marketing LP

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #112038 to purchase sixty (60) Latitude 3340 laptops for Hunters Lane High School. This purchase piggybacks the Wilson County contract with Dell Marketing LP.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: MNPS students at Hunters Lane High School

COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $38,581.80.

OVERSIGHT: Technology and Information Services

EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: Wilson County contract #13ABX

Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(11) VENDOR: Imagine Learning

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111193 to purchase an annual site license for Napier Elementary School for the Imagine Learning language and literacy products specifically designed for English Learners (EL). This purchase piggybacks the Philadelphia School District’s contract with Imagine Learning.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through July 31, 2016

FOR WHOM: EL students at Napier Elementary School

COMPENSATION: Total purchase is not to exceed $40,000.

OVERSIGHT: Leadership and Learning – English Learners

EVALUATION: Quality and effectiveness of the product.

MBPE Contract Number: Philadelphia School District contract #RFQ-022212
Source of Funds: Operating Budget

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(12) VENDOR: Interface Flooring Systems, Inc. LLC

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111077 for the purchase of carpet for MNPS schools. This purchase piggybacks the National Joint Powers Alliance (NJPA) contract with Interface Flooring Systems, Inc. LLC.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $100,000.

OVERSIGHT: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: NJPA contract #032108-IA
Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(13) VENDOR: Leonard Stevens

SERVICE/GOODS: Seventh Amendment to the contract, extending the term and increasing compensation for services to be performed in the 2015-2016 school year.

TERM: April 1, 2012 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Student Assignment Services

COMPENSATION: This Amendment increases compensation under this contract by $60,000.

Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $308,500.

OVERSIGHT: Student Assignment Services

EVALUATION: Quality of service support.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-801371-01A7
Source of Funds: Operating Budget

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(14) VENDOR: Noser Consulting, LLC

SERVICE/GOODS: Contractor will conduct a multi-method, multi-informant process and outcome evaluation across the 11 full-service Community School Sites with the goal of continuous quality improvement throughout the development and continuous implementation. Evaluation design and implementation will be structured around the results-based accountability framework proposed by the Coalition for Community Schools, with emphasis on sustainability.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Support Services – Community Achieves

COMPENSATION: Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $100,000.

OVERSIGHT: Support Services - Community Achieves

EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-549794-05
Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(15) VENDOR: Oasis Center

SERVICE/GOODS: Second Amendment to the contract, adding the following services:

a. Development of curriculum for working with a diverse, ethnic population.

b. Training in diverse, ethnic populations.

TERM: November 1, 2013 to September 30, 2015

FOR WHOM: MNPS teachers and staff at MNPS Middle Schools and High Schools

COMPENSATION: Curriculum development: $125 per hour
Training: $200 per session

This Amendment increases compensation under the contract by $30,000.
Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $99,950.

OVERSIGHT: Leadership and Learning

EVALUATION: Based on deliverables in Contractor’s scope of work.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-173773-00A2
Source of Funds: Federal Funds - School Climate Grant
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

   r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(16) VENDOR: PENCIL Foundation

SERVICE/GOODS: Contractor will provide the following services during the 2015-2016 school year.

- Recruitment of new community partners for schools (businesses, churches, universities, etc.).
- Training and facilitation of 800+ school/community partnerships (nearly 300 are Academy PENCIL Partners).
- Hosting an annual Partnership Summit to learn about best practices for partnerships for schools and community partners.
- Hosting an end-of-year volunteer celebration for schools and community partners.
- Recruitment, training, and placement of volunteers to support academic remediation in math and reading for elementary and middle school students.
- Recruitment of volunteers to support career exploration activities in selected middle schools.
- Recruitment of volunteers to support the College Career Mentors program for 9th graders in 3 selected high schools.
- Report end-of-year outcomes to MNPS and other constituents.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Leadership and Learning

COMPENSATION: Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $100,000.

OVERSIGHT: Leadership and Learning

EVALUATION:

1. Success and sufficiency of recruiting activities conducted by Contractor (do the results meet MNPS needs/expectations?).
2. Contribution and value of PENCIL Partners trained by Contractor.
3. Quality and outcome of annual events hosted by Contractor.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-171814-11
Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

   r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

      (17) VENDOR: Pitney Bowes Global Financial Services Agreement

      SERVICE/GOODS: Five-year lease of digital mailing equipment and handled scanning
device. This lease agreement is awarded from the National Joint Powers Alliance
contract with the Contractor.

      TERM: August 12, 2015 through August 11, 2020

      FOR WHOM: All MNPS personnel who send or receive mail

      COMPENSATION: Total compensation for this contract is not to exceed $178,668.

      OVERSIGHT: Central Services

      EVALUATION:
      1. Timely and efficient installation
      2. Four hour response time upon request for service
      3. Equipment down time of less than 48 hours

      MBPE Contract Number: 2-726603-01
      Source of Funds: Operating Budget

   r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

      (18) VENDOR: Praters, Inc.

      SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111081 for the purchase of gym floor resurfacing and
recoating. This purchase piggybacks the Hamilton County Board of Education contract
with Praters, Inc.

      TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

      FOR WHOM: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

      COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $100,000.

      OVERSIGHT: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

      EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

      MBPE Contract Number: Hamilton County BOE contract #11-29
      Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(19) VENDOR: Public Consulting Group, Inc.

SERVICE/GOODS: Purchase requisition #112370 for EasyFax software license renewal. The EasyFax software application is used in conjunction with the State-mandated web-based IEP system called EasyIEP. EasyFax gives us the ability to convert important paper documents (such as signature pages and meeting comments) to digital format and attach them to students’ digital IEP records. This purchase piggybacks the State of Tennessee contract with Public Consulting Group, Inc.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: All MNPS students with disabilities

COMPENSATION: Total purchase is not to exceed $30,000.

OVERSIGHT: Leadership and Learning - Exceptional Education

EVALUATION: Based on functionality, reliability, and service related to the software application.

MBPE Contract Number: State of Tennessee contract #33136-00114
Source of Funds: Federal Funds – IDEA Part B FY16

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(20) VENDOR: Rush Truck Centers

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisitions #112092 and #112093 for bus parts. These purchases piggyback the BuyBoard Cooperative contract with Rush Truck Centers.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Transportation

COMPENSATION: These purchases are not to exceed $40,000.

OVERSIGHT: Transportation

EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: BuyBoard contract #430-13
Source of Funds: Operating Budget
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(21) VENDOR: Southern Word Inc.

SERVICE/GOODS: Second Amendment to the contract, adding the following services:

a. Crosswalk document for 9th-12th grade English Language Arts state standards to the Southern Word learning objectives. Cost = $5,000.

b. Development of summative assessments to administer to students each nine weeks in grades 9-12. Cost = $10,000.

c. Development of formative assessments to administer to students each semester in grades 9-12. Cost = $10,000.

d. Development of a rubric aligned to English Language Arts state standards and Southern Word learning objectives for grades 9-12. Cost = $10,000.


g. Development of a handbook for annual Southern Word evaluation in MNPS high schools. Handbook must include all needed surveys, permission slip forms, rubrics, etc. Cost = $20,000.

h. Production of a CD/video featuring MNPS students performing Southern Word final projects. Cost = $20,000.

i. Writing of the 2016 IES grant application for MNPS to continue using the Southern Word program. Cost = $30,000.

TERM: October 15, 2014 through September 30, 2015

FOR WHOM: Select MNPS High Schools and Middle Schools

COMPENSATION: This Amendment increases compensation under the contract by $125,500.

Total compensation for this contract is not to exceed $236,000.

OVERSIGHT: Leadership and Learning

EVALUATION: Based on deliverables in Contractor’s Scope of Work.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-695329-04A1
Source of Funds: Federal Funds - School Climate Grant
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(22) VENDOR: TRA, Inc.

SERVICE/GOODS: 2015-2016 maintenance fee for School Funds Online software.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through July 31, 2016

FOR WHOM: All MNPS schools

COMPENSATION: Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $57,675.

OVERSIGHT: School Audit

EVALUATION: Service responsiveness.

MBPE Contract Number: 2-100125-02
Source of Funds: Operating Budget

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(23) VENDOR: Trane

SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111393 to replace a cracked chiller barrel at John Overton High School. This purchase piggybacks The Cooperative Purchasing Network (TCPN) contract with Trane.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: MNPS students and staff at John Overton High School

COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $46,843.52.

OVERSIGHT: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

EVALUATION: Quality of products and timeliness of service.

MBPE Contract Number: TCPN contract #R5045
Source of Funds: Capital Funds – Emergency Maintenance
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts


SERVICE/GOODS: Requisition #111123 for the purchase of services of Metro Nashville Police Officers for security at Music City Central. This purchase piggybacks the Metro Transit Authority (MTA) contract with U.S. Security Associates, Inc.

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Nashville Music City Central

COMPENSATION: This purchase is not to exceed $25,000.

OVERSIGHT: Security

EVALUATION: Quality of product and service support; timeliness of delivery.

MBPE Contract Number: MTA contract # [pending]

Source of Funds: Operating Budget

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(25) VENDOR: Awardees from MNPS Invitation to Bid (ITB) #16-4

SERVICE/GOODS: Replacement of boilers in three (3) MNPS schools. The scope of work includes removal of the existing boilers, and supply and installation of the replacement boilers. The awardees and schools to be serviced are:

- Advanced Mechanical Contractors Inc. (Granbery Elementary School)
- Enerfab, Inc. (Harris-Hillman Special Education School)
- Demand Mechanical (Johnson Alternative School)

TERM: August 12, 2015 through June 30, 2016

FOR WHOM: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

COMPENSATION: Total compensation under these contracts is not to exceed $493,630.

OVERSIGHT: Facility and Grounds Maintenance

EVALUATION: Quality of products and services, timeliness of service, and adherence to schedule.

MBPE Contract Number: Pending

Source of Funds: Capital Funds - HVAC
GOVERNANCE ISSUES

A. ACTIONS

1. CONSENT

r. Awarding of Purchases and Contracts

(26) VENDOR: Awardees from MNPS Request for Proposals (RFP) #15-19

SERVICE/GOODS: External food preparation and delivery to supplement MNPS-sponsored events. Awardees from this RFP are:
- DMI, Inc. (Jason’s Deli)
- Whitt’s Barbecue, LLC
- HoneyBaked Ham of Nashville
- Domino’s Pizza, Inc.
- Mid-state Catering
- Ambrosia Catering, LLC
- UKno Catering
- Vanishing Gourmet
- Monell’s
- Copper Kettle Café & Catering

TERM: August 12, 2015 through August 11, 2018

FOR WHOM: All MNPS schools and departments

COMPENSATION: Total compensation under this contract is not to exceed $500,000.

OVERSIGHT: Leadership and Learning; Federal Programs

EVALUATION: Quality of food and timeliness of deliveries/services.

MBPE Contract Number: Pending
Source of Funds: Various
Memorandum

To: Chris Henson, Director of Schools

From: Alvin Jones, Executive Director, Support Services

Date: 8/4/2015

Re: Compulsory Attendance Waiver Request

This request for exemption from compulsory school attendance has been reviewed. The request meets the guidelines for exemption as approved by the State Board of Education and MNPS policy. I recommend approval of this request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>Waiver</th>
<th>Waiver/GED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.G.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Home School</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.E.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Home School</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.B.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Home School</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Consent Agenda:

Special Textbook Adoption for New Courses:
Two new world languages have been added this year. The world language adoption cycle is 2 years away. In order to have instructional materials for these courses, we need to do a special adoption.

American Sign Language:
Recommended textbook: *Signing Naturally, Units 1-6*, 1st Edition Dawn Sign Press, San Diego, CA

Heritage Arabic/Arabic I
House Education Committees’ Summer Review Aug 12-13
Rachel Jackson Building, Ground Floor Conference Room
320 6th Ave., North, Nashville, TN (please have ID to enter building)

August 12th at 1:00 PM

• Assessments
  o Review of Assessment Task Force convened by Department of Education
  o Value of quality assessments
  o Testing transparency
  o Understanding quick score/cut score
  o Opt-out provisions
  o Competency-based testing
  o K-2 assessments
  o End of course assessments and Dual Enrollment courses - AP
  o Digital access and security
  o Virtual schools
  o Technology access and preparedness

Invited School Board Members:
  o Patti Bounds – Knox County School Board
  o Aaron Holladay – Rutherford County School Board

August 13th at 9:00 AM

• Physical Education

  Invited:
  o Shirley Holt/Hale – retired teacher

• Attendance & Truancy
  o Current district policy
  o Best practices
  o Juvenile Court role

• For profit education – restrictions on use of title “college” and “university” in title
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Summary of Recommendations: 2015 Applicants at a Glance

**Recommended Approvals: New Starts**

KIPP Nashville Primary – proposes to begin with grades K-1  
KIPP Nashville Middle – proposes to begin with grade 5  
*This creates a continuous pathway for students to matriculate from K-12 at KIPP Nashville.

**Recommended Denials**

These schools were not rated meets or exceeds on all parts of the amended capacity review process, and it is our policy to recommend denial for schools that do not meet or exceed in all categories.

Rocketship #3  
Rocketship #4  
Rocketship Conversion  
International Academy of Excellence
### Summary of 2015 Amended Charter Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Grade Range</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Number of students year 1</th>
<th>Number of Students at Capacity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KIPP Nashville Primary</td>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPP Nashville Middle School</td>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Academy of Excellence</td>
<td>New Start</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocketship 3</td>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocketship 4</td>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocketship Conversion</td>
<td>Conversion/Replication</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Charter schools are public schools operated by independent, non-profit governing bodies that are granted greater autonomy in the areas of curriculum, calendar, staffing, methodology, and pedagogy in return for greater accountability in achieving high quality academic results with their students. In Tennessee, public charter school students are measured against the same academic standards as students in other public schools and are required to use the same state-approved assessments as all other public schools. Charter schools are required to serve all eligible students, with the education of at-risk students being of utmost importance.

It is the responsibility of the authorizer to create and apply a rigorous, fair and thorough authorization process in order to ensure only those charter schools who can offer and sustain high quality educational options for all students are recommended and approved to open. Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools is interested in charter applicants who demonstrate the capacity to educate the most at-risk students in highly diverse and personalized settings.

Charter schools in Nashville are required to provide appropriate curriculum, aligned professional standards, engaging models of parental and partnership programs, and strategic planning to leverage and grow resources for the school. Schools are held accountable for academic results, responsible school leadership, sound fiscal and operational management and adherence to the laws and rules that govern education in the state of Tennessee.
Evaluation Process

The Office of Innovation, Division of Charter Schools, has worked closely with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) to set up an evaluation process that embodies best practices from authorizers throughout the country and is rigorous and thorough. The MNPS process has gained both state-wide and national recognition as rigorous, thorough, fair and impartial.

In accordance with the NACSA Principles and Standards, three review teams were assembled to review the April, 2015 applications. Each team consisted of a team lead plus individuals who had expertise with curriculum, special education, English language learners, charter school financials, operations, management and legal. Each team was given extensive training in application review and interviewing techniques.

The Office of Innovation and one MNPS board representative exercised additional oversight of the process.

The stages of review are as follows:

**Phase I - Capacity Review**
Charter applications are thoroughly reviewed to insure sufficient strength in areas of Education Plan, Organization Plan and Business/Financial Plan, as described below:

- **Proposal Overview**
  Basic information about the proposed school

- **Evaluation**
  Analysis of the proposal based on the three major areas of plan development
  
  - **Academic Plan** – including Mission, Vision, Executive Summary and Educational Philosophy; Curriculum and Instruction, Target Population, School Calendar and Daily Schedule; Special Student Populations (exceptional education and English Language Learners); School-specific goals and objectives, Assessment; School Climate and Discipline; and Prior Success in Raising Student Achievement
  
  - **Operations Plan** – Includes governing body; governing board composition; governance structure; management and operations; staffing; Human Resources; Professional Development; Student Recruitment and Enrollment; and Community Involvement.
  
  - **Financial/Business Plan** – Including budget assumptions, five year budget and first year start-up budget; Financial Management; Transportation/Food Service/Other Partnerships; Insurance; and Pre-Opening Plan, payroll, fundraising, compliance with state and federal reporting requirements
  
  - **Final Capacity Analysis Summary** – Review and recap of all three areas – academic, operations, and financial – with emphasis on the reasons for recommending approval or denial
Opening a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan. It is not an endeavor for which strength in one area can compensate for weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must meet or exceed the criteria in all three areas of the capacity review in order to move forward to the next phases of consideration.

**Phase II – Absolute Priorities**
If an application meets standard in all four (4) areas of the capacity review, it then moves to Phase II. The application must meet both absolute priorities of strong academic benchmarks and diversity plan that aligns with the MNPS Board of Education diversity goals. A separate diversity plan submitted by applicants will be evaluated for recruiting plans, transportation, facility acquisition and recruitment strategies to discern whether an applicant meets diversity standards. An application that does not meet both absolute priorities in Phase II will not move forward in the application process.

**Phase III – Competitive Priorities**
Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendation for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district.
Proposal Overview

School Name  International Academy of Excellence

Mission and Vision: The mission of the International Academy of Excellence is to provide a quality education in a safe learning environment for and linguistically diverse student population. The International Academy of Excellence will blend academic rigor with character building and cultural awareness to enable its students to thrive within a global society.

