

1. The first section of the Charter School Review Committee was said to “Partially Meets the Standard.” What if any part of our application changed from last year when it was stated to have “Meet the standard”? **No, no significant changes were made to the Academic Section. The only significant change was to provide much more extensive detail on how we plan to deliver Special Education and Special Population services.**
2. It appears as the Charter School Review Committee suggests the administrator for the school should be local to Tennessee for effectiveness. If this is formally requested by the district, would you comply with this request? **Yes, the plan has always been for the administrator of the school to be local.**
3. Some of the books in your curriculum are being called into question because they don’t have alignment with Tennessee State standards. Specifically, Singapore Math books. To your knowledge, are these books aligned with these standards? If not, would you be able to bring them in line to meet these standards? **Yes, we will align our teaching to the Tennessee State Standards using curricular resources like Singapore Math. Several authorized Tennessee charter public schools are using Singapore Math to teach Tennessee math standards. E.g., [Valor Collegiate Academy](#) in Nashville ([approved charter application](#)) and [Ivy Academy](#) in Chattanooga. As our application repeatedly makes clear and is required by law, our curriculum is aligned to TN State Standards and will be adjusted if required to comply. Furthermore, CMCSS’s review committee found this exact same curriculum was aligned to TN State Standards last year.**
4. The review committee listed that they have concerns with your student handbook. They listed Student decorum – “clean and tasteful,” “hair styled traditionally,” “boys’ hair not being lower than the top of the shirt collar in the back,” “religious purposes,” “reasonable uniform alterations,” (Pages 14 and 15, Student Handbook Attachment B). Is there anything that is listed that could be amended? The committee listed “religious purposes” – can you explain the reason this is listed in the student handbook? **Of course. We are happy to work with CMCSS to ensure our dress code is congruent with the dress codes currently in effect within CMCSS schools. The Committee appears to be referring to the following: "Religious headgear is permitted when worn for religious purposes." which acknowledges that certain students may have religious requirements for headgear or headcoverings and of course permits this within ACACM.**
5. In the application there were 60 letters of support. The review committee suggests that you have not shown “significant demand.” The TN Department of Education Rubric states there must be “sufficient support.” Have you been told the exact number of letters of support that would indicate “sufficient demand”? **No, the review committee has never communicated to us how many letters would indicate "sufficient demand." However Oxtan submitted no letters of support from parents last year and was found to meet the standard by the CMCSS review committee.**

6. If approved, you would start with 340 students and after 8 years will have a totality of 690 students (pg. 36). Can you share more about why you believe you will meet these projected enrollments? **As was discussed in our capacity interview and is evident from the community survey conducted by CMCSS and letters submitted by ACACM and reviewed by the Committee in person, there is significant demand for a free public classical school within the Clarksville-Montgomery community. We are very confident interest will exceed our opening projected enrollment and we will be required to use a lottery for admission.**

7. There is a lot of feedback in the community that Charter Schools don't or won't support students with IEPs or special populations according to state law. Is this true? **No, this is not true. All public schools, including public charter schools, are required to meet the needs of students with special needs. In fact, many Tennessee charter schools serve a higher percentage of students with disabilities than the districts in which they operate (this can be seen by reviewing [the Tennessee State Report Card](#)). ACACM spoke with multiple parents who have seen their children with disabilities thrive in classical schools (some of these parents testified in application hearings last year). Our application spends more than 20 pages detailing how our model supports both students with IEPs and other special populations.**

8. On page 137 of the Charter Application you speak to a time for construction. The Review Committee stated that "unless that is a misunderstanding of their start-up plan," that, "They have only allotted a few months for construction." Is there a misunderstanding or did you only allot a few months for construction after approval? If there is a misunderstanding, what is the timeline if approved? And did the committee reach out to you for clarification? **Yes, the application clearly states on page 148 that we expect construction to be 10 months (which is reasonable for a Phase 1 build). No, the CMCSS review committee did not reach out to us at all for any questions in regards to clarification on our application despite ACACM proactively asking via email whether *"there any other materials we can share with the review team at this time or outstanding questions that we can answer? We want to be sure that we've shared everything the review team needs to make its recommendation."***

9. The review committee mentioned the absence of a logo identifying information for an architect for the rendering provided in the application. Did the committee ask you for this information? Where did this design come from and who designed it? **No, we were never asked for this information. The design was created by the in-house architect at Bouma USA which we would have gladly shared with the Committee if we had been asked.**

10. On page 149 of the Charter Application it states, "The following represents the properties that are under consideration. ACAM has looked at 22 potential green field sites and 3 existing facilities and would value input and feedback from CMCSS Schools as its authorizer. "

Was any feedback given to you about the potential facilities or land as requested in your application? **No. As the application made clear and as was reiterated in the capacity interview, we would highly value input and feedback from CMCSS on location. Unfortunately, we have**

not received any input or feedback from CMCSS or the Review Committee during this process despite proactively reaching out to the review Committee on multiple occasions.

11. In light of recent events and legislative actions around school safety, have any additional questions been asked of you specifically concerning school safety? **No, neither CMCSS or the review committee have asked us any questions about school safety.**

12. Last year, you met the standard in section three. This year, you do not. Were any significant changes made to this section from last year? **No.**