

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



CATHERINE PAYNE
CHAIRPERSON

STATE OF HAWAII
STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION
(‘AHA KULA HO‘ĀMANA)

1111 Bishop Street, Suite 516, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel: (808) 586-3775 Fax: (808) 586-3776

RECOMMENDATION SUBMITTAL

DATE OF SUBMITTAL: August 5, 2016

DATE OF MEETING: August 11, 2016

TO: Catherine Payne, Chairperson

FROM: Yvonne Lau, Acting Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM: IX. Action on Charter Application for Proposed Charter School, Kamalani Academy

I. DESCRIPTION

Recommendation that the Commission approve the charter school application for Kamalani Academy.

II. AUTHORITY

Charter School Applications: Pursuant to §302D-5(a), Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”), “[a]uthorizers are responsible for executing the following essential powers and duties: . . . (1) Soliciting and evaluating charter applications; (2) Approving quality charter applications that meet identified educational needs and promote a diversity of educational choices; [and] (3) Declining to approve weak or inadequate charter applications[.]”

III. APPLICANT PROFILE

Proposed School Name: Kamalani Academy

Mission: “Kamalani Academy believes that each of our students is born with great abilities. We use the arts to release those talents. The arts enhance the learning of core academic subjects and, also, provide students with vital skills such as creativity, communication, leadership, and collaboration.”

Vision: “A space where children become leaders, prepared for a Twenty First Century we cannot even imagine.”

Geographical Area: Kamalani Academy plans to be located within the facility previously occupied by Our Lady of Sorrows School, 1403-A California Avenue, Wahiawa, HI 96786.

Program Synopsis: Kamalani Academy will organize its curriculum into two integrated blocks: arts and humanities and science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Within each block, instruction will not only address specific knowledge, skills and dispositions unique to each content area, but also provide integrated process and products through which students construct and demonstrate understandings across content. There is a commitment to rigor and a plan to prepare young people for career, college, and community.

Through the arts, KA students will have options for understanding new material, engagement, and action/expression (Universal Design for Learning). Positive Behavioral Instructional Support (PBIS) and the principles of Na Hopena A’o will nurture a safe environment; the social and emotional growth of each child will be grounded in a sense of self and a sense of place.

Ongoing assessments, data analyses and results will identify improvement needs and guide instruction for mastery.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Capacity	
	2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K	25		25		25		25		25		25	
1	25		25		25		25		25		25	
2	25		25		25		25		25		25	
3	25		25		25		25		25		25	
4	25		25		25		25		25		25	
5	25		25		25		25		25		25	
6	52		52		52		52		52		52	
7			52		52		52		52		52	
8					52		52		52		52	
9												
10												
11												
12												
Subtotals	202		254		306		306		306		306	
Totals	202		254		306		306		306		306	

IV. BACKGROUND

The Evaluation Team assigned to the Kamalani application was comprised of Cindy Henry, Leila Shar, Sylvia Silva, and Sherri Morgan. In conjunction with the application, the Evaluation Team interviewed applicant group members and reviewed the applicant's responses to the Request for Clarification. The applicant group members that attended the interview were Kuuipo Laumatia, Dr. Steve Davidson, Ryan Reeves, Robert Howell, Jamie Simpson Steele, and Martha Evans.

After evaluating the information presented in the application, capacity interview, and Request for Clarification response, the Evaluation Team published its Recommendation Report. The applicant exercised its option to write a response to the recommendation report, and the Evaluation Team did not write a rebuttal to that response. The Recommendation Report (**Exhibit A**), and Applicant Response (**Exhibit B**) make up the Recommendation Packet.

In addition, the Commission held a public hearing on the application on May 12, 2016. Written testimony in support of Kamalani was submitted by Frances M. Wiebenga, Reverend Richard McNally, Senator Donovan Dela Cruz, Representative Marcus Oshiro, Jamie Simpson Steele, Daniel Kelin, Lei Ahsing, Herb Lee, Lisa Letoto-Ohata, Brad Kellaway, Lynn Fujioka, Don Robbins, Jana Koerte, and the Wahiawa-Whitmore Neighborhood Board.

Further, staff solicited comments from the Department of Education ("DOE")—particularly the Leilehua-Mililani-Waiialua Complex Area Superintendent—on the application. Dr. John Brummel, the Leilehua-Mililani-Waiialua Complex Area Superintendent provided comments and noted that the location of the proposed school will be in direct competition with the public schools in Wahiawa which could impact enrollment in the area's schools. He argues that a decrease in student enrollment may have an effect on staffing which may negatively impact the high quality nature of the existing art programs within the complex. Dr. Brummel's comments are attached as **Exhibit C**.

Recommendation Report.

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for Kamalani be approved. The Recommendation Report states that the academic plan, organizational plan, financial plan, and evidence of capacity meet the standard of approval and notes that the application has "an innovative and rigorous academic plan," and "presents sound management and facilities plans."

The report finds that the academic plan meets the standard overall. However, the Evaluation Team notes that there are concerns relating to transportation of special needs students and the 7:45 AM start times for both staff and students that should be addressed. Highlights on the academic plan include:

- A thorough understanding on how to align outcomes and standards with their academic philosophy;
- A strong understanding of instructional strategies that supports their emphasis on the arts;
- A coherent plan for developing the school culture; and
- Professional development plans that are responsive to the assessed needs of students and staff.

The report also finds that the applicant's organizational plan meets standards due to sound management and facilities plans that have detailed and realistic targets as well as experienced

individuals leading the development and management of the start-up phase. Highlights on the organizational plan include:

- The school's principal and governing board members will donate 500 hours each to meet the demands of school development in year 0; additional individuals are committed to donating 200 hours each to provide project management and project coordination services;
- The location of the proposed school was previously a K-8 school, and there is a comprehensive, reasonable and sound plan for securing the building;
- The applicant identified viable brokers and consultants to ensure buildings would meet the required county building, planning, and fire codes; and
- Needed facility improvements have been assessed by an architecture firm, and a nationally experienced education facility developer will finance the improvements and lease the facility.