Proposed location: Southeast Davidson County

Enrollment Projections (to be copied from the table in the Proposed Overview & Enrollment section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Planned # of Students</th>
<th>Maximum # of Students</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>K, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>K-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Capacity</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

School Name: International Academy of Excellence

Summary of Section Ratings
Ratings options for each section are Exceeds the Standard; Meets the Standard; Partially Meets the Standard; Does Not Meet the Standard.

Phase I Capacity Review
Academic Plan
Does Not Meet Standard

This includes the entire plan for the academic program including at-risk and ELL students

Operations Plan
Does Not Meet Standard

This includes the proposed governance and management structure, including skill and experience of governing board, and leadership team, relevant experience and record of performance based on due diligence. Also included is school staffing, start-up and operations, performance management systems and facilities plans

Financial/Business Plan
Does Not Meet Standard

This includes the start-up budget, operating budget and budget notes and assumptions

Capacity Analysis Summary
Does Not Meet Standard

Included is a summary of all other sections and a statement of the overall confidence of the review committee that the applicant has the capacity to start and operate a successful school
Phase II Absolute Priorities

Academic Benchmarks

Recommendation

N/A

New school will increase number of Achieving or Excelling schools on an annual and three year rolling basis; new school will serve students currently not served in Achieving or Excelling schools; new school will establish annual performance targets and benchmarks aligned with the Academic Performance Framework (APF)

Diversity Management

New school will meet diversity definitions in the MNPS Diversity Management Strategy; new school will adopt a diversity plan supportive of and similar in kind to the MNPS Diversity Strategy; new school will not reduce the number of diverse schools (district-run or charter) currently operating in Nashville

Phase III Competitive Priorities (one or more of three)

Growth/Demand

Recommendation

N/A

New school will assist in serving students currently attending schools that are overcrowded or likely to become overcrowded; new school will offer opportunities to serve students at schools with enrollments that are rapidly declining or below a reasonable threshold; new school will expand district capacity to respond to population growth consistent with its goals for academic excellence and diversity; new school will recruit, retain, locate and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand opportunities for families who are unable to access similar options at present

Management Conversion

New school will serve all students residing in the current school zone of an MNPS school with a three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework as of fall 2014; sponsor organization offers experience and planning demonstrating expertise in school turnaround and building schools with readiness to teach, readiness to learn, and readiness to act; new school proposal addresses transition challenges and costs associated with serving all students well who reside in the current school zone of an MNPS school with three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework; new school will recruit, retain, locate, and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand options for families who are unable to access similar options at present
Continuation/Additional Grades for Existing Operators

New school will open a high school pathway with priority enrollment for all students matriculating from an existing middle school managed by the same operator; existing middle school will be in Achieving or Excelling status on the Academic Performance Framework; review of the criteria for replication applications offers great confidence that the new school will continue to serve students well.

Applications that pass the capacity review and meet the absolute priorities in Phases I and II may be considered for their ability to serve the competitive priority of management conversion. All applications found to have the capacity to serve this priority will be then ranked by tier-level according to the relative quality of the plan and the strength of the stated commitments.

Phase IV Annual New School Investment Plan Matching

Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendations for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district. Schools will be selected to fill needs according to their priority ranking until all identified annual needs are met.
Academic Plan

Plan Summary – International Academy of Excellence proposes to open an elementary school with grades K-4, beginning with Kindergarten in the southeast area of Davidson County. The school proposes a modified STEM approach with an emphasis on linguistic and cultural diversity, and will prepare students for success in a global society. IAE will provide an esteemed education, meaning the implementation of a standards-based curriculum, extended instructional time and an early college focus. Technology will be implemented in every classroom and a co-teaching model was presented.

Analysis – The Educational Plan does not meet standard for approval because the proposal is more theoretical in nature with many different theories presented, but with little or no research concerning which of the theories has been proven to improve academic outcomes for the targeted population of students. Educational strategies were unclear and academic benchmarks were vague and used outdated adequate yearly progress metrics as an indicator of success. No clear plan was presented as to how those strategies would be implemented, and the applicants were very vague on what success in a global society might look like. Although STEM was mentioned, there is insufficient detail – no strategies were mentioned and there are no student technology goals.

Applicants were unable to provide a clear plan for assessment and communication of goals for students in grades K-2, indicating there would be internal benchmarks set and assessments given. However, the review team is unclear on how that would be accomplished. Additionally, the applicant referred to outdated assessments (PARCC, ELDA, TELPA, etc.) and did not reference TN Ready or the recently adopted assessments for EL students. No formative or interim assessments were mentioned, with the exception of NWEA MAP, which was mentioned only briefly and not fully explained as to its use. There was no clear plan to review data or how data would be used to inform instructional practice.

There is no consistency throughout the document or during the interview concerning both class size and the co-teaching model. Five different co-teaching models were outlined in the application and when questioned, the applicants stated they would take the best from each one. They additionally stated the teachers would be able to choose which ones they would use, and also that the co-teaching model would be phased in, leaving the review team confused as to how co-teaching might be implemented or how teachers would be trained in its use and effectiveness.
The applicants state that students who need more educational support or who do not make sufficient academic progress may be referred to their family physician for evaluation of a medical condition (such as ADHD). Although there is a reference to RTI2, it is not clear how it will be implemented or when a referral to a physician might be warranted. The review team has many concerns with this approach, which only were heightened after the interview process:

- Schools do not typically refer children to their family doctor for ADHD diagnosis
- Applicants were unable to sufficiently answer very specific questions related to provision of special education services to students who may have multiple disabilities, stating frequently that transparency is important. Reviewers are unsure if the applicant understands they are required to serve all students, regardless of disability, under Tennessee law, and the indication was they would be letting families know their school was not the best place for a child with multiple behavior or academic issues.
- No differentiated levels of instruction offered for special needs learners
- Budget assumptions regarding how the applicant would provide special transportation or other services to students with those needs were vague and unclear. While there was a reference to working with MNPS, no evidence was presented that gave the review team confidence this applicant understands the financial ramifications or obligations of providing related services, transportation, additional personnel, etc. for special needs students.
- No clear plans for the required on-going progress monitoring for students with disabilities
- Applicants used IEP’s and Tier II and III interventions interchangeably, thus contributing to the general review team sense that the applicants do not understand the difference between interventions for general education students and students with disabilities who have an IEP.

The southeast portion of Nashville, where the applicant has indicated they will locate their school, has a very high EL population, and the applicants indicated plans to teach Spanish, as well as Japanese and/or Arabic utilizing Rosetta Stone software. While applicants discussed the benefits of acquisition of another language at an early age, the review team had concerns about very young students’ capacity to learn two additional languages at one time, particularly those who already struggle with English. There was insufficient detail given concerning research around this strategy, nor could the applicant articulate how this would be incorporated into the daily schedule. There does not appear to be a robust, comprehensive plan to accommodate students whose first language is not English.

The recruitment and enrollment plan for attracting students is insufficient in detail and there is no robust proposal presented to ensure the school will be able to attract area families or a defined recruitment area given.
Amended Application Analysis of Education Plan

The amended Academic Plan does not meet standard because, while the applicant did present a clearer picture of blended learning and a better look at co-teaching, the review team was unable to determine a clear curriculum plan, nor were there any STEM goals discussed, although STEM was mentioned in the narrative. There appears to be a heavy reliance on computer programs rather than teacher provided instruction and the technology plan related to blended learning was unclear and vague. Professional development for teachers also seemed vague and lacked specificity or detail.

The plans for special education students were still unclear, and the applicant still indicated they would refer a student to their family doctor for ADHD assessment, as well as referring students back to MNPS for certain services. Additionally, the applicant referenced special education students, ELL students, and RTI2 services interchangeably, which does not give the review team confidence that the applicant has the expertise needed for those special populations of students.

Additionally, the applicant still referred to outdated state assessments such as the PARCC, ELDA, and TELPA, and listed Study Island as a tool for RTI2 progress monitoring, which is not a viable or allowable option.

Reviewers had questions about the school schedules, particularly the extended day services. The daily schedule seemed especially long for young children, and there was a lack of clarity surrounding the extracurricular activities in the afternoon. It appeared that this was when the language classes would be offered, as opposed to being integrated into the regular school day. Additionally, the applicant still included teaching as many as three languages, but did not offer a clear rationale other than preparation for a “global” world.
Operations Plan

Plan Summary – International Academy of Excellence is sponsored by Beyond the Border non-profit organization. The governing board consists of seven (7) members, with an additional two (2) members added upon approval. There will be an Executive Director and Principal, as well as five (5) core teachers the first year of operation and three (3) non-core teachers. The school will follow the MNPS yearly schedule, and the school day will begin at 7:30 and end at 3:55, with additional time until 4:45 for extracurricular activities. They have tentatively selected a facility, and will purchase buses for transportation. The applicant will work with MNPS food service to provide meals.

Analysis – The Operational Plan does not meet standard for approval because there is very little specificity concerning critical aspects of school operations. Starting with the governing board, board members appear have a variety of education experience, but there is no one on the board with management, organizational or start-up school experience and the review team is not confident the expertise needed to open and run a new elementary charter school exists with the current members. Additionally, the applicant has an inadequate policy in place to handle parent concerns, and is under the mistaken impression that all complaints will go to the MNPS Director of Schools. Because of this the review team is not confident that this governing board is aware of its responsibilities.

Throughout the application, the applicant refers to the use of technology, but the budget assumptions do not show any laptops or other computers for students. When questioned in the interview, the applicant team indicated they would rely heavily on a community partner who owns a computer shop. However, no evidence was presented that gives the review team confidence this partner and/or the applicant team understand the required elements for building out a computer network. This lack of attention to detail is very concerning to the review team.

Additionally, the start-up plan as presented is confusing and does not appear to have been well-thought out. For example, the applicant indicates if approved, they would conduct a lottery between June and September 2015. This timeline is unrealistic at best and at worst reflects an inadequate understanding of Tennessee law as it relates to lottery requirements.

The facility plans are very concerning to the review team. Although the applicants identify a space they may lease and include the lease agreement, there is a lack of specificity concerning if 13,000 square feet is adequate, how much build out will be required in order to be able to house students, who is responsible for payment for such
build-out, the timetable required to execute the required changes, and whether there is money in the budget to cover all cost contingencies.

Transportation is described as purchasing one bus, but the school will begin with 100 students. Assuming even 80% of the students ride the bus, one will be an inadequate number. Additionally, there is no plan presented that outlines a bus route, where students will be picked up, or presents a contingency plan in the event the one bus breaks down or must be taken out of service for repairs.

Equally concerning is the teacher recruitment process outlined on page 92 of the application. The plan lacks a clear vision of how the applicant expects to attract and retain teachers and contains no job descriptions or expectations for teachers. While the applicant speaks of co-teaching with either two teachers or a teacher and an educational assistant in each classroom, the staffing model shows only 5 teachers in year 1 with one educational assistant.

Professional development plans are unclear and lack specificity. While they are described generally, the review team could not determine how, when or on what relevant topics professional development would center. Reference is made to specific professional development on both ELL and special education that has been developed by different professors. However, it is not clear whether these professors would be doing the training, or if a staff member would be trained and then utilize the “train the trainer” method of ensuring the staff is trained. Neither the methodology nor pedagogy of these training programs is discussed in any detail, so it was impossible for the review team to determine if these programs are adequate or if they include elements of Tennessee law. Additionally, it is not clear if the applicant must pay for the use of these programs or trainers, and there is no mention of them in the budget assumptions.

Food service plans are inadequate and unclear. While the applicant indicates they prefer a partnership with MNPS, they also reference “scratch” cooking, and there are no indications they are aware of the space and equipment requirements needed in order for MNPS to be able to provide service. Additionally, there is no mention of whether there is any such equipment or a kitchen already in place in the proposed facility and there is no money in the budget assumptions for building out such a space. The applicant does not appear to understand the requirements of the School Nutrition Program.

Finally, school health and safety plans are inadequate and lack specificity. The applicant seems to indicate they will partner with the Metro Health Department to assist with nutrition, but the Health Department has a contract with MNPS and does not serve charter schools. The costs for a health care provider are not reflected in the budget.
Amended Application Operational Analysis

The amended operational plan does not meet standard for approval because it did not substantially change from the first application submitted. Although the applicant did clarify their food service plans and included a quote from MNPS transportation for their bus service, many other items that were cited deficient remained concerning to the review team, including:

- Lack of specific professional development plans – while the applicant clarified how many times PD would occur, they did not offer any specificity.
- ELL and Special Education training for teachers was cited as being given from samples developed by two professors, but lacked citations on this model or if these models qualified as best practice.
- Teacher recruiting and staffing is still unclear and lacks focus.
- Equipping a kitchen to the standard necessary for MNPS food service to be able to serve the school was not mentioned in the budget assumptions or in the budget line items.
- Costs for build-out that may be required in a leased building were not itemized or included in budget assumptions.
- The amended application includes a quote from the MNPS transportation department, but the narrative of the application also included an indication the organization would purchase a bus. The review team is not clear on how transportation will be provided to all students.
- The description of how the school would handle complaints still appears to be under the assumption that complaints would be directed to the MNPS Director of Schools.
Financial/Business Plan

Plan Summary – The International Academy of Excellence submitted their budget on the incorrect form and the team was unable to fully evaluate this part of the application.

Analysis – The Financial Plan does not meet the criteria for approval due to the fact that it could not be evaluated after being submitted on the wrong form and deemed incomplete.

The team did look at the budget assumptions, however, and it was determined that many of the assumptions did not align with the claims made in either the written application or in the interview process. Some examples:

- STEM mentioned in the academic section but no mention is made in the budget assumptions for computers for students.
- Most state assessments are moving to on-line administration, and while the applicant indicated they would purchase a laptop cart, this is not reflected in the budget assumptions.
- Use of Kickboard software for student monitoring is mentioned numerous times throughout the written document; however, there is no mention of this program in the budget assumptions.
- While the applicant speaks of co-teaching with either two teachers or a teacher and an educational assistant in each classroom, the staffing model shows only 5 teachers in year 1 with one educational assistant.

During both the written application review and the follow-up interview, it is clear the applicant does not have a strong understanding of funding streams, or how they would receive their BEP monies. The indication was that they would rely on grants when and if funding deficits occurred, but when questioned, could not provide specifics on the grants that would be pursued, donors who have committed, or will commit, resources for the school. A contingency plan for the school should their enrollment fall below the 100 students required to meet their budget is non-existent and this is concerning to the review team. Cash flow projections do not meet the criteria outlined in the Financial Performance Framework, salaries are out of line (year 5 the principal is projected to receive between $207,000 and $530,000), and very little money is budgeted for textbooks, supplies, assessments, furniture, etc.

The applicant makes reference to partnering with EdTec to provide back-office services, and EdTec appears to have given prices, but those services are not detailed in the budget assumptions.
Amended Application Financial/Business Plan Analysis

The amended application financial/business plan does not meet the criteria for approval because, while the review team could see improvements in the budget development, there were still concerns regarding the lack of alignment between the budget narrative, the academic plan and the budget document. For example, the academic plan calls for two teachers per classroom; however, the budget outlined five teachers for the first year for 100 kindergarten students. This appears to include ELL and Special Education teachers as well. Additionally, the budget narrative shows the recommendation for hiring three (3) assistant teachers. The staffing plan on page 51 matches the budget, but the budget does not match the instructional plan. The staffing model alternately shows a 16:1 and a 20:1 ratio. Additional to this, the applicant once again used the incorrect form to submit the budget, using the old state form instead of the new one posted for all 2015 applicants on the state’s web site.

Applicants made the assumption that they will receive CSP grant money in the amount of $500,000, and made that a part of their budget. The CSP grant is a competitive grant and there is no guarantee the school will be awarded the grant.

Applicants made the erroneous statement that EdTec, a back office provider, would serve as their Charter Management Organization (CMO). This appears several times throughout the application and gives the review team a clear indication the applicant does not understand the terminology or the function of a CMO.

Finally, reviewers expressed their deepest concerns regarding funds for technology. Within the described blended learning environment, the applicants appear to utilize a variety of computer programs and hardware, but there is no corresponding budget for either that would support a blended learning environment.
Capacity Analysis Summary

**Analysis** – The International Academy of Excellence does not meet the standard for approval in any of the three major areas of the application: Academic Plan, Operational Plan, or Financial Plan. The review team does not believe this applicant can start and sustain a successful, high-performing school that raises the academic achievement of the students who attend.

The academic plan lacks definition and is not well-designed. There is a lack of focused curriculum, robust supports for struggling and special needs students, a plan for EL students that aligns with state law, and targeted academic benchmarks with outcomes that are indicative of a high performing school. Little research is presented to support the co-teaching model as it relates to the targeted population of students, and there is a lack of specific, measurable, and coherent academic strategies that would give the review team confidence that the applicant can open and run a successful school. Most disturbing to the review team was that it appears students with significant disabilities might be discouraged from attending the school. The applicant states attending the school is a privilege, and clearly does not understand the premise of a free public education for all.

