

I. Achievement School District

a. Priority School Selection Timeline

- i. **Request:** ASD must select schools it intends to operate within six months of the Priority Schools List announcement

Rationale: Identifying all schools the ASD intends to operate once the Priority List is announced provides LEAs better planning with respect to schools that will leave the district

b. Limitation on Priority School Selection

- i. **Request:** The ASD may not select additional schools to operate until the next Priority Schools List is generated

Rationale: Allows districts more opportunity to target Priority List Schools for additional interventions and creates stability within the school and community

c. County Cap

- i. **Request:** Institute a cap on the number of schools the ASD can operate within one county

Rationale: Prevents unequal distribution of ASD schools in one district and ensures that priority schools across the state are addressed

d. Turnaround Choice

- i. **Request:** Allow parents with students attending Priority Schools to provide input on the selection of a turnaround model (ASD, District, Innovation Zone, Charter etc.) as provided in TCA 49-1-602(b)(2)

Rationale: Gives parents, students, and the community more voice in the selection of the turnaround model for schools on the Priority List

- ii. **Request:** Mandate that State resources for school turnaround models be allocated based on student academic performance and rate of improvement

Rationale: Ensures that limited resources are allocated to turnaround models that have a proven track record of academic success

e. Establish Rules and Regulations

- i. **Request:** Promulgate Rules and Regulations for the operation of the Achievement School District

Rationale: Establishment of rules and regulations for the ASD ensures that ambiguities in the law and operational processes are clear for LEAs and the ASD

f. Facilities (TCA 49-1-614(f))

- i. **Request:** Require the ASD be responsible for deferred maintenance in ASD occupied buildings/schools

Rationale: Ensures that LEAs are not fiscally responsible for schools outside of their local governance

Rationale: Ensures that charter schools have adequate financial resources for operation

d. Charter Funding Calculation

- i. **Request:** Require charter funding to be calculated on previous year student enrollment

Rationale: Currently, charter school funding is based on current year student figures, whereas, SCS is provided funding based on prior year enrollment data. As a result, the funding calculation results in a higher per pupil allocation for charter schools than if both were using prior year student enrollment figures

III. BEP/Fiscal Issues

a. Full Funding of BEP

- i. **Request:** Fully fund BEP including unfunded mandates such as Response to Intervention (RTI), testing and teacher evaluation

Rationale: All LEAs were required to begin implementation of the RTI program in 2014-2015; however, funds to support the program are not included in the BEP formula. As such, LEAs must use funds from other programs to support the RTI work.

b. BEP Fiscal Capacity Calculation

- i. **Request:** Calculate the fiscal capacity of the area within the borders of the school district when a county has municipal and county school district funding

Rationale: Account for all local funding streams

c. BEP Funding Calculation

- i. **Request:** Uniformity in the funding calculation for ASD, Charter Schools, and LEAs

Rationale: In September 2016, the Tennessee Comptroller's office found that the BEP Funding calculation for charter schools lacked sufficient clarity. ASD funding is calculated in the same manner as charter schools. SCS requests that the TNDOE establish clear rules regarding the calculation of the BEP for ASD, Charter Schools and LEAs.

- ii. **Request:** Remove requirement that BEP funding be calculated based on monthly attendance data

Rationale: By using monthly attendance date to calculate BEP, LEAs may be penalized for common district attendance trends

d. State Board of Education

- i. **Request:** Require the State Board of Education to publish a funding report that is calculated based on the specific student needs (i.e. factors utilized could include, but are not limited to, ELL, special needs, disabilities, Title 1 eligibility, per capita income of the families of students in the LEA boundaries, etc.)

Rationale: Providing a funding report ensures an accurate accounting of the costs associated with educating special student populations

- ii. **Request:** Require the State Department of Education to issue a report annually that identifies the Fiscal note for all of the initiatives (individually & totally) mandated for the LEAs

Rationale: Providing an annual fiscal report of all initiatives ensures an accurate accounting of the costs associated with state mandated initiatives

IV. **School Based Issues (TCA Title 49)**

a. Assessments and Standards

- i. **Request:** Reduce the number of state mandated assessments and include funds to pay for the testing and assessment process (including technology costs); also limit the number of times a student is subjected to state mandated assessments in a semester/quarter.

Rationale: In absence of direction from the State Board of Education or the State Department of Education concerning the implementation of ESSA, LEAs should be allowed to limit assessment and mandated testing as they see fit as long as they can document a process that includes input from Teachers, Administration, Families, and community

b. Elimination of RTI² Requirements

- i. **Request:** Eliminate the RTI² requirements
Rationale: The current RTI² requirements prescribe the screening and progress monitoring processes which requires the purchase of additional assessments. The requirements also specify instructional minutes which require additional staff and resources to implement with fidelity.

c. Extended School Day

- i. **Request:** Extend the school day at least 1 hours for schools in the Bottom 15% and provide funding
Rationale: Extended school day provides opportunity for students to receive intervention in various subjects and can offset the cost of after-school care for parents

d. Safe Harbor for School Consolidation

- i. **Request:** Exclude the first year of student assessment data for schools that were consolidated following the closure of either an under-performing or under-utilized school
Rationale: Allows schools and LEAs an opportunity to adjust to new leadership at the schools as well as establishing a new and accurate depiction of baseline academic performance data for the newly consolidated school

e. Pre-K

- i. **Request:** Continue to fund Pre-K based on the amount of Title 1 student population

Rationale: Providing funds for Pre-K classrooms based on Title 1 student population allows LEAs with high poverty rates to direct funds to much needed opportunities to ensure incoming students are at grade-level, thereby lessening the achievement gap

f. Schools (TCA 49-1-104; TCA 49-6-3110)

- i. **Request:** Class Size Waivers

Rationale: Allow class size waivers from the state mandated maximum

g. Elected Superintendents

- i. Oppose

h. Funding of Educational Assistants

- i. **Request:** Provide for additional educational assistants for schools identified by the LEA needing additional support

Rationale: Allows LEAs to provide enhanced academic support to target schools on the State's Priority and Focus Lists

i. Teacher Credentialing Flexibility

- i. **Request:** Allow credentialing flexibility for hiring teachers

Rationale: Gives LEAs greater ability to recruit second career teachers as well as teachers for hard to staff subjects and schools

j. Vouchers

- i. Oppose

- ii. If adopted, include the following:

1. Deduct from each voucher the OPEB liability on a per student basis;
2. Require schools that allow the use of vouchers to administer Tennessee state mandated assessments for K-12;
3. Require that the facilities used for educating voucher students meet or exceed the same standards and requirements for public school facilities;
4. Require evidence of enrollment capacity for the number of vouchers issued by the state and accepted by a non-public school;
5. Establish process for return of funds for students failing to enroll and/or expelled from voucher school;
6. Establish a process for verification of non-public school accreditation