The operational structure is equally unfocused, with no solid student or teacher recruitment plans, inconsistencies in staffing models, and vague transportation and food service plans. Facility plans are ambiguous and there is no plan presented that convinces the review team the applicant is aware of the cost of bringing the facility up to current codes and ADA requirements or how much that might cost. The co-teaching model referred to throughout the application as either two teachers or a teacher and an educational assistant in each classroom is not evident in the staffing models or in budget assumptions. Budget assumptions do not align with the narrative within the application in key areas, and contingency plans are non-existent.

While the team was unable to review the financial document, as it was submitted on the wrong form and was incomplete, the budget assumptions and the few line items we could see do not align and it is impossible to discern if the applicant has the expertise or experience to create a viable, robust budget that supports the mission, vision, and academic plan for the school.

**Amended Capacity Analysis**

The amended application does not meet the standard for approval in any of the three major areas of the application. This includes the Academic, Operations and Financial plans. The review team still does not have confidence this applicant can open and sustain a successful school that creates a high-quality learning environment or is in the best interests of the students, families or community in which they wish to locate.
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Introduction

Charter schools are public schools operated by independent, non-profit governing bodies that must include parents. In Tennessee, public charter school students are measured against the same academic standards as students in other public schools. Charter schools are required to serve all eligible students, with the education of at-risk students being of utmost importance.

It is the responsibility of the authorizer, to apply a rigorous authorization process in order to ensure only those charter schools meeting the needs of students open. Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools is interested in charter applicants who demonstrate the capacity to educate the most at-risk students in highly diverse and personalized settings.

An existing Tennessee operator proposing to open an exact model (including focus and grade levels) of an existing school currently authorized by MNPS may submit just the replication application, along with a copy of the original application of the school to be replicated.

The replication application allows existing operators to describe their organization’s structure, track record, and capacity to operate one or more schools in Tennessee and within MNPS. MNPS is allowed to look at previous academic data, operational data and financial data as found within the performance frameworks that are included as a part of each charter contract and that are used in creating the annual school report card for each charter school.
The Office of Innovation, Division of Charter Schools, has worked closely with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) to set up an evaluation process that embodies best practices from authorizers throughout the country and is rigorous and thorough.

In accordance with the NACSA Principles and Standards, three review teams were assembled to review the April, 2015 applications. Each team consisted of a team lead plus individuals who had expertise with curriculum, special education, English language learners, charter school financials, operations, management and legal. Each team was given extensive training in application review and interviewing techniques.

The Office of Innovation and one MNPS board representative exercised additional oversight of the process.

The stages of review are as follows:

**Phase I - Capacity Review**
Charter applications are thoroughly reviewed to insure sufficient strength in areas of Education Plan, Organization Plan and Business/Financial Plan, and Portfolio Review/Performance Record as described below:

- **Proposal Overview**
  Basic information about the proposed school
- **Evaluation**
  Analysis of the proposal based on the four major areas of plan development
  - **Educational Plan** – Key academic features described in the original application that might differ from the operator’s existing schools
  - **Organizational Plan** – Includes governing body; governing board composition, management and operations; staffing and Human Resources; Professional Development; Student Recruitment and Enrollment; Growth Plan, CMO status (if applicable), and detailed management plan for governance structure at both the school and network levels
  - **Business Plan** – Including budget assumptions, five year budget and first year start-up budget; Financial Management; network fiscal capacity with an emphasis on human capital expenditures, accounting, purchasing, payroll, and audits
  - **Portfolio Review/Performance Record** – Summary of replicating school’s performance record and network financial capacity.

**Opening a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan. It is not an endeavor for which strength in one area can compensate for**
weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must meet or exceed the criteria in all four areas of the capacity review in order to move forward to the next phases of consideration.

**Phase II – Absolute Priorities**
If an application meets standard in all four (4) areas of the capacity review, it then moves to Phase II. The application must meet both absolute priorities of strong academic benchmarks and diversity plan that aligns with the MNPS Board of Education diversity goals. A separate diversity plan submitted by applicants will be evaluated for recruiting plans, transportation, facility acquisition and recruitment strategies to discern whether an applicant meets diversity standards. An application that does not meet both absolute priorities in Phase II will not move forward in the application process.

**Phase III – Competitive Priorities**
Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendation for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district.
Proposal Overview

School Name: Rocketship Nashville #3

Rationale for Expanding Current Network of Schools: Rocketship’s mission is to eliminate the achievement gap by graduating their students at or above grade level in Literacy and Math. Furthermore, Rocketship seeks to create a future in which thousands of children from Tennessee have graduated from four-year colleges and have come back to Tennessee to eradicate the last traces of the achievement gap.

Proposed location: Southeastern Davidson County within the Overton, Glencliff, and Antioch clusters.

Enrollment Projections (to be copied from the table in the Proposed Overview & Enrollment section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Planned # of Students</th>
<th>Maximum # of Students</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Capacity</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

School Name

Deny

Summary of Section Ratings
Ratings options for each section are Exceeds the Standard; Meets the Standard; Partially Meets the Standard; Does Not Meet the Standard.

Phase I Capacity Review

Academic Plan Design and Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partially Meets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amended Academic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partially Meets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If applicable, rationale and identified resources for any key academic features that would differ significantly from the organization’s current model

Operations Plan and Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets or Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amended Operations Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets or Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A strong description of the network vision, growth plan, and capacity for quality school replication. Includes staffing plans, network management, governance, and school management contracts (if applicable)

Financial Plan and Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets or Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amended Financial Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets or Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Financial plan is aligned internally, accounts for network growth as well as individual school growth, has sufficient cash flow, revenues, and realistic budget assumptions.

Portfolio Review/Performance Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partially Meets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Amended Portfolio Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partially Meets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Review of previous performance management reports – academic, operational, and financial
Phase II Absolute Priorities

Academic Benchmarks

New school will increase number of Achieving or Excelling schools on an annual and three year rolling basis; new school will serve students currently not served in Achieving or Excelling schools; new school will establish annual performance targets and benchmarks aligned with the Academic Performance Framework (APF)

Diversity Management

New school will meet diversity definitions in the MNPS Diversity Management Strategy; new school will adopt a diversity plan supportive of and similar in kind to the MNPS Diversity Strategy; new school will not reduce the number of diverse schools (district-run or charter) currently operating in Nashville

Phase III Competitive Priorities (one or more of three)

Growth/Demand

New school will assist in serving students currently attending schools that are overcrowded or likely to become overcrowded; new school will offer opportunities to serve students at schools with enrollments that are rapidly declining or below a reasonable threshold; new school will expand district capacity to respond to population growth consistent with its goals for academic excellence and diversity; new school will recruit, retain, locate and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand opportunities for families who are unable to access similar options at present

Management Conversion

New school will serve all students residing in the current school zone of an MNPS school with a three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework as of fall 2015; sponsor organization offers experience and planning demonstrating expertise in school turnaround and building schools with readiness to teach, readiness to learn, and readiness to act; new school proposal addresses transition challenges and costs associated with serving all students well who reside in the current school zone of an MNPS school with three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework; new school will recruit, retain, locate, and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand options for families who are unable to access similar options at present
Continuation/Addition of Grades for Existing Operators

New school will open a school pathway with priority enrollment for all students matriculating from an existing elementary/middle school managed by the same operator; existing school will be in Achieving or Excelling status on the Academic Performance Framework; review of the criteria for replication applications offers great confidence that the new school will continue to serve students well

Applications that pass the capacity review and meet the absolute priorities in Phases I and II may be considered for their ability to serve the competitive priority of management conversion. All applications found to have the capacity to serve this priority will be then ranked by tier-level according to the relative quality of the plan and the strength of the stated commitments.
Academic Plan Design and Capacity

Plan Summary – Rocketship Nashville proposes to open their third elementary school with grades K-4. The academic plan will not differ significantly from the original Rocketship model. Rocketship’s instructional model is a teacher-led, technology-supported approach to personalized learning. Teachers leverage frequent assessment and learning lab data to group students for targeted instruction. Rocketship utilizes a unique integrated special education program, with special education teachers pushing into the classrooms to provide support and co-teaching. Teachers collaborate to provide greater differentiation for all learning. Rocketship provides a positive behavior intervention and support culture that promotes character development and offers social emotional curriculum to all students. Blended learning initiatives increase access to technology, self-paced curriculum and on-going real time data.

Analysis – The academic plan partially meets the criteria for approval because there is considerable concern that the organization does not have a proven record of success in Tennessee. The first Nashville Rocketship school has not yet been in existence a full school year; thus, they do not have TCAP scores to enable reviewers to explore accountability data. Additionally, the state replication application and guidance (issued prior to the 2015 application cycle) specifically indicate a replication application is appropriate only if a school is in at least year two (2) of operation so there is academic data to support expansion and to assist in evaluating the capacity of an organization to expand.

The review team found many areas of the academic plan to be strengths, including:

- Strong academic plan with double literacy blocks. Further explanation history of effectiveness of this approach further outlined in the review session.
- The plan for social-emotional learning was thoroughly and thoughtfully developed, including the intentional application of SEL practices throughout the day. Recess was defined as an avenue for authentic application of practices, with teachers required to be present at their recess periods to monitor opportunities of collaborative interactions and conflict resolution.
- Use of a learning lab was outlined within the application, and its use appears to supplement education rather than drive it completely.
- Review team felt the Professional Development Plan to be strong, including GLADE Training for social emotional development. There were, however, remaining questions related to how 250 hours of PD are incorporated into the school year.
- Rocketship’s approach to cases where there is a lack of parental involvement was outstanding. Data related to the number of hours parent volunteered at the school, participated in activities, etc. was viewed not as a hammer with which to threaten parents, but as a yardstick by which to measure the school’s ability to effectively engage families. The importance of parent involvement and well developed strategies were clearly communicated and included: Parent/Teacher Conferences occur 3 times per year. Utilizing parents for outreach, and strategies to foster increased parent
participation such as meeting families in their homes or community centers as opposed to the school when schedules and/or transportation pose issues for the family.

**Amended Application Academic Plan Analysis**

At the time of the first submission, state assessment data was not available for the review team to consider. Since that time, the data has been released and the review team, after very thorough consideration of Rocketship’s mission, vision, and capacity, still has very serious concerns.

On the scoring rubric, one of the standards the team has to consider with a replication is the performance record of an existing school: If operator has existing schools within the district, previous compliance/performance reports show evidence of student academic success, organizational efficiency, and financial sustainability. Plainly, the results that Rocketship’s Nashville school achieved in 2014-15 do not meet this standard.

Rocketship’s achievement results showed fewer than 1 in 5 students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts (17.7%) and fewer than 1 in 3 proficient or advanced in math (29.1%). These results were the lowest of any charter school in Nashville’s portfolio and lower than schools that have previously requested to expand their student numbers and been denied that opportunity because of poor results. It is the policy of MNPS not to expand seats or replicate schools whose performance is substandard, and the results that Rocketship demonstrated this year were significantly substandard.

Rocketship used its resubmission to make the case that strong TVAAS results (5) justified replication of the school model, but the application did not address, nor did it even reveal, the extremely low achievement scores. In fact, reviewers had to obtain the academic achievement data from state resources rather than the charter applicant. Growth is important, and the results from 2014-15 convey optimism that student achievement will eventually improve. When it does, we fully anticipate that Rocketship will be able to reapply for replication, but growth without achievement does not justify replication at this time, and the application’s failure to address the achievement reality suggests that the applicant understands that reality.

The achievement scores for 2014-15 did not significantly outperform schools with similar demographics or schools with similar prior achievement, nor did it positively compare in any achievement category with other charter schools. In math, 5 of Nashville’s Priority Schools were within ±5% of Rocketship’s score with 3 Priority Schools scoring higher than Rocketship. In reading/language arts, 9 of Nashville’s Priority Schools were within ±5% of Rocketship’s score with 5 Priority Schools scoring higher than Rocketship.
The committee sincerely hopes that results at Rocketship’s first to schools will improve in the year ahead and points to positive growth as the basis for that hope. However, hoping for better results in the future does not meet the standards for further replication of existing schools. Rocketship was already awarded a second school based on the perceived strengths of the model, and further replication is now subject to the clear wording of the standard in the replication application that is stated above. Now that “the operator has existing schools within the district,” it is the track record of those schools that determines whether or not the schools can replicate. It is clear that the current achievement of the applicant’s school does not “show evidence of student academic success.” Rocketship’s current track record is not better than the record of the lowest performing schools (Priority Schools) in the district. While we hope for improvement in those schools, we would not recommend replication of our Priority Schools until AFTER their achievement increases. Likewise, we cannot recommend replication of this charter school until AFTER its achievement increases.
Operational Plan and Capacity

Plan Summary – Rocketship Tennessee schools are governed by Rocketship Education’s (RSED) Board of Directors and will benefit from the support of the Rocketship Education Network Support Team (NEST). The governance structure will not change significantly with the addition of a conversion school. Rocketship has a local advisory board comprised of community members and parents of students attending the school.

The Rocketship model includes all grades beginning at the same time, with year 1 of the conversion estimated at 448 students. At capacity, Rocketship #3 will have 560 students.

The leadership team consists of a principal, two assistant principals, and a business operations manager. This is consistent with all Rocketship schools, including their first Nashville school which opened for the 2014-15 school year.

Staffing plans include salaries that average 20% above the local district and Rocketship will provide transportation and food service. Rocketship anticipates a 15% special needs population and the budgetary assumptions reflect these needs.

Organizational charts, start-up plans and job descriptions are included and recruitment and hiring plans are also presented. Rocketship outlines extensive professional development opportunities throughout the year.

Analysis - The Operational Plan meets the standard for approval because their operations model is well thought out and proven successful throughout the country. Additionally, the review team found these outstanding characteristics:

- Rocketship has a robust and well-developed talent pipeline. Applicants explained during the interview that not only do they have access to teachers trained in Rocketship’s methods here in Nashville, but they also have access to talent within the larger organization. Both the application and the interview indicated intentional development of staff as leaders
- The national Rocketship Education network is supportive to local schools
- The local advisory board has input into all aspects of the Nashville schools
- There is a well thought-out accountability system in place, with the use of a network health dashboard that monitors the health across a number of metrics including student achievement, staff satisfaction and staff retention
- Growth plans are viewed through the lens of a process called the Greenlight Process, which assesses Rocketship’s readiness to expand. Metrics include overall network
health, the network’s capacity to support growth, political and community support, financial commitments, affordable and safe school facilities, and an identified school leader capable of founding a new school and region

- Well thought out plans exist for choosing areas where school are low-performing and overcrowded.
- Both the written application and interview revealed the organization’s commitment to the principals as the instructional leaders at the school. A robust plan for operations provides support for school leaders so they can dedicate their full focus to instructional leadership
Financial Plan and Capacity

Plan Summary – Rocketship’s strategy is to achieve educational outcomes while becoming self-sufficient on the allotted public dollars once its schools are fully operational. This financial requirement allows Rocketship to achieve its impact objectives while also providing a replicable and affordable blueprint for other district or charter schools who seek to adopt its approach.

The replication application indicates a consolidated budget and a fee schedule to schools that support the regional office. These fees are between 3% and 5% and amount to approximately $100,000 per school at full enrollment.

The network budget presents a positive cash flow and extensive assistance from the national and regional staff for start-up schools. Additionally, contingency plans to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than normal are listed.

Analysis - The Financial Plan meets the standard for approval because the applicant presents viable and realistic budgets for both their current network, a five-year growth plan, and for each school. The budget assumptions align with the proposed budget with reasonable, well-supported revenues and cost assumptions, including the amount and sources of all anticipated funds, property, and other resources.

Additionally, Rocketship has already secured $2.5 million from the Charter School Growth Fund to support replication in Nashville.

Both the budget and assumptions are aligned with the educational and operational goals outlined in the application and the review team has great confidence that Rocketship can successfully replicate their model and provide excellent educational outcomes for students.
Portfolio Review/Performance Record

Summary of Performance – Rocketship Education is in its first year of operation with its Rocketship Nashville Northeast Elementary school. Thus, there is no academic data available to the review teams, and the first school report card concerning Rocketship will not be complete until later in 2015. National data presented indicates Rocketship is in the top 5% of California districts serving low-income students. The average Rocketship student showed 1.5 years’ growth in math and 1.3 years’ growth in reading according to NWEA MAP assessments.

Analysis - The Portfolio review indicates a school that has a sound academic, operational and financial plan, and the review team is impressed with their very thorough, well-thought out approach to achieving high academic gains with their students.

However, the review team has a few concerns about the organization that prompt a partially meets standard rating. They are:

- Rocketship has a very aggressive growth plan that also includes several schools through the Achievement School District. Although Rocketship itself has a very robust Greenlighting process to assess its growth capacity, the team is concerned that such rapid growth will dilute both the leadership and teacher pipelines.

- The review team did not see financials for the additional ASD schools should Rocketship be approved through them, and thus could not make a determination of how those schools might stretch financial capacity of the organization.

- It is important to note that while the review team is convinced overall that Rocketship has a strong school model, there is considerable concern that the organization does not have a proven record of success in Tennessee. The first Nashville Rocketship school has not yet been in existence a full school year; thus, there is no reliable academic data available to explore accountability and growth. A prudent investment strategy that is in the best interests of the students who will attend the schools is to wait to approve a third or fourth school until after evidence of how well the organization is meeting its robust achievement goals is available. Once approved, it becomes very difficult to stop the extra schools from opening even if the results of the first schools appear substandard, so the best interests of the students, the district, and the community are served by waiting until future years to consider approving this application.
Amended Application Portfolio Analysis
Rocketship showed growth numbers, but their academic achievement percentages placed them in the lower quadrant of schools, which leads the review team to the recommendation that Rocketship is not ready to expand their network at this time. The application does not meet the standard in the replication rubric that states: If operator has existing schools within the district, previous compliance/performance reports show evidence of student academic success, organizational efficiency, and financial sustainability. Nor, did the applicant use the application or resubmission process to make the case that growth ought to be considered to the exclusion of achievement data in meeting this standard. By identifying success not growth, this standard is plainly about achievement data, and there is no question that the achievement data for Rocketship’s existing schools in the district does not show evidence of student academic success.

The best interests of the students, district and community would be served by denying this application and allowing Rocketship the time needed to achieve success with the students they already have.
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Introduction

Charter schools are public schools operated by independent, non-profit governing bodies that must include parents. In Tennessee, public charter school students are measured against the same academic standards as students in other public schools. Charter schools are required to serve all eligible students, with the education of at-risk students being of utmost importance.

It is the responsibility of the authorizer, to apply a rigorous authorization process in order to ensure only those charter schools meeting the needs of students open. Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools is interested in charter applicants who demonstrate the capacity to educate the most at-risk students in highly diverse and personalized settings.

An existing Tennessee operator proposing to open an exact model (including focus and grade levels) of an existing school currently authorized by MNPS may submit just the replication application, along with a copy of the original application of the school to be replicated.

The replication application allows existing operators to describe their organization’s structure, track record, and capacity to operate one or more schools in Tennessee and within MNPS. MNPS is allowed to look at previous academic data, operational data and financial data as found within the performance frameworks that are included as a part of each charter contract and that are used in creating the annual school report card for each charter school.
Evaluation Process

The Office of Innovation, Division of Charter Schools, has worked closely with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) to set up an evaluation process that embodies best practices from authorizers throughout the country and is rigorous and thorough.

In accordance with the NACSA Principles and Standards, three review teams were assembled to review the April, 2015 applications. Each team consisted of a team lead plus individuals who had expertise with curriculum, special education, English language learners, charter school financials, operations, management and legal. Each team was given extensive training in application review and interviewing techniques.

The Office of Innovation and one MNPS board representative exercised additional oversight of the process.

The stages of review are as follows:

**Phase I - Capacity Review**
Charter applications are thoroughly reviewed to insure sufficient strength in areas of Education Plan, Organization Plan and Business/Financial Plan, and Portfolio Review/Performance Record as described below:

- **Proposal Overview**
  Basic information about the proposed school
- **Evaluation**
  Analysis of the proposal based on the four major areas of plan development
  - **Educational Plan** – Key academic features described in the original application that might differ from the operator’s existing schools
  - **Organizational Plan** – Includes governing body; governing board composition, management and operations; staffing and Human Resources; Professional Development; Student Recruitment and Enrollment; Growth Plan, CMO status (if applicable), and detailed management plan for governance structure at both the school and network levels
  - **Business Plan** – Including budget assumptions, five year budget and first year start-up budget; Financial Management; network fiscal capacity with an emphasis on human capital expenditures, accounting, purchasing, payroll, and audits
  - **Portfolio Review/Performance Record** – Summary of replicating school’s performance record and network financial capacity.

Opening a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan. It is not an endeavor for which strength in one area can compensate for
weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must meet or exceed the criteria in all four areas of the capacity review in order to move forward to the next phases of consideration.

Phase II – Absolute Priorities
If an application meets standard in all four (4) areas of the capacity review, it then moves to Phase II. The application must meet both absolute priorities of strong academic benchmarks and diversity plan that aligns with the MNPS Board of Education diversity goals. A separate diversity plan submitted by applicants will be evaluated for recruiting plans, transportation, facility acquisition and recruitment strategies to discern whether an applicant meets diversity standards. An application that does not meet both absolute priorities in Phase II will not move forward in the application process.

Phase III – Competitive Priorities
Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendation for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district.
Proposal Overview

**School Name:** Rocketship Nashville #4

**Rationale for Expanding Current Network of Schools:** Rocketship’s mission is to eliminate the achievement gap by graduating their students at or above grade level in Literacy and Math. Furthermore, Rocketship seeks to create a future in which thousands of children from Tennessee have graduated from four-year colleges and have come back to Tennessee to eradicate the last traces of the achievement gap.

**Proposed location:** Southeastern Davidson County with in the Overton, Glencliff, and Antioch clusters.

**Enrollment Projections (to be copied from the table in the Proposed Overview & Enrollment section)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Planned # of Students</th>
<th>Maximum # of Students</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Capacity</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

School Name

Summary of Section Ratings
Ratings options for each section are Exceeds the Standard; Meets the Standard; Partially Meets the Standard; Does Not Meet the Standard.

Phase I Capacity Review

Academic Plan Design and Capacity

- Partially Meets

If applicable, rationale and identified resources for any key academic features that would differ significantly from the organization’s current model.

Amended Academic Plan

- Partially Meets

Operations Plan and Capacity

- Meets or Exceeds

A strong description of the network vision, growth plan, and capacity for quality school replication. Includes staffing plans, network management, governance, and school management contracts (if applicable).

Amended Operations Plan

- Meets or Exceeds

Financial Plan and Capacity

- Meets or Exceeds

Financial plan is aligned internally, accounts for network growth as well as individual school growth, has sufficient cash flow, revenues, and realistic budget assumptions.

Amended Financial Plan

- Meets or Exceeds

Portfolio Review/Performance Record

- Meets or Exceeds

Review of previous performance management reports – academic, operational, and financial.
Phase II Absolute Priorities

Academic Benchmarks

New school will increase number of Achieving or Excelling schools on an annual and three year rolling basis; new school will serve students currently not served in Achieving or Excelling schools; new school will establish annual performance targets and benchmarks aligned with the Academic Performance Framework (APF)

Diversity Management

New school will meet diversity definitions in the MNPS Diversity Management Strategy; new school will adopt a diversity plan supportive of and similar in kind to the MNPS Diversity Strategy; new school will not reduce the number of diverse schools (district-run or charter) currently operating in Nashville

Phase III Competitive Priorities (one or more of three)

Growth/Demand

New school will assist in serving students currently attending schools that are overcrowded or likely to become overcrowded; new school will offer opportunities to serve students at schools with enrollments that are rapidly declining or below a reasonable threshold; new school will expand district capacity to respond to population growth consistent with its goals for academic excellence and diversity; new school will recruit, retain, locate and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand opportunities for families who are unable to access similar options at present

Management Conversion

New school will serve all students residing in the current school zone of an MNPS school with a three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework as of fall 2015; sponsor organization offers experience and planning demonstrating expertise in school turnaround and building schools with readiness to teach, readiness to learn, and readiness to act; new school proposal addresses transition challenges and costs associated with serving all students well who reside in the current school zone of an MNPS school with three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework; new school will recruit, retain, locate, and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand options for families who are unable to access similar options at present
Continuation/Addition of Grades for Existing Operators

New school will open a school pathway with priority enrollment for all students matriculating from an existing elementary/middle school managed by the same operator; existing school will be in Achieving or Excelling status on the Academic Performance Framework; review of the criteria for replication applications offers great confidence that the new school will continue to serve students well.

Applications that pass the capacity review and meet the absolute priorities in Phases I and II may be considered for their ability to serve the competitive priority of management conversion. All applications found to have the capacity to serve this priority will be then ranked by tier-level according to the relative quality of the plan and the strength of the stated commitments.
Academic Plan Design and Capacity

**Plan Summary** – Rocketship Nashville proposes to open their third elementary school with grades K-4. The academic plan will not differ significantly from the original Rocketship model. Rocketship’s instructional model is a teacher-led, technology-supported approach to personalized learning. Teachers leverage frequent assessment and learning lab data to group students for targeted instruction. Rocketship utilizes a unique integrated special education program, with special education teachers pushing into the classrooms to provide support and co-teaching. Teachers collaborate to provide greater differentiation for all learning. Rocketship provides a positive behavior intervention and support culture that promotes character development and offers social emotional curriculum to all students. Blended learning initiatives increase access to technology, self-paced curriculum and on-going real time data.

**Analysis** – The academic plan partially meets the criteria for approval because there is considerable concern that the organization does not have a proven record of success in Tennessee. The first Nashville Rocketship school has not yet been in existence a full school year; thus, they do not have TCAP scores to enable reviewers to explore accountability data. Additionally, the state replication application and guidance (issued prior to the 2015 application cycle) specifically indicate a replication application is appropriate only if a school is in at least year two (2) of operation so there is academic data to support expansion and to assist in evaluating the capacity of an organization to expand.

The review team found many areas of the academic plan to be strengths, including:

- Strong academic plan with double literacy blocks. Further explanation history of effectiveness of this approach further outlined in the review session.
- The plan for social-emotional learning was thoroughly and thoughtfully developed, including the intentional application of SEL practices throughout the day. Recess was defined as an avenue for authentic application of practices, with teachers required to be present at their recess periods to monitor opportunities of collaborative interactions and conflict resolution.
- Use of a learning lab was outlined within the application, and its use appears to supplement education rather than drive it completely.
- Review team felt the Professional Development Plan to be strong, including GLADE Training for social emotional development. There were, however, remaining questions related to how 250 hours of PD are incorporated into the school year.
- Rocketship’s approach to cases where there is a lack of parental involvement was outstanding. Data related to the number of hours parent volunteered at the school, participated in activities, etc. was viewed not as a hammer with which to threaten parents, but as a yardstick by which to measure the school’s ability to effectively engage families. The importance of parent involvement and well developed strategies were clearly communicated and included: Parent/Teacher Conferences occur 3 times per year. Utilizing parents for outreach, and strategies to foster increased parent
participation such as meeting families in their homes or community centers as opposed to the school when schedules and/or transportation pose issues for the family.

**Amended Application Academic Plan Analysis**

At the time of the first submission, state assessment data was not available for the review team to consider. Since that time, the data has been released and the review team, after very thorough consideration of Rocketship’s mission, vision, and capacity, still has very serious concerns.

On the scoring rubric, one of the standards the team has to consider with a replication is the performance record of an existing school: If operator has existing schools within the district, previous compliance/performance reports show evidence of student academic success, organizational efficiency, and financial sustainability. Plainly, the results that Rocketship’s Nashville school achieved in 2014-15 do not meet this standard.

Rocketship’s achievement results showed fewer than 1 in 5 students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts (17.7%) and fewer than 1 in 3 proficient or advanced in math (29.1%). These results were the lowest of any charter school in Nashville’s portfolio and lower than schools that have previously requested to expand their student numbers and been denied that opportunity because of poor results. It is the policy of MNPS not to expand seats or replicate schools whose performance is substandard, and the results that Rocketship demonstrated this year were significantly substandard.

Rocketship used its resubmission to make the case that strong TVAAS results (5) justified replication of the school model, but the application did not address, nor did it even reveal, the extremely low achievement scores. In fact, reviewers had to obtain the academic achievement data from state resources rather than the charter applicant. Growth is important, and the results from 2014-15 convey optimism that student achievement will eventually improve. When it does, we fully anticipate that Rocketship will be able to reapply for replication, but growth without achievement does not justify replication at this time, and the application’s failure to address the achievement reality suggests that the applicant understands that reality.

The achievement scores for 2014-15 did not significantly outperform schools with similar demographics or schools with similar prior achievement, nor did it positively compare in any achievement category with other charter schools. In math, 5 of Nashville’s Priority Schools were within +5% of Rocketship’s score with 3 Priority Schools scoring higher than Rocketship. In reading/language arts, 9 of Nashville’s Priority Schools were within +5% of Rocketship’s score with 5 Priority Schools scoring higher than Rocketship.

The committee sincerely hopes that results at Rocketship’s first to schools will improve
in the year ahead and points to positive growth as the basis for that hope. However, hoping for better results in the future does not meet the standards for further replication of existing schools. Rocketship was already awarded a second school based on the perceived strengths of the model, and further replication is now subject to the clear wording of the standard in the replication application that is stated above. Now that “the operator has existing schools within the district,” it is the track record of those schools that determines whether or not the schools can replicate. It is clear that the current achievement of the applicant’s school does not “show evidence of student academic success.” Rocketship’s current track record is not better than the record of the lowest performing schools (Priority Schools) in the district. While we hope for improvement in those schools, we would not recommend replication of our Priority Schools until AFTER their achievement increases. Likewise, we cannot recommend replication of this charter school until AFTER its achievement increases.
Operational Plan and Capacity

Plan Summary – Rocketship Tennessee schools are governed by Rocketship Education’s (RSED) Board of Directors and will benefit from the support of the Rocketship Education Network Support Team (NEST). The governance structure will not change significantly with the addition of a conversion school. Rocketship has a local advisory board comprised of community members and parents of students attending the school.

The Rocketship model includes all grades beginning at the same time, with year 1 of the conversion estimated at 448 students. At capacity, Rocketship #3 will have 560 students.

The leadership team consists of a principal, two assistant principals, and a business operations manager. This is consistent with all Rocketship schools, including their first Nashville school which opened for the 2014-15 school year.

Staffing plans include salaries that average 20% above the local district and Rocketship will provide transportation and food service. Rocketship anticipates a 15% special needs population and the budgetary assumptions reflect these needs.

Organizational charts, start-up plans and job descriptions are included and recruitment and hiring plans are also presented. Rocketship outlines extensive professional development opportunities throughout the year.

Analysis - The Operational Plan meets the standard for approval because their operations model is well thought out and proven successful throughout the country. Additionally, the review team found these outstanding characteristics:

- Rocketship has a robust and well-developed talent pipeline. Applicants explained during the interview that not only do they have access to teachers trained in Rocketship’s methods here in Nashville, but they also have access to talent within the larger organization. Both the application and the interview indicated intentional development of staff as leaders
- The national Rocketship Education network is supportive to local schools
- The local advisory board has input into all aspects of the Nashville schools
- There is a well thought-out accountability system in place, with the use of a network health dashboard that monitors the health across a number of metrics including student achievement, staff satisfaction and staff retention
- Growth plans are viewed through the lens of a process called the Greenlight Process, which assesses Rocketship’s readiness to expand. Metrics include overall network
health, the network’s capacity to support growth, political and community support, financial commitments, affordable and safe school facilities, and an identified school leader capable of founding a new school and region

• Well thought out plans exist for choosing areas where schools are low-performing and overcrowded.

• Both the written application and interview revealed the organization’s commitment to the principals as the instructional leaders at the school. A robust plan for operations provides support for school leaders so they can dedicate their full focus to instructional leadership
Financial Plan and Capacity

Plan Summary – Rocketship’s strategy is to achieve educational outcomes while becoming self-sufficient on the allotted public dollars once its schools are fully operational. This financial requirement allows Rocketship to achieve its impact objectives while also providing a replicable and affordable blueprint for other district or charter schools who seek to adopt its approach.

The replication application indicates a consolidated budget and a fee schedule to schools that support the regional office. These fees are between 3% and 5% and amount to approximately $100,000 per school at full enrollment.

The network budget presents a positive cash flow and extensive assistance from the national and regional staff for start-up schools. Additionally, contingency plans to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than normal are listed.

Analysis - The Financial Plan meets the standard for approval because the applicant presents viable and realistic budgets for both their current network, a five-year growth plan, and for each school. The budget assumptions align with the proposed budget with reasonable, well-supported revenues and cost assumptions, including the amount and sources of all anticipated funds, property, and other resources.

Additionally, Rocketship has already secured $2.5 million from the Charter School Growth Fund to support replication in Nashville.

Both the budget and assumptions are aligned with the educational and operational goals outlined in the application and the review team has great confidence that Rocketship can successfully replicate their model and provide excellent educational outcomes for students.
Portfolio Review/Performance Record

Summary of Performance – Rocketship Education is in its first year of operation with its Rocketship Nashville Northeast Elementary school. Thus, there is no academic data available to the review teams, and the first school report card concerning Rocketship will not be complete until later in 2015. National data presented indicates Rocketship is in the top 5% of California districts serving low-income students. The average Rocketship student showed 1.5 years’ growth in math and 1.3 years’ growth in reading according to NWEA MAP assessments.

Analysis - The Portfolio review indicates a school that has a sound academic, operational and financial plan, and the review team is impressed with their very thorough, well-thought out approach to achieving high academic gains with their students.

However, the review team has a few concerns about the organization that prompt a partially meets standard rating. They are:

- Rocketship has a very aggressive growth plan that also includes several schools through the Achievement School District. Although Rocketship itself has a very robust Greenlighting process to assess its growth capacity, the team is concerned that such rapid growth will dilute both the leadership and teacher pipelines.

- The review team did not see financials for the additional ASD schools should Rocketship be approved through them, and thus could not make a determination of how those schools might stretch financial capacity of the organization.

- It is important to note that while the review team is convinced overall that Rocketship has a strong school model, there is considerable concern that the organization does not have a proven record of success in Tennessee. The first Nashville Rocketship school has not yet been in existence a full school year; thus, there is no reliable academic data available to explore accountability and growth. A prudent investment strategy that is in the best interests of the students who will attend the schools is to wait to approve a third or fourth school until after evidence of how well the organization is meeting its robust achievement goals is available. Once approved, it becomes very difficult to stop the extra schools from opening even if the results of the first schools appear substandard, so the best interests of the students, the district, and the community are served by waiting until future years to consider approving this application.
Amended Application Portfolio Analysis
Rocketship showed growth numbers, but their academic achievement percentages placed them in the lower quadrant of schools, which leads the review team to the recommendation that Rocketship is not ready to expand their network at this time. The application does not meet the standard in the replication rubric that states: If operator has existing schools within the district, previous compliance/performance reports show evidence of student academic success, organizational efficiency, and financial sustainability. Nor, did the applicant use the application or resubmission process to make the case that growth ought to be considered to the exclusion of achievement data in meeting this standard. By identifying success not growth, this standard is plainly about achievement data, and there is no question that the achievement data for Rocketship’s existing schools in the district does not show evidence of student academic success.

The best interests of the students, district and community would be served by denying this application and allowing Rocketship the time needed to achieve success with the students they already have.
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Introduction

Charter schools are public schools operated by independent, non-profit governing bodies that must include parents. In Tennessee, public charter school students are measured against the same academic standards as students in other public schools. Charter schools are required to serve all eligible students, with the education of at-risk students being of utmost importance.

It is the responsibility of the authorizer, to apply a rigorous authorization process in order to ensure only those charter schools meeting the needs of students open. Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools is interested in charter applicants who demonstrate the capacity to educate the most at-risk students in highly diverse and personalized settings.

An existing Tennessee operator proposing to open an exact model (including focus and grade levels) of an existing school currently authorized by MNPS may submit just the replication application, along with a copy of the original application of the school to be replicated.

The replication application allows existing operators to describe their organization’s structure, track record, and capacity to operate one or more schools in Tennessee and within MNPS. MNPS is allowed to look at previous academic data, operational data and financial data as found within the performance frameworks that are included as a part of each charter contract and that are used in creating the annual school report card for each charter school.

Evaluation Process

The Office of Innovation, Division of Charter Schools, has worked closely with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) to set up an evaluation process that embodies best practices from authorizers throughout the country and is rigorous and thorough.

In accordance with the NACSA Principles and Standards, three review teams were assembled to review the April, 2015 applications. Each team consisted of a team lead plus individuals who had expertise with curriculum, special education, English language learners, charter school financials, operations, management and legal. Each team was given extensive training in application review and interviewing techniques.

The Office of Innovation and one MNPS board representative exercised additional oversight of the process.
The stages of review are as follows:

**Phase I - Capacity Review**
Charter applications are thoroughly reviewed to insure sufficient strength in areas of Education Plan, Organization Plan and Business/Financial Plan, and Portfolio Review/Performance Record as described below:

- **Proposal Overview**
  Basic information about the proposed school
- **Evaluation**
  Analysis of the proposal based on the four major areas of plan development
  - **Educational Plan** – Key academic features described in the original application that might differ from the operator’s existing schools
  - **Organizational Plan** – Includes governing body; governing board composition, management and operations; staffing and Human Resources; Professional Development; Student Recruitment and Enrollment; Growth Plan, CMO status (if applicable), and detailed management plan for governance structure at both the school and network levels
  - **Business Plan** – Including budget assumptions, five year budget and first year start-up budget; Financial Management; network fiscal capacity with an emphasis on human capital expenditures, accounting, purchasing, payroll, and audits
  - **Portfolio Review/Performance Record** – Summary of replicating school’s performance record and network financial capacity.

Opening a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan. It is not an endeavor for which strength in one area can compensate for weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must meet or exceed the criteria in all four areas of the capacity review in order to move forward to the next phases of consideration.

**Phase II – Absolute Priorities**
If an application meets standard in all four (4) areas of the capacity review, it then moves to Phase II. The application must meet both absolute priorities of strong academic benchmarks and diversity plan that aligns with the MNPS Board of Education diversity goals. A separate diversity plan submitted by applicants will be evaluated for recruiting plans, transportation, facility acquisition and recruitment strategies to discern whether an applicant meets diversity standards. An application that does not meet both absolute priorities in Phase II will not move forward in the application process.

**Phase III – Competitive Priorities**
Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office
of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendation for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district.
Proposal Overview

School Name: Rocketship Education Conversion

Rationale for Expanding Current Network of Schools: Rocketship’s mission is to eliminate the achievement gap by graduating their students at or above grade level in Literacy and Math. Furthermore, Rocketship seeks to create a future in which thousands of children from Tennessee have graduated from four-year colleges and have come back to Tennessee to eradicate the last traces of the achievement gap.

Proposed location: Rocketship will partner with Metro Nashville Public Schools to determine the school and community that will be best matched with Rocketship.

Enrollment Projections (to be copied from the table in the Proposed Overview & Enrollment section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Planned # of Students</th>
<th>Maximum # of Students</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Capacity</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

School Name: Rocketship Conversion

Summary of Section Ratings
Ratings options for each section are Exceeds the Standard; Meets the Standard; Partially Meets the Standard; Does Not Meet the Standard.

Phase I Capacity Review

Academic Plan Design and Capacity
- Partially Meets
- If applicable, rationale and identified resources for any key academic features that would differ significantly from the organization’s current model

Amended Academic Plan
- Partially Meets

Operations Plan and Capacity
- Meets or Exceeds
- A strong description of the network vision, growth plan, and capacity for quality school replication. Includes staffing plans, network management, governance, and school management contracts (if applicable)

Amended Operations Plan
- Meets or Exceeds

Financial Plan and Capacity
- Meets or Exceeds
- Financial plan is aligned internally, accounts for network growth as well as individual school growth, has sufficient cash flow, revenues, and realistic budget assumptions.

Amended Financial Plan
- Meets or Exceeds

Portfolio Review/Performance Record
- Partially Meets
- Review of previous performance management reports – academic, operational, and financial

Amended Portfolio Review
- Partially Meets
Phase II Absolute Priorities

Academic Benchmarks

New school will increase number of Achieving or Excelling schools on an annual and three year rolling basis; new school will serve students currently not served in Achieving or Excelling schools; new school will establish annual performance targets and benchmarks aligned with the Academic Performance Framework (APF)

Diversity Management

New school will meet diversity definitions in the MNPS Diversity Management Strategy; new school will adopt a diversity plan supportive of and similar in kind to the MNPS Diversity Strategy; new school will not reduce the number of diverse schools (district-run or charter) currently operating in Nashville

Phase III Competitive Priorities (one or more of three)

Growth/Demand

New school will assist in serving students currently attending schools that are overcrowded or likely to become overcrowded; new school will offer opportunities to serve students at schools with enrollments that are rapidly declining or below a reasonable threshold; new school will expand district capacity to respond to population growth consistent with its goals for academic excellence and diversity; new school will recruit, retain, locate and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand opportunities for families who are unable to access similar options at present

Management Conversion

New school will serve all students residing in the current school zone of an MNPS school with a three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework as of fall 2015; sponsor organization offers experience and planning demonstrating expertise in school turnaround and building schools with readiness to teach, readiness to learn, and readiness to act; new school proposal addresses transition challenges and costs associated with serving all students well who reside in the current school zone of an MNPS school with three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework; new school will recruit, retain, locate, and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand options for families who are unable to access similar options at present
Continuation/Addition of Grades for Existing Operators

New school will open a school pathway with priority enrollment for all students matriculating from an existing elementary/middle school managed by the same operator; existing school will be in Achieving or Excelling status on the Academic Performance Framework; review of the criteria for replication applications offers great confidence that the new school will continue to serve students well.

Applications that pass the capacity review and meet the absolute priorities in Phases I and II may be considered for their ability to serve the competitive priority of management conversion. All applications found to have the capacity to serve this priority will be then ranked by tier-level according to the relative quality of the plan and the strength of the stated commitments.

Phase IV Annual New School Investment Plan Matching
Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendations for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district. Schools will be selected to fill needs according to their priority ranking until all identified annual needs are met.
Academic Plan Design and Capacity

Plan Summary – Rocketship Nashville proposes to enter into their first conversion elementary school in partnership with MNPS to take over a low performing school and turn it into a high performing school. The academic plan will not differ significantly from the original Rocketship model. Rocketship’s instructional model is a teacher-led, technology-supported approach to personalized learning. Teachers leverage frequent assessment and learning lab data to group students for targeted instruction. Rocketship utilizes a unique integrated special education program, with special education teachers pushing into the classrooms to provide support and co-teaching. Teachers collaborate to provide greater differentiation for all learning. Rocketship provides a positive behavior intervention and support culture that promotes character development and offers social emotional curriculum to all students. Blended learning initiatives increase access to technology, self-paced curriculum and on-going real time data.

Analysis – The academic plan partially meets the criteria for approval because there is considerable concern that the organization does not have a proven record of success in Tennessee. The first Nashville Rocketship school has not yet been in existence a full school year; thus, they do not have TCAP scores to enable reviewers to explore accountability data. Additionally, the new guidelines published by the state of Tennessee concerning replications indicate a school should have been in existence for at least a year prior to replication so there is assessment data available to review teams to assist in evaluating the capacity of an organization to expand.

Reviewers also expressed concern regarding the expertise of the organization with parental involvement as related to school conversions. While the applicant has extensive experience promoting parental involvement in a new start-up, the conversion of a school, especially total conversion, will pose unique challenges. When sending their children to a start-up or an established school, parents have made the conscious choice to do so. When a conversion occurs, parents may perceive their choice has been taken away from them. A plan specific to working with families and community partners (potentially in a volatile environment) should be explored and developed.

The review team found many areas of the academic plan to be strengths, including:
- Strong academic plan with double literacy blocks. Further explanation history of effectiveness of this approach further outlined in the review session.
- The plan for social-emotional learning was thoroughly and thoughtfully developed, including the intentional application of SEL practices throughout the day. Recess was defined as an avenue for authentic application of practices, with teachers required to be present at their recess periods to monitor opportunities of collaborative interactions and conflict resolution.
- Use of a learning lab was outlined within the application, and its use appears to supplement education rather than drive it completely.
• Review team felt the Professional Development Plan to be strong, including GLADE Training for social emotional development. There were, however, remaining questions related to how 250 hours of PD are incorporated into the school year.
• Rocketship’s approach to cases where there is a lack of parental involvement was outstanding. Data related to the number of hours parent volunteered at the school, participated in activities, etc. was viewed not as a hammer with which to threaten parents, but as a yardstick by which to measure the school’s ability to effectively engage families. The importance of parent involvement and well developed strategies were clearly communicated and included: Parent/Teacher Conferences occur 3 times per year. Utilizing parents for outreach, and strategies to foster increased parent participation such as meeting families in their homes or community centers as opposed to the school when schedules and/or transportation pose issues for the family.

Amended Application Academic Plan Analysis
At the time of the first submission, state assessment data was not available for the review team to consider. Since that time, the data has been released and the review team, after very thorough consideration of Rocketship’s mission, vision, and capacity, still has very serious concerns.

On the scoring rubric, one of the standards the team has to consider with a replication is the performance record of an existing school: If operator has existing schools within the district, previous compliance/performance reports show evidence of student academic success, organizational efficiency, and financial sustainability. Plainly, the results that Rocketship’s Nashville school achieved in 2014-15 do not meet this standard.

Rocketship’s achievement results showed fewer than 1 in 5 students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts (17.7%) and fewer than 1 in 3 proficient or advanced in math (29.1%). These results were the lowest of any charter school in Nashville’s portfolio and lower than schools that have previously requested to expand their student numbers and been denied that opportunity because of poor results. It is the policy of MNPS not to expand seats or replicate schools whose performance is substandard, and the results that Rocketship demonstrated this year were significantly substandard.

Rocketship used its resubmission to make the case that strong TVAAS results (5) justified replication of the school model, but the application did not address, nor did it even reveal, the extremely low achievement scores. In fact, reviewers had to obtain the academic achievement data from state resources rather than the charter applicant. Growth is important, and the results from 2014-15 convey optimism that student achievement will eventually improve. When it does, we fully anticipate that Rocketship will be able to reapply for replication, but growth without achievement does not justify replication at this time, and the application’s failure to address the achievement reality suggests that the applicant understands that reality.
The achievement scores for 2014-15 did not significantly outperform schools with similar demographics or schools with similar prior achievement, nor did it positively compare in any achievement category with other charter schools. In math, 5 of Nashville’s Priority Schools were within +5% of Rocketship’s score with 3 Priority Schools scoring higher than Rocketship. In reading/language arts, 9 of Nashville’s Priority Schools were within +5% of Rocketship’s score with 5 Priority Schools scoring higher than Rocketship.

The committee sincerely hopes that results at Rocketship’s first to schools will improve in the year ahead and points to positive growth as the basis for that hope. However, hoping for better results in the future does not meet the standards for further replication of existing schools. Rocketship was already awarded a second school based on the perceived strengths of the model, and further replication is now subject to the clear wording of the standard in the replication application that is stated above. Now that “the operator has existing schools within the district,” it is the track record of those schools that determines whether or not the schools can replicate. It is clear that the current achievement of the applicant’s school does not “show evidence of student academic success.” Rocketship’s current track record is not better than the record of the lowest performing schools (Priority Schools) in the district. While we hope for improvement in those schools, we would not recommend replication of our Priority Schools until AFTER their achievement increases. Likewise, we cannot recommend replication of this charter school until AFTER its achievement increases.

This caused concern related to conversion of a significantly low performing school. In particular, identifying a school for conversion that is among our Priority Schools would possibly be a school that outperformed Rocketship in 2014-15. Of course, the purpose of conversion is to produce significantly stronger achievement results for the students in the converted school, and there are simply no candidates for whom Rocketship’s current achievement levels would represent a significant gain.
Operational Plan and Capacity

**Plan Summary** – Rocketship Tennessee schools are governed by Rocketship Education’s (RSED) Board of Directors and will benefit from the support of the Rocketship Education Network Support Team (NEST). The governance structure will not change significantly with the addition of a conversion school. Rocketship has a local advisory board comprised of community members and parents of students attending the school.

The Rocketship model includes all grades beginning at the same time, with year 1 of the conversion estimated at 448 students. At capacity, Rocketship Conversion will have 560 students housed in a facility of MNPS’ choosing.

The leadership team consists of a principal, two assistant principals, and a business operations manager. This is consistent with all Rocketship schools, including their first Nashville school which opened for the 2014-15 school year.

Staffing plans include salaries that average 20% above the local district and Rocketship will provide transportation and food service. Rocketship anticipates a 15% special needs population and the budgetary assumptions reflect these needs.

Organizational charts, start-up plans and job descriptions are included and recruitment and hiring plans are also presented. Rocketship outlines extensive professional development opportunities throughout the year.

**Analysis** – The Operational Plan meets the standard for approval because their operations model is well thought out and proven successful throughout the country. Additionally, the review team found these outstanding characteristics:

- Rocketship has a robust and well-developed talent pipeline. Applicants explained during the interview that not only do they have access to teachers trained in Rocketship’s methods here in Nashville, but they also have access to talent within the
larger organization. Both the application and the interview indicated intentional development of staff as leaders

- The national Rocketship Education network is supportive to local schools
- The local advisory board has input into all aspects of the Nashville schools
- There is a well thought-out accountability system in place, with the use of a network health dashboard that monitors the health across a number of metrics including student achievement, staff satisfaction and staff retention
- Growth plans are viewed through the lens of a process called the Greenlight Process, which assesses Rocketship’s readiness to expand. Metrics include overall network health, the network’s capacity to support growth, political and community support, financial commitments, affordable and safe school facilities, and an identified school leader capable of founding a new school and region
- Well thought out plans exist for choosing areas where school are low-performing and overcrowded.
- Both the written application and interview revealed the organization’s commitment to the principals as the instructional leaders at the school. A robust plan for operations provides support for school leaders so they can dedicate their full focus to instructional leadership

**Financial Plan and Capacity**

**Plan Summary** – Rocketship’s strategy is to achieve educational outcomes while becoming self-sufficient on the allotted public dollars once its schools are fully operational. This financial requirement allows Rocketship to achieve its impact objectives while also providing a replicable and affordable blueprint for other district or charter schools who seek to adopt its approach.

The replication application indicates a consolidated budget and a fee schedule to schools that support the regional office. These fees are between 3% and 5% and amount to approximately $100,000 per school at full enrollment.

The network budget presents a positive cash flow and extensive assistance from the national and regional staff for start-up schools. Additionally, contingency plans to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than normal are listed.

**Analysis** - The Financial Plan meets the criteria for approval because the applicant presents viable and realistic budgets for both their current network, a five-year growth plan, and for each school. The budget assumptions align with the proposed budget with reasonable, well-supported revenues and cost assumptions, including the amount and sources of all anticipated funds, property, and other resources.

Additionally, Rocketship has already secured $2.5 million from the Charter School Growth Fund to support replication in Nashville.
Both the budget and assumptions are aligned with the educational and operational goals outlined in the application and the review team has great confidence that Rocketship can successfully replicate their model and provide excellent educational outcomes for students.

Portfolio Review/Performance Record

Summary of Performance – Rocketship Education is in its first year of operation with its Rocketship Nashville Northeast Elementary school. Thus, there is no academic data available to the review teams, and the first school report card concerning Rocketship will not be complete until later in 2015. National data presented indicates Rocketship is in the top 5% of California districts serving low-income students. The average Rocketship student showed 1.5 years’ growth in math and 1.3 years’ growth in reading according to NWEA MAP assessments.

Analysis – The Portfolio review indicates a school that has a sound academic, operational and financial plan, and the review team is impressed with their very thorough, well-thought out approach to achieving high academic gains with their students.

However, the review team has a few concerns about the organization that prompt a partially meets standard rating. They are:

- Rocketship has a very aggressive growth plan that also includes several schools through the Achievement School District. Although Rocketship itself has a very robust Greenlighting process to assess its growth capacity, the team is concerned that such rapid growth will dilute both the leadership and teacher pipelines.
- This application represents Rocketship’s first conversion, not just in Tennessee, but within the network as a whole. The team noted concern regarding the transitions that may be associated with a first time conversion, including community push-back and incorporation of school and community traditions. There does not seem to be a plan in place that accounts for the difference in recruiting and approach to a community that is forced to accept a turnaround model that includes a charter school, and that of a new, start-up school where families “opt-in” and choose.
- It is important to note that while the review team is convinced overall that Rocketship has a strong school model, there is considerable concern that the organization does not have a proven record of success in Tennessee. The first Nashville Rocketship school has not yet been in existence a full school year; thus, there is no reliable academic data available to explore accountability and growth.
Amended Application Portfolio Analysis
In denying the Rocketship Conversion the first time, along with the lack of academic results, the board also expressed concerns regarding program location and a lack of community support. The review team believes the applicant adequately addressed these concerns in the amended application, but is not convinced with any degree of confidence that Rocketship has positioned themselves to successfully convert an already low performing school due to their low academic achievement during the first year of operation. The best interests of the students, district and community would be served by denying this application and allowing Rocketship the time needed to achieve success with the students already entrusted to them.
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Introduction

Charter schools are public schools operated by independent, non-profit governing bodies that must include parents. In Tennessee, public charter school students are measured against the same academic standards as students in other public schools. Charter schools are required to serve all eligible students, with the education of at-risk students being of utmost importance.

It is the responsibility of the authorizer, to apply a rigorous authorization process in order to ensure only those charter schools meeting the needs of students open. Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools is interested in charter applicants who demonstrate the capacity to educate the most at-risk students in highly diverse and personalized settings.

An existing Tennessee operator proposing to open an exact model (including focus and grade levels) of an existing school currently authorized by MNPS may submit just the replication application, along with a copy of the original application of the school to be replicated.

The replication application allows existing operators to describe their organization’s structure, track record, and capacity to operate one or more schools in Tennessee and within MNPS. MNPS is allowed to look at previous academic data, operational data and financial data as found within the performance frameworks that are included as a part of each charter contract and that are used in creating the annual school report card for each charter school.
The Office of Innovation, Division of Charter Schools, has worked closely with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) to set up an evaluation process that embodies best practices from authorizers throughout the country and is rigorous and thorough.

In accordance with the NACSA Principles and Standards, three review teams were assembled to review the April, 2015 applications. Each team consisted of a team lead plus individuals who had expertise with curriculum, special education, English language learners, charter school financials, operations, management and legal. Each team was given extensive training in application review and interviewing techniques.

The Office of Innovation and one MNPS board representative exercised additional oversight of the process.

The stages of review are as follows:

**Phase I - Capacity Review**
Charter applications are thoroughly reviewed to insure sufficient strength in areas of Education Plan, Organization Plan and Business/Financial Plan, and Portfolio Review/Performance Record as described below:

- **Proposal Overview**
  Basic information about the proposed school
- **Evaluation**
  Analysis of the proposal based on the four major areas of plan development
  - **Educational Plan** – Key academic features described in the original application that might differ from the operator’s existing schools
  - **Organizational Plan** – Includes governing body; governing board composition, management and operations; staffing and Human Resources; Professional Development; Student Recruitment and Enrollment; Growth Plan, CMO status (if applicable), and detailed management plan for governance structure at both the school and network levels
  - **Business Plan** – Including budget assumptions, five year budget and first year start-up budget; Financial Management; network fiscal capacity with an emphasis on human capital expenditures, accounting, purchasing, payroll, and audits
  - **Portfolio Review/Performance Record** – Summary of replicating school’s performance record and network financial capacity.
Opening a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan. It is not an endeavor for which strength in one area can compensate for weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must meet or exceed the criteria in all four areas of the capacity review in order to move forward to the next phases of consideration.

Phase II – Absolute Priorities
If an application meets standard in all four (4) areas of the capacity review, it then moves to Phase II. The application must meet both absolute priorities of strong academic benchmarks and diversity plan that aligns with the MNPS Board of Education diversity goals. A separate diversity plan submitted by applicants will be evaluated for recruiting plans, transportation, facility acquisition and recruitment strategies to discern whether an applicant meets diversity standards. An application that does not meet both absolute priorities in Phase II will not move forward in the application process.

Phase III – Competitive Priorities
Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendation for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district.
Proposal Overview

School Name: KIPP Nashville Primary

Rationale for Expanding Current Network of Schools: KIPP Nashville Primary is designed with the needs of students who come from low-performing schools and may be behind grade level in reading and/or math, and/or require intervention to meet and exceed standards. In Nashville, these students are largely low-income and/or students of color. Because the capacity to meet these needs is a foundation of the model (data-driven decision making, robust time and capacity for intervention, and differentiation as a core element of instruction), KIPP Nashville Primary is designed with the capacity to meet the diverse needs of a diverse population by expanding access to a proven high-performing college-prep program in a community currently without such options.

Proposed location: KIPP Nashville Primary will partner with MNPS to identify a community with limited access to high-performing, college-prep schools as the target community for the school.

Enrollment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Planned # of Students</th>
<th>Maximum # of Students</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>K-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>K-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>K-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Capacity</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

School Name: KIPP Nashville Primary

Recommendation

Deny and Resubmit

Amended Recommendation

Approve

Summary of Section Ratings
Ratings options for each section are Exceeds the Standard; Meets the Standard; Partially Meets the Standard; Does Not Meet the Standard.

Phase I Capacity Review

Academic Plan Design and Capacity

Amended Academic Capacity

Partially Meets

Meets Standard

If applicable, rationale and identified resources for any key academic features that would differ significantly from the organization’s current model

Operations Plan and Capacity

Amended Operations Capacity

Partially Meets

Meets Standard

A strong description of the network vision, growth plan, and capacity for quality school replication. Includes staffing plans, network management, governance, and school management contracts (if applicable)

Financial Plan and Capacity

Amended Financial Capacity

Partially Meets

Meets Standard

Financial plan is aligned internally, accounts for network growth as well as individual school growth, has sufficient cash flow, revenues, and realistic budget assumptions.

Portfolio Review/Performance Record

Amended Portfolio Review

Does Not Meet

Meets Standard

Review of previous performance management reports – academic, operational, and financial
**Phase II Absolute Priorities**

**Academic Benchmarks**

Meets Standard

New school will increase number of Achieving or Excelling schools on an annual and three year rolling basis; new school will serve students currently not served in Achieving or Excelling schools; new school will establish annual performance targets and benchmarks aligned with the Academic Performance Framework (APF)

**Diversity Management**

Meets Standard

New school will meet diversity definitions in the MNPS Diversity Management Strategy; new school will adopt a diversity plan supportive of and similar in kind to the MNPS Diversity Strategy; new school will not reduce the number of diverse schools (district-run or charter) currently operating in Nashville

**Phase III Competitive Priorities (one or more of three)**

**Growth/Demand**

Meets Standard

New school will assist in serving students currently attending schools that are overcrowded or likely to become overcrowded; new school will offer opportunities to serve students at schools with enrollments that are rapidly declining or below a reasonable threshold; new school will expand *district capacity to respond to population growth consistent with its goals for academic excellence and diversity*; new school will recruit, retain, locate and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand opportunities for families who are unable to access similar options at present

**Management Conversion**

New school will serve all students residing in the current school zone of an MNPS school with a three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework as of fall 2015; sponsor organization offers experience and planning demonstrating expertise in school turnaround and building schools with readiness to teach, readiness to learn, and readiness to act; new school proposal addresses transition challenges and costs associated with serving all students well who reside in the current school zone of an MNPS school with three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework; new school will recruit, retain, locate, and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand options for families who are unable to access similar options at present

**Continuation/Addition of Grades for Existing Operators**
New school will open a school pathway with priority enrollment for all students matriculating from an existing elementary/middle school managed by the same operator; existing school will be in Achieving or Excelling status on the Academic Performance Framework; review of the criteria for replication applications offers great confidence that the new school will continue to serve students well.

Applications that pass the capacity review and meet the absolute priorities in Phases I and II may be considered for their ability to serve the competitive priority of management conversion. All applications found to have the capacity to serve this priority will be then ranked by tier-level according to the relative quality of the plan and the strength of the stated commitments.
Academic Plan Design and Capacity

Plan Summary – KIPP Nashville Primary will be the fifth school opened and managed by KIPP in Nashville and in partnership with MNPS. The academic plan for the new elementary school will not differ significantly from the plan approved in a prior application cycle, but proposes to open in a different community from that currently served by KIPP Nashville. The application proposes to work with MNPS to find an appropriate location. As designed, KIPP Nashville Primary will be positioned to:

- Advance academic performance of students that underperform over multiple years on the Academic Performance Framework (APF) through location in a community with persistently low-performing schools and recruitment of students who are zoned for persistently low-performing schools.
- Will add to and not diminish the number of schools with student enrollment diversity in Nashville by leveraging its network and local reputation to recruit from geographically close, diverse communities
- Account for and advance identified needs in the context of recently approved new schools (district and charter) that may be growing to address those needs by providing increased to a high-performing, college-preparatory feeder pattern (including prioritized admission to a KIPP high school) for students who are currently without convenient access to such schools.

Analysis – The KIPP Primary proposal partially meets standard, in that it is a replication of an already approved elementary school. One of those schools, however, has been deferred to open in 2017. The written application shows this third primary school planning to open in 2016 (p. 6), but the committee was told that 2017 would be the first year of operation. It is possible that the difference in timing impacts the budgetary deficits below, but the committee believes it is important to get the plan’s timing and budget right before recommending approval.

KIPP has a long-established track record for opening successful middle schools, and their work at Kirkpatrick elementary has been celebrated so far. Clarification of the opening timeline and its connection to the budget certainly seems possible upon resubmission.

Amended Analysis
The amended application answered many questions for the review team, especially in terms of leadership, curriculum plan and capacity to expand. KIPP Nashville elementary draws from the instructional design that has been successful at other KIPP elementary schools throughout the country. This includes balanced literacy, based in Wilson’s Foundations and Core Knowledge. Math will utilize the Great Minds Eureka curriculum, as well as a problem solving section based on Cognitively Guided
Instruction (CGI). All curricular materials are aligned to common core and will be adapted if necessary when TN Ready standards are released. KIPP presented a robust, yet achievable, set of academic benchmarks that the review team believes will position their students for continued academic success once they leave KIPP Elementary for middle and high school. Additionally, KIPP schools track their students through college, whether or not they attend a KIPP high school, offering additional supports where possible, and thus aligning with the new Tennessee Department of Education initiatives as outlined by Commissioner Candace McQueen.

The review team has confidence that KIPP will deliver the outcomes as outlined in their academic benchmarks and based on prior successful schools in the Nashville area.
Operational Plan and Capacity

Plan Summary – KIPP Nashville has successfully opened and operated two middle schools and one high school to date. Additionally, KIPP Nashville is opening KIPP Academy Nashville Elementary School (KANES) at Kirkpatrick in 2015-16. An elementary school approved through MNPS prior to this application cycle will open in 2017. KIPP Nashville’s short-term vision for growth is to provide three communities K-12 programming in the form of three (3) primary schools, three middle schools, and one high school (an additional middle school has also been applied for in this application cycle).

The majority of the staff at KIPP Nashville and the leadership of KIPP Primary will be developed from within the organization, which has significant experience and demonstrated skill. KIPP Nashville has benefitted from planning support and refinement from the Charter School Growth Fund and KIPP National which has enabled the regional office to afford the expertise, capacity, structures and systems necessary for growth to be successful.

The current KIPP Nashville Board of Directors will be the governing body for the new school and will continue to operate in the same way as they currently do for the existing schools. No leader or facility has been chosen for the current primary school proposal.

Analysis – As presented, the operational plan partially meets standard. KIPP has deferred the opening of the already approved elementary school to 2017 due primarily to the lack of a strong school leadership candidate and additionally did not identify a school leader for the proposed new school. The review team is concerned that the aggressive growth plan for the KIPP network may outpace both the leadership and teacher growth pipelines, thus establishing a troubling pattern of approving schools that then continue to be deferred due to gaps in these areas.

A facility has not been identified, and the KIPP team indicates it will partner with MNPS to identify a surplus or under-utilized MNPS facility, which has worked out well for KIPP to date. The plan for locating the school is to partner with MNPS to find a location where the need exists. Unfortunately, those areas that are most in need of new school capacity are also areas that do not offer surplus or vacant MNPS capacity suitable for KIPP to occupy, and the plans in this application do not account for this challenge. The budget assumptions are based solely on the MNPS lease price of $5.00 per square foot plus and additional $1.25 per square foot for any additional facilities costs (building maintenance, janitorial, utilities, etc.). If KIPP has to lease from another vendor, those costs could go up considerably and the assumptions do not yet reflect that contingency.
Amended Operations Analysis
The amended application sufficiently addressed the review team’s concerns around personnel, leadership, facilities and timeline. KIPP Nashville has developed a growth plan that, as a part of their strategic plan, establishes complete K-12 pathways to college for students in MNPS. KIPP’s research of successful, high-performing elementary schools suggests proven best practices which they have included in their academic plan as well as urgency around gap closure between sub-groups that led to an aggressive growth plan with enough time before school openings to ensure the right leadership and teacher talent are recruited and trained. The addition of this elementary school, along with KIPP’s currently approved elementary and middle schools, will complete the vision of providing three Nashville communities with high quality options that include three primary schools, three middle schools and one high school. At capacity KIPP intends to graduate 148 students each year, with a goal of 100% scoring 21 or higher on the ACT and positioned to be accepted to and graduate from a four-year higher learning institution.

KIPP has been well-established in the east and north Nashville communities thus far, but intends through this school to work with MNPS to identify the community of greatest need in which to open the new school. These students will receive priority enrollment into KIPP middle and high schools and KIPP is dedicated to recruiting a diverse student population as outlined in the MNPS diversity plan.

In response to the review team’s concern about leadership and teacher recruitment, KIPP has outlined a robust, comprehensive plan for both, beginning in 2015 with the addition of a COO, and Director of Talent Management. In addition, KIPP has doubled the capacity of their recruitment team and are making investments in developing key relationships with both local and national sources of talent.

KIPP presented a much more comprehensive plan for facilities, including an analysis of costs, development of partnerships with foundations that fund facility development and working with developers to secure space for long-term leases. Although the preferred plan is to lease space from MNPS, KIPP has presented other viable options, and adjusted its budget to reflect those options, which gives the review team confidence they will be able to secure adequate space.
Financial Plan and Capacity

Plan Summary – The KIPP governing board oversees the financial operations of KIPP Nashville and works closely with the regional finance team to implement rigorous internal control policies.

KIPP Nashville has produced annual audits free of findings and financials that are reviewed by the governing board. Budget assumptions and five-year projections are given that include all incoming revenues and outgoing expenses. Historically KIPP Nashville has had significant success fundraising and has the capacity to meet the funding needs to offset operating costs as the school grows to scale. KIPP Nashville has received a $2 million gift from the Charter School Growth Fund, and has also historically received money from both the Walton Foundation and the Federal Charter School Program grant. KIPP anticipates receiving a total of $115,000 from the Walton Foundation over two years and another $450,000 from the Charter School Planning Grant over three years. Neither of these grants is included in the budget in order to ensure conservative numbers.

Analysis – The Financial plan partially meets standard due to the review team’s concern about the significant budget deficits during the first four (4) years of operation. The deficits as presented within the application are as follows and represent the ending fund balance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Surplus/Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>-$671,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>-$805,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>-$694,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>-$270,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year to Year Surplus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Surplus/Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-$659,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-$730,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-$1,421,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-$1,094,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-$158,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$191,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the review team believes KIPP has the fundraising capabilities to begin addressing these deficits, the Financial Performance Framework, developed by MNPS in conjunction with NACSA and MDS Advisors, and by which the financial health of charter organizations is calculated, indicates the following cash flow standard:

“Multi-Year Cash Flow = (Year 3 Total Cash) minus (Year 1 Total Cash); One-Year Cash Flow = (Year 2 Total Cash) minus (Year 1 Total Cash)”
Meets Standard • Multi-Year cumulative cash flow is positive and cash flow is positive each year, OR
• Multi-Year cumulative cash flow is positive, cash flow is positive in one of two years, and cash flow in the most recent year is positive.” The budget presented within the application for KIPP primary does not meet that standard.

The same is true for unrestricted days cash. The standard set by the Financial Performance Framework requires a 60 day cash reserve, or between 30 and 60 days with a one-year positive trend. For schools in their first year of operation, 30 days unrestricted cash is the minimum expectation. Although KIPP stated in the interview with the review team their goal is to have a three (3) month (90 days) cash reserve, the submitted budget falls well below this goal.

The following table represents the capacity of the submitted budget to maintain a one (1) month, 30 day, cash reserve, based on the budget submitted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIPP Network</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>30 Day Cash Reserve Target</th>
<th>End of Year Budget Reserved</th>
<th>Difference from 30 Day Cash Reserve Target</th>
<th>Proposed Year of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$9,124,515.00</td>
<td>$760,376.25</td>
<td>$3,873,716.00</td>
<td>$3,311,339.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$13,526,725.00</td>
<td>$1,127,227.08</td>
<td>$3,142,369.00</td>
<td>$2,015,141.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$19,965,590.00</td>
<td>$1,663,799.17</td>
<td>$1,720,805.00</td>
<td>$57,905.83</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$26,526,676.00</td>
<td>$2,210,556.33</td>
<td>$626,521.00</td>
<td>($1,584,035.33)</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$31,655,580.00</td>
<td>$2,637,965.00</td>
<td>$467,526.00</td>
<td>($2,170,439.00)</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$35,541,426.00</td>
<td>$2,961,785.50</td>
<td>$658,716.00</td>
<td>($2,303,069.50)</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$38,643,311.00</td>
<td>$3,220,275.92</td>
<td>$1,959,283.00</td>
<td>($1,260,992.92)</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers represent the entire KIPP Nashville network, and are indicative to the review team of an organizational deficit that does not reflect sound contingency plans should revenues be lower than expected or costs higher.

Amended Financial Capacity Analysis
The amended financial plan sufficiently addressed the review team concerns about the budget, growth strategy and reserves based on the timeline for the new school to open. KIPP will implement the same strategies, fiscal policies and procedures which have been successful with their currently operating schools. Along with strong fiscal oversight by the KIPP Board of Directors, KIPP has shown very successful fundraising abilities in the past and has outlined a much more robust strategy for development of philanthropy which includes 900 separate individual donors, KIPP Leaders and Scholars Breakfast, and a diversified corporate donor base. Additionally, KIPP has received a $2,000,000.00 gift from the Charter School Growth Fund to provide support for their growth plan as outlined in the operations section of this report.

The budget provided adequately addressed the initial concerns of the review team,
including sufficient cash reserves and sound growth strategy.
Portfolio Review/Performance Record

Summary of Performance – KIPP Nashville has had a long and successful history with MNPS since 2005 when their first school, KIPP Academy, opened. They consistently score in the “Excelling” range on the MNPS charter school report card on the academic, operational and financial areas, and KIPP Academy was named a rewards school by the state for progress for the past two years (see attached MNPS School Report Card). After the initial KIPP Academy, KIPP Nashville has opened KIPP Nashville College Prep (2013) and KIPP High School (2014). They are scheduled to open KIPP @ Kirkpatrick in 2015 with grades K-1 and have been approved for an additional elementary school (grades K-4) which they have deferred until 2017.

KIPP National has an excellent training program for new school leaders with its Fisher Fellow program, and it has produced outstanding leaders for the KIPP Nashville schools.

Analysis – The KIPP Nashville past performance record and portfolio review indicates an organization that has proven successful in raising the academic achievement of its middle school students while relying on lean budgets and tight operations to control costs and avoid overruns.

However, this application does not presently meet the standard of review to open an additional school. While all of the above is true, the review team has overarching concerns with the budget as presented as well as questions concerning the timing of this application. The application shows large cash flow deficits and does not meet the financial performance framework criteria to insure financial stability and sustainability.

KIPP is a strong partner of MNPS, and while recommending approval of an application with substantial deficits in the budget is not advisable, we have every confidence that the organization will dig in to address the risky financial position that appears in this version of the application.

In summary, with an elementary school already approved in a prior application cycle and its opening deferred, time available to get the budget and contingency planning around facilities completed, and large cash flow deficits, the review team believes that opening this school at this time is not in the best interests of the parents, students, and community.

Getting it right before entering a 10 year contract is why our charter review process includes time for revisions and resubmission. KIPP has a great track record in Nashville of opening and operating successful schools. This round of applications missed the mark in terms of financial stability. The KIPP team has been doing this for a long time.
They have a lot of experience in our process and know what we expect from our schools. We hope they will take advantage of the opportunity to revise and resubmit their application.

**Amended Portfolio Review/Performance Record Analysis**

The KIPP Nashville portfolio of schools has shown strong student outcomes amid growth and the changing landscape of public education within our district. Their willingness to partner with MNPS and the leadership they provide to other charter operators is well-documented and speaks well of their collaborative approach with all aspects of the MNPS district.

The review team is impressed that KIPP acted upon the areas of needed improvement for this application cycle, including an explanation of their growth plan and its many components which suggest the timeline they presented will give adequate time to recruit the best leadership and teacher talent available before opening the school. The revised budget and expanded financial plan are more than adequate to meet the needs of that growth. KIPP has shown itself to be responsive to the concerns and the review team is confident that KIPP will continue to provide a high-quality education that creates opportunities for some of Nashville’s most disadvantaged students. At this time, the review team is convinced that approving this school is in the best interest of the students, parents and community in Nashville.
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Introduction

Charter schools are public schools operated by independent, non-profit governing bodies that must include parents. In Tennessee, public charter school students are measured against the same academic standards as students in other public schools. Charter schools are required to serve all eligible students, with the education of at-risk students being of utmost importance.

It is the responsibility of the authorizer, to apply a rigorous authorization process in order to ensure only those charter schools meeting the needs of students open. Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools is interested in charter applicants who demonstrate the capacity to educate the most at-risk students in highly diverse and personalized settings.

An existing Tennessee operator proposing to open an exact model (including focus and grade levels) of an existing school currently authorized by MNPS may submit just the replication application, along with a copy of the original application of the school to be replicated.

The replication application allows existing operators to describe their organization’s structure, track record, and capacity to operate one or more schools in Tennessee and within MNPS. MNPS is allowed to look at previous academic data, operational data and financial data as found within the performance frameworks that are included as a part of each charter contract and that are used in creating the annual school report card for each charter school.
Evaluation Process

The Office of Innovation, Division of Charter Schools, has worked closely with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) to set up an evaluation process that embodies best practices from authorizers throughout the country and is rigorous and thorough.

In accordance with the NACSA Principles and Standards, three review teams were assembled to review the April, 2015 applications. Each team consisted of a team lead plus individuals who had expertise with curriculum, special education, English language learners, charter school financials, operations, management and legal. Each team was given extensive training in application review and interviewing techniques.

The Office of Innovation and one MNPS board representative exercised additional oversight of the process.

The stages of review are as follows:

Phase I - Capacity Review
Charter applications are thoroughly reviewed to insure sufficient strength in areas of Education Plan, Organization Plan and Business/Financial Plan, and Portfolio Review/Performance Record as described below:

- **Proposal Overview**
  Basic information about the proposed school

- **Evaluation**
  Analysis of the proposal based on the four major areas of plan development
  - **Educational Plan** – Key academic features described in the original application that might differ from the operator’s existing schools
  - **Organizational Plan** – Includes governing body; governing board composition, management and operations; staffing and Human Resources; Professional Development; Student Recruitment and Enrollment; Growth Plan, CMO status (if applicable), and detailed management plan for governance structure at both the school and network levels
  - **Business Plan** – Including budget assumptions, five year budget and first year start-up budget; Financial Management; network fiscal capacity with an emphasis on human capital expenditures, accounting, purchasing, payroll, and audits
  - **Portfolio Review/Performance Record** – Summary of replicating school’s performance record and network financial capacity.

Opening a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan. It is not an endeavor for which strength in one area can compensate for
weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must meet or exceed the criteria in all four areas of the capacity review in order to move forward to the next phases of consideration.

Phase II – Absolute Priorities
If an application meets standard in all four (4) areas of the capacity review, it then moves to Phase II. The application must meet both absolute priorities of strong academic benchmarks and diversity plan that aligns with the MNPS Board of Education diversity goals. A separate diversity plan submitted by applicants will be evaluated for recruiting plans, transportation, facility acquisition and recruitment strategies to discern whether an applicant meets diversity standards. An application that does not meet both absolute priorities in Phase II will not move forward in the application process.

Phase III – Competitive Priorities
Once applications have been ranked by tier-level according to their competitive priority ranking, and the district’s annual needs assessment plan report is complete, the Office of Innovation in consultation with Student Assignment, Diversity Management, and the Director’s Office will consider and make recommendation for investment in new schools matched to identified needs of the district.
Proposal Overview

School Name: KIPP Nashville Middle

Rationale for Expanding Current Network of Schools: KIPP Nashville Middle is designed with the needs of students who come from low-performing schools and may be behind grade level in reading and/or math, and/or require intervention to meet and exceed standards. In Nashville, these students are largely low-income and/or students of color. Because the capacity to meet these needs is a foundation of the model (data-driven decision making, robust time and capacity for intervention, and differentiation as a core element of instruction), KIPP Nashville Middle is designed with the capacity to meet the diverse needs of a diverse population by expanding access to a proven high-performing college-prep program in a community currently without such options.

Proposed location: KIPP Nashville Middle will partner with MNPS to identify a community with limited access to high-performing, college-prep schools as the target community for the school.

Enrollment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Planned # of Students</th>
<th>Maximum # of Students</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Capacity</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

School Name: KIPP Nashville Middle

Recommendation

Deny and Resubmit

Amended Recommendation

Approve

Summary of Section Ratings

Ratings options for each section are Exceeds the Standard; Meets the Standard; Partially Meets the Standard; Does Not Meet the Standard.

Phase I Capacity Review

Academic Plan Design and Capacity

Meets or exceeds

Amended Academic Capacity

Meets Standard

If applicable, rationale and identified resources for any key academic features that would differ significantly from the organization’s current model

Operations Plan and Capacity

Partially Meets

Amended Operations Capacity

Meets Standard

A strong description of the network vision, growth plan, and capacity for quality school replication. Includes staffing plans, network management, governance, and school management contracts (if applicable)

Financial Plan and Capacity

Partially Meets

Amended Financial Capacity

Meets Standard

Financial plan is aligned internally, accounts for network growth as well as individual school growth, has sufficient cash flow, revenues, and realistic budget assumptions.

Portfolio Review/Performance Record

Partially Meets

Amended Portfolio Capacity

Meets Standard

Review of previous performance management reports – academic, operational, and financial
Phase II Absolute Priorities

Academic Benchmarks

Meets Standard

New school will increase number of Achieving or Excelling schools on an annual and three year rolling basis; new school will serve students currently not served in Achieving or Excelling schools; new school will establish annual performance targets and benchmarks aligned with the Academic Performance Framework (APF)

Diversity Management

Meets Standard

New school will meet diversity definitions in the MNPS Diversity Management Strategy; new school will adopt a diversity plan supportive of and similar in kind to the MNPS Diversity Strategy; new school will not reduce the number of diverse schools (district-run or charter) currently operating in Nashville

Phase III Competitive Priorities (one or more of three)

Growth/Demand

Meets Standard

New school will assist in serving students currently attending schools that are overcrowded or likely to become overcrowded; new school will offer opportunities to serve students at schools with enrollments that are rapidly declining or below a reasonable threshold; new school will expand district capacity to respond to population growth consistent with its goals for academic excellence and diversity; new school will recruit, retain, locate and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand opportunities for families who are unable to access similar options at present

Management Conversion

New school will serve all students residing in the current school zone of an MNPS school with a three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework as of fall 2015; sponsor organization offers experience and planning demonstrating expertise in school turnaround and building schools with readiness to teach, readiness to learn, and readiness to act; new school proposal addresses transition challenges and costs associated with serving all students well who reside in the current school zone of an MNPS school with three year status of Target on the Academic Performance Framework; new school will recruit, retain, locate, and offer transportation plans that will add unique and/or new options for access to educational opportunities; new school will expand options for families who are unable to access similar options at present
Continuation/Addition of Grades for Existing Operators

New school will open a school pathway with priority enrollment for all students matriculating from an existing elementary/middle school managed by the same operator; existing school will be in Achieving or Excelling status on the Academic Performance Framework; review of the criteria for replication applications offers great confidence that the new school will continue to serve students well.

Applications that pass the capacity review and meet the absolute priorities in Phases I and II may be considered for their ability to serve the competitive priority of management conversion. All applications found to have the capacity to serve this priority will be then ranked by tier-level according to the relative quality of the plan and the strength of the stated commitments.
Academic Plan Design and Capacity

**Plan Summary** – KIPP Nashville Middle will be latest school opened and managed by KIPP in Nashville and in partnership with MNPS. The academic plan for the new middle school will not differ significantly from the plan approved prior to this submission and will open in a community currently in need of a high performing quality college pre option in a community the MNPS Board designates as having the greatest need.

KIPP Nashville has adopted a blended learning strategy to provide increased individualization for each student using 1:1 Chromebooks during daily intervention time. Curricula such as Khan Academy and Achieve 3000 are utilized on this computer platform to supplement core curricular materials and provide computer adaptive, standards-aligned practice for each student in reading and math. Each grade level retains two ELA teachers, one math teacher, and one science/social studies teacher, which allows for a data-driven literacy block each day (in addition to the grade level ELA course).

Special populations, schedule, calendar, assessments and RTI2 approaches will remain the same as the other KIPP Middle schools already operating.

All KIPP schools are built on KIPP’s Five Pillars:
- High Expectations – clearly defined, measurable expectations for all students
- Choice and Commitment – All stakeholders make the choice to be part of the school community
- More Time – longer school day, week, and year; student and staff development each summer; allocation of instructional minutes prioritized to student needs
- Power to Lead – School leaders drive decision-making; flexibility to meet the needs of students and their community; support and development for leaders to leverage best practices from across the country
- Focus on Results – Objective data to measure progress and set goals; unrelenting focus on achievement for every student

**Analysis** – The academic plan meets the standard for approval, as KIPP has a proven academic model that has consistently been recognized by both MNPS and the State of Tennessee as one that is effective in achieving higher academic outcomes for students. KIPP Nashville is rapidly closing the achievement gap for low-performing students, and has a smaller gap across all subgroups that that of the state.

All three existing KIPP schools are largely comprised of low-income students of color and have a percentage of students who qualify for special education that is the same as or greater than that of the district average. Both KIPP Nashville middle schools were
designated as “Excelling” on the most recent MNPS school report card, and will increase the number of high performing schools in the district.

**Operational Plan and Capacity**

**Plan Summary** – KIPP Nashville has successfully opened and operated two middle schools and one high school to date. Additionally, KIPP Nashville is opening KIPP Academy Nashville Elementary School (KANES) at Kirkpatrick in 2015-16. An elementary school approved through MNPS prior to this application cycle will open in 2017 to partially complete the KIPP Nashville short-term vision for growth by providing three communities K-12 programming in the form of three (3) primary schools, three middle schools, and one high school (an additional middle school has also been applied for in this application cycle).

The majority of the staff at KIPP Nashville and the leadership of KIPP Middle will be developed from within the organization, which has significant experience and demonstrated skill. KIPP Nashville has benefitted from planning support and refinement from the Charter School Growth Fund and KIPP National which has enabled the regional office to afford the expertise, capacity, structures and systems necessary for growth to be successful.

The current KIPP Nashville Board of Directors will be the governing body for the new school and will continue to operate in the same way as they currently do for the existing schools. No leader or facility has been chosen for the current school proposal.

**Analysis** – As presented, the operational plan partially meets standard. The review team is concerned that the aggressive growth plan for the KIPP network is outpacing both the leadership and teacher growth pipelines, thus establishing a pattern of approving schools that may continue to be deferred due to gaps in these areas. KIPP states this as an area of risk for them as well in the application on page 18, and while we can appreciate KIPP’s willingness to wait to open until fully prepared, the written application does not reflect this intended timeline.

A facility has not been identified, and the KIPP team indicates it will partner with MNPS to identify a surplus or under-utilized MNPS facility, which has worked out well for KIPP to date. The plan for locating the school is to partner with MNPS to find a location where the need exists. Unfortunately, those areas that are most in need of new school capacity are also areas that do not offer surplus or vacant MNPS capacity suitable for KIPP to occupy, and the plans in this application do not account for this challenge. KIPP indicates it will need to find a long term facility option, however, and their business model does not currently include purchasing buildings. While leasing
from MNPS on a short term basis is feasible, there is no indication that a long term solution has been reached with MNPS.

However, the most concerning for the review team was the indication by the KIPP team in the interview that the middle school would not open until the 2019-20 school year. The written application indicates a pending school opening date of 2016. The review team is concerned that the application has been submitted too far in advance of the school opening. The written resubmission needs to include an accurate timeline for opening each school so that the budgetary contingencies can be accurately addressed.

Amended Operations Analysis
The amended application sufficiently addressed the review team’s concerns around personnel, leadership, facilities and timeline.

KIPP Nashville has developed a growth plan that, as a part of their strategic plan, establishes complete K-12 pathways to college for students in MNPS. KIPP’s research of successful, high-performing middle schools suggests proven best practices which they have included in their academic plan as well as urgency around gap closure between subgroups that led to an aggressive growth plan with enough time before school openings to ensure the right leadership and teacher talent are recruited and trained. The addition of this middle school, along with KIPP’s currently approved elementary and middle schools, will complete the vision of providing three Nashville communities with high quality options that include three primary schools, three middle schools and one high school. At capacity KIPP intends to graduate 148 students each year, with a goal of 100% scoring 21 or higher on the ACT and positioned to be accepted to and graduate from a four-year higher learning institution.

KIPP has been well-established in the east and north Nashville communities thus far, but intends through this school to work with MNPS to identify the community of greatest need in which to open the new middle school. These students will receive priority enrollment into KIPP high school and KIPP is dedicated to recruiting a diverse student population as outlined in the MNPS diversity plan.

In response to the review team’s concern about leadership and teacher recruitment, KIPP has outlined a robust, comprehensive plan for both, beginning in 2015 with the addition of a COO, and Director of Talent Management. In addition, KIPP has doubled the capacity of their recruitment team and are making investments in developing key relationships with both local and national sources of talent.

KIPP presented a much more comprehensive plan for facilities, including an analysis of costs, development of partnerships with foundations that fund facility development and working with developers to secure space for long-term leases. Although the preferred plan is to lease space from MNPS, KIPP has presented other viable options, and adjusted
its budget to reflect those options, which gives the review team confidence they will be able to secure adequate space.
Financial Plan and Capacity

Plan Summary – The KIPP governing board oversees the financial operations of KIPP Nashville and works closely with the regional finance team to implement rigorous internal control policies.

KIPP Nashville has produced annual audits free of findings and financials that are reviewed by the governing board. Budget assumptions and five -year projections are given that include all incoming revenues and outgoing expenses. Historically, KIPP Nashville has had significant success fundraising, and has the capacity to meet the funding needs to offset operating costs as the school grows to scale. KIPP Nashville has received a $2 million gift from the Charter School Growth Fund, and has also historically received money from both the Walton Foundation and the Federal Charter School Program grant. KIPP anticipates receiving a total of $115,000 from the Walton Foundation over two years and another $450,000 from the Charter School Planning Grant over three years. Neither of these grants is included in the budget in order to ensure conservative numbers. KIPP has also had fundraising success, with an average of $300,000 a year over its history in Nashville.

Analysis – The Financial Plan partially meets the standard because the review team found significant budget deficits in the first years of operation.
In attachment 6A – Budget Summary – KIPP Nashville Middle – Year to Year Surplus
Year 1: -$387,541
Year 2: -$188,111
Year 3: -$50,330

Ending Fund Balance
Year 1: -$387,541
Year 2: -$575,652
Year 3: -$625,982
Year 4: -$431,368
Year 5: -$456,916
Attachment 6d – 10 Year Network Budget
Year to Year Surplus
2014: -$659,617
2015: -$730,730
2016: -$1,421,563
2017: -$1,094,284
2018: -$158,996
2019: $191,191

During the review team interview and discussion, KIPP Nashville indicated a goal of maintaining a three months (90 days) cash reserve. The following table represents the capacity of the submitted budget to maintain a one (1) month (30 day) cash reserve, based on the budget submitted for review with the application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIPP Network</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>30 Day Cash Reserve Target</th>
<th>End of Year Budget Reserved</th>
<th>Difference from 30 Day Cash Reserve Target</th>
<th>Proposed Year of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$9,124,515.00</td>
<td>$760,376.25</td>
<td>$3,873,716.00</td>
<td>$3,311,339.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$13,526,725.00</td>
<td>$1,127,227.08</td>
<td>$3,142,369.00</td>
<td>$2,015,141.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$19,965,590.00</td>
<td>$1,663,799.17</td>
<td>$1,720,805.00</td>
<td>$57,005.83</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$26,526,676.00</td>
<td>$2,210,556.33</td>
<td>$626,521.00</td>
<td>($1,584,035.33)</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$31,655,580.00</td>
<td>$2,637,965.00</td>
<td>$467,526.00</td>
<td>($2,170,439.00)</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$35,541,426.00</td>
<td>$2,961,785.50</td>
<td>$658,716.00</td>
<td>($2,303,069.50)</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$38,643,311.00</td>
<td>$3,220,275.92</td>
<td>$1,959,283.00</td>
<td>($1,260,992.92)</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the review team believes KIPP has the fundraising capabilities to begin addressing these deficits, the Financial Performance Framework, developed by MNPS in conjunction with NACSA and MDS Advisors, and by which the financial health of charter organizations is calculated, indicates the following cash flow standard:

“Multi-Year Cash Flow = (Year 3 Total Cash) minus (Year 1 Total Cash); One-Year Cash Flow = (Year 2 Total Cash) minus (Year 1 Total Cash)

Meets Standard • Multi-Year cumulative cash flow is positive and cash flow is positive each year, OR
• Multi-Year cumulative cash flow is positive, cash flow is positive in one of two years, and cash flow in the most recent year is positive.” The budget presented within the application for KIPP primary does not meet that standard.

The same is true for unrestricted days cash. The standard set by the Financial Performance Framework requires a 60 day cash reserve, or between 30 and 60 days with a one-year positive trend. For schools in their first year of operation, 30 days unrestricted cash is the minimum expectation. Although KIPP stated in the interview with the review team their goal is to have a three (3) month (90 days) cash reserve, the submitted budget falls well below this goal.
Amended Financial Capacity Analysis

The amended financial plan sufficiently addressed the review team concerns about the budget, growth strategy and reserves based on the timeline for the new school to open. KIPP will implement the same strategies, fiscal policies and procedures which have been successful with their currently operating schools. Along with strong fiscal oversight by the KIPP Board of Directors, KIPP has shown very successful fundraising abilities in the past and has outlined a much more robust strategy for development of philanthropy which includes 900 separate individual donors, KIPP Leaders and Scholars Breakfast, and a diversified corporate donor base. Additionally, KIPP has received a $2,000,000.00 gift from the Charter School Growth Fund to provide support for their growth plan as outlined in the operations section of this report.

The budget provided adequately addressed the initial concerns of the review team, including sufficient cash reserves and sound growth strategy.
Portfolio Review/Performance Record

Summary of Performance – KIPP Nashville has had a long and successful history with MNPS since 2005 when their first school, KIPP Academy, opened. They consistently score in the “Excelling” range on the MNPS charter school report card on the academic, operational and financial areas, and KIPP Academy was named a rewards school by the state for progress for the past two years (see attached MNPS School Report Card). After the initial KIPP Academy, KIPP Nashville has opened KIPP Nashville College Prep (2013) and KIPP High School (2014). They are scheduled to open KIPP @ Kirkpatrick in 2015 with grades K-1 and have been approved for an additional elementary school (grades K-4) which they have deferred until 2017.

KIPP National has an excellent training program for new school leaders with its Fisher Fellow program, and it has produced outstanding leaders for the KIPP Nashville schools. No leaders were introduced in this application.

Analysis - The KIPP Nashville past performance record and portfolio review indicates an organization that has proven successful in raising the academic achievement of its middle school students while relying on lean budgets and tight operations to control costs and avoid overruns.

However, this application does not meet the standard of review to open an additional school right now or approve the opening of a school up to 4 years from now. While all of the above is true, the review team has overarching concerns with the budget as presented. It shows large cash flow deficits and does not meet the financial performance framework criteria to insure financial stability and sustainability. Questions remain concerning the timing of this application. In the interview KIPP stated they would not open the middle school until 2019-20, while the written information indicates a 2016 opening date.

In summary, with an elementary school already approved in a prior application cycle and its opening deferred, time to get the budget and contingency planning around facilities completed, and large cash flow deficits, the review team believes that opening this school at this time is not in the best interests of the parents, students, and community.

Getting it right before entering a 10 year contract is why our charter review process includes time for revisions and resubmission. KIPP has a great track record in Nashville of opening and operating successful schools. This round of applications missed the mark in terms of financial stability. The KIPP team has been doing this for a long time. They have a lot of experience in our process and know what we expect from our
schools. We hope they will take advantage of the opportunity to revise and resubmit their application.

**Amended Portfolio Review/Performance Record**

The KIPP Nashville portfolio of schools has shown strong student outcomes amid growth and the changing landscape of public education within our district. Their willingness to partner with MNPS and the leadership they provide to other charter operators is well-documented and speaks well of their collaborative approach with all aspects of the MNPS district.

The review team is impressed that KIPP acted upon the areas of needed improvement for this application cycle, including an explanation of their growth plan and its many components which suggests the timeline they presented will give adequate time to recruit the best leadership and teacher talent available before opening the school. The revised budget and expanded financial plan are more than sufficient to meet the needs of that growth. KIPP has shown itself to be responsive to the concerns and the review team is confident that KIPP will continue to provide a high-quality education that creates opportunities for some of Nashville’s most disadvantaged students. At this time, the review team is convinced that approving this school is in the best interest of the students, parents and community in Nashville.
STUDENT ASSIGNMENT SERVICES

PROPOSED CHANGES DUE TO POPULATION GROWTH IN THE GLENCLIFF CLUSTER

PUBLIC MEETING AT BOARD OF EDUCATION

AUGUST 11, 2015

Mission: Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools will provide every student with the foundation of knowledge, skills and character necessary to excel in higher education, work and life. We embrace and value a diverse student population and community. Different perspectives and backgrounds form the cornerstone of our strong public education system.
Overview
Paragon Mills Elementary School is overcrowded and the building is at its maximum advisable size. To help alleviate overcrowding, the MNPS administration is proposing that the School Board rezone a portion of students from Paragon Mills Elementary School to Glencliff Elementary School, where MNPS is constructing 12 additional classrooms. The proposed zoning change would go into effect during the 2016-17 school year, which is also when the classroom addition will be complete.

MNPS has been meeting with parents and neighbors to communicate these proposed zoning changes as well as to solicit input. This briefing document is to update the School Board on the draft proposal in addition to detailing the process. MNPS administration will give a presentation with this material at the August 11, 2015 School Board meeting two weeks prior to the proposed vote on the zoning changes on August 25, 2015.

Process
The goal of this public engagement process was to develop proposed zone lines that relieve overcrowding at Paragon Mills Elementary School, maintain and build diversity in our schools, and incorporate the neighborhood dynamics and future growth. To achieve this goal, the MNPS administration solicited community input prior to drafting the proposed zone lines and then at two larger community meetings after the proposed lines were drafted.

- July 2, 2015 – The MNPS Administration held a small visioning meeting with parents and neighbors who were recommended by both school principals. Team members from Communications, Student Assignment and Planning and Construction presented information about the project and the reasons behind it. The community group was presented with a blank map showing streets, houses, and the current school zone lines. Student Assignment walked them through the considerations of zoning changes and pointed out prominent geography in the area. All in the room agreed that the area now called 1A seemed to be best suited for rezoning to Glencliff Elementary. Concerns about traffic at Glencliff Elementary were noted for further study. Fliers were distributed for the follow-up public meetings on July 30 and Aug. 13.

- July 2 through July 30, 2015 – Based on the initial visioning meeting, Student Assignment services drew a proposal for moving the area 1A into the Glencliff Elementary zone. Additionally, the Communication Offices began promoting the large community meetings including:
  - callouts to families and staff at both schools,
  - translated letters and fliers mailed home to all families at both schools,
  - translated letters and fliers mailed home to all neighbors within a half-mile of each school and
  - social media promotion and prominent website placement.

- July 30, 2015 – The first large public meeting was held at Paragon Mills Elementary School. The full zoning proposal was presented with time for questions and comments. The meeting was well attended with 20-30 families. All but one of the families were non-English speakers, and the MNPS translators conveyed the presenters’ messages. The initial concerns about traffic at Glencliff Elementary were further addressed, and solutions are still
in development. Comment cards were collected showing parents’ general acceptance of the proposal as is drafted, and input is being considered in the drafting of the proposed zone lines. The MNPS administration also notified attendees of the second meeting scheduled for August 13, 2015 at Glencliff Elementary School.

- August 11, 2015 – The MNPS Administration briefs the School Board on the proposed zoning changes. There will not be a vote at this Board Meeting; however, there will be a time for public comment as regularly scheduled for the first Board Meeting of the month.

- August 13, 2015 – The second large public meeting will be held at Glencliff Elementary School. The full zoning proposal will be presented with time for questions and comments. MNPS will provide translators for families.

- August 25, 2015 – Proposed School Board vote on zoning changes. The MNPS administration will present a review of the draft zoning changes and an overview of the community input.

- Fall 2015 – The MNPS Administration will communicate the approved zoning changes to families for the 2016-17 school year.

**Current Enrollment Conditions and Capital Planning**

The entire school district has experienced significant enrollment growth in the elementary tier by increasing almost 5,000 students over the past 5 years. During this time, Paragon Mills Elementary School has grown by over 200 students and is operating at 124% of capacity with 16 portables on site and is projected to be 137% of capacity by 2019-20.

Metro Council approved capital funding in June 2014 to help accommodate the district’s enrollment growth. The capital budget included funding to add 12 classrooms to Glencliff Elementary School to alleviate overcrowding at Paragon Mills. With the addition, Glencliff Elementary will have a capacity of 778 students. It will be completed by August 2016. The recommended attendance boundary changes for Paragon Mills and Glencliff Elementary Schools will alleviate overcrowding at Paragon Mills and allow for additional growth within the Glencliff Elementary school zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glencliff Elementary School</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills Elementary School</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Zoning for 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-A</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>Paragon Mills ES</td>
<td>Glencliff ES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grandfathering option for two highest grade levels (rising 3rd and 4th grade).

**Current Enrollment and Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall-Hamilton Enhanced Option School</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencliff Elementary School</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glengary Elementary School</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Elementary School</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills Elementary School</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Whitsitt Elementary School</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capacity</td>
<td>3499</td>
<td>3493</td>
<td>3850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrollment Estimate and Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLENCLIFF CLUSTER</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Est. 2016-17</th>
<th>Proj. 19-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall-Hamilton Enhanced Option School</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glencliff Elementary School</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glengary Elementary School</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenview Elementary School</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills Elementary School</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Whitsitt Elementary School</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capacity</td>
<td>3764</td>
<td>3377</td>
<td>3850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- Enrollment estimates for 2016-17 reflect zoned students.
- Enrollment estimates for 2016-17 reflect projected impact of Rocketship opening.
- Enrollment estimates for 2019-20 reflect projected growth and charter school impact.

**Additional Documents**
The following attached documents provide additional specifics regarding the zoning changes proposed for Glencliff Cluster:
- 2015-16 Cluster Map – Current attendance boundaries
- Proposed 2016-17 Cluster Map – Proposed changes to current attendance boundaries
- Diversity Impact Analysis
Student Diversity Impact Analysis

When assessing diversity impact, the district utilized the four part definition of diversity in the Diversity Management Plan. The four parts are Racial/Ethnic, Income, Language, and Disability.

Diversity Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLENCLIFF CLUSTER</th>
<th>Oct. 2014-15</th>
<th>Estimate 2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racial/Ethnic</td>
<td>I/L/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenciff</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Diversity Impact Analysis:

- Regarding diversity, the percentages shown herein for 2016-17 reflect current student enrollments.
- The impact on Glenciff and Paragon Mills would be benign or *de minimis*.

Detailed Diversity Summary

Racial/Ethnic Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLENCLIFF CLUSTER</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Pac. Island</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenciff Oct. 2014-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenciff Estimate 2016-17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills Oct. 2014-15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills Estimate 2016-17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income/Language/Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLENCLIFF CLUSTER</th>
<th>FARM</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenciff Estimate 2016-17</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills Oct. 2014-15</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragon Mills Estimate 2016-17</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Policy states that the Executive Director of Facilities Services has the authority to approve requests for the naming of parts of buildings and programs throughout the year. Approved namings are to be given to the full Board of Education each year for information. The following namings have been approved since the last report to the Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Named For</th>
<th>Submitted By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium at Apollo Middle School</td>
<td>Willie J. Scruggs, long-time basketball, football, and track coach at Apollo and MNPS</td>
<td>Antoine Hegwood, former student, Supported by Principal, Jon Hubble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library at Old Center Elementary School</td>
<td>Dr. Betsy Potts, educator at MNPS from 2006-2014. Teacher at Goodlettsville Elementary, Assistant Principal at Amqui Elementary, and Principal at Old Center Elementary</td>
<td>Brenda Steele, Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium at McGavock High School</td>
<td>Kent Cathcart, teacher and drama coach at McGavock for 28 years and 39 years of teaching</td>
<td>Phillip Williams, former McGavock student, Supported by Executive Principal, Robbin Wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium floor at Martin Luther King, Jr. Magnet High School</td>
<td>James “Doc” Shelton, long-time basketball coach</td>
<td>Dr. Watechia Lawless, President MLK Alumni Association. Supported by Principal, Dr. Angela Carr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>