The report also finds that the financial plan meets the standard for approval because the standard criteria are materially met. However, the Evaluation Team is recommending that specific requirements be addressed before a charter is awarded. Specifically, the applicant must address:

- Development of internal control procedures;
- Description of roles, responsibilities and processes with appropriate delineation to insure proper financial oversight and management;
- Development of sound criteria and procedures for vendor and contract selection; and
- Development of a year 1 cash flow contingency plan in the event revenue and/or cost projections are not met in advance of opening.

The report notes that the evidence of capacity meets the standard since there is evidence that the key members of the proposed school's academic team have the collective qualifications and capacity to implement the academic plan successfully. The applicant also demonstrates capacity to implement the organizational plan, and the financial plan, although some elements of the financial plan need to be further developed.

Applicant Response

The Applicant Response to the Recommendation Report acknowledges the areas of concern brought forth by the Evaluation Team and indicates that they are committed to resolving each of the concerns during the pre-opening period.

Evaluation Team Rebuttal.

The Evaluation Team Rebuttal opted to not present a rebuttal to the Applicant Response.

Applications Committee Meeting.

At the July 28, 2016 Applications Committee meeting, six applicant group members provided oral testimony in support of the application. No written testimony was submitted. After discussion, the Committee unanimously took action to recommend the approval of the application to the full Commission.

DECISION MAKING STATEMENT

Introduction.

Scope of Commissioner Review.

Applicants were advised at the beginning of the application process that the Application should be a complete and accurate depiction of their proposed plans and that no new information would be accepted after the Recommendation Report is issued. Applicants had the opportunity to provide clarifying information through the Request for Clarification responses. However, applicants may not provide any new information beyond the information provided to the Evaluation Team in the Application, capacity interview, or responses to the Request for Clarification, because such new information would not have been completely evaluated by the Evaluation Team. Further, the Request for Proposals states that the Commission shall not consider new information that was not available to the Evaluation Team. As such, when conducting their review of the application, and during decision making, Commissioners should not consider any new information submitted by the applicant.

Staff Recommendation Focuses on Key Points.

While the Recommendation Report and Applicant Response cover a variety of issues, staff has attempted to focus on the few issues that appear to be the most significant and would have the biggest impact on an applicant's ability to successfully start and operate a high-quality charter school. The omission of an issue from this review is not meant to indicate that the staff believes that the issue was resolved one way or another, only that it is not a major point of contention or is not a critical point that warrants further analysis here. For each key point staff reaches a conclusion for the Committee's and Commission's consideration, but at a minimum the inclusion of these points in this submittal are intended to draw out the key points for an approval or denial of the application.

The Academic Plan meets standard.

The Evaluation Team found that Kamalani provided a coherent Academic Plan overall that was aligned internally with the proposed school's mission and vision; Organizational Plan; and Financial Plan. Kamalani's Academic Plan was particularly strong in its Curriculum and Instructional Design, its discussion on as it laid out two integrated blocks of humanities and STEM. The outcomes of each block were thoroughly discussed in each grade level and were developmentally appropriate. Kamalani's plan also demonstrated understanding and use of assessment instruments to inform instruction. Instructional strategies have a strong emphasis on the arts, and further evidence the school's focus. The Evaluation Team also found that their plan provides an overall sound plan for special populations and at-risk students. The plan has a coherent plan for developing school culture. Professional development for the staff was also discussed including how the school plans to align it with the assessed needs of the students and staff.

The Evaluation Team expressed some concerns with the concurrent start time of both the school staff and students at 7:45 AM, in addition to concern with the start time and the transportation of special needs students.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

The Organizational Plan meets standard.

The Evaluation Team found that the Applicant presented an Organizational Plan that described sound management and facilities plans with detailed and realistic targets. Kamalani's Governing Board, Advisory Board, Charter School Service Provider, Academica, and an annual affiliation with Doral Academy Inc. provide the backdrop for their governance system. Kamalani also provided a detailed and reasonable timeline for start-up with clearly defined assignments. Kamalani's facilities plan is strong with a facility already identified and a targeted population that matches their proposed location. Additionally the Evaluation Team found their plan to insure that the facilities be completed in Year 0 to accommodate additional grades and enrollment in Year 2 to be a very good idea to insure that the school will not be dealing with facilities challenges in its inaugural and most difficult year.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

The Financial Plan meets standard.

Kamalani's Financial Plan is coherent overall and aligned internally with the proposed school's mission and vision, Academic and Organization Plans. The Applicant's Financial Plan describes their financial oversight and management and an operating budget that materially met standards. The Applicant's proposal plans to contract out the operational and business operations of the school, leaving the school leader to focus on the Academic Plan. This requires strong governance from a Governing Board that has a good understanding of how all of these contractual relationships will work and what happens if things go wrong. With this in mind, while the Evaluation Team acknowledged the strategy in freeing up the school leader from having to deal with the operational pieces of running a school, this means that the Governing Board will need to ensure that all of the contractors and the school leader are carrying out their duties.

For this reason, the Evaluation Team asked that the Applicant be required to provide the following items during the Start-up Year 0:

1. Development of internal control procedures;
2. Description of roles, responsibilities and processes with appropriate delineation to insure proper financial oversight and management;
3. Development of sound criteria and procedures for vendor and contractor selection;
4. Development of a Year 1 cash flow contingency plan in the event revenue and/or cost projections are not met in advance of opening.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

Applicant's evidence of capacity meets standard.

In each of the three areas of the Applicant's plan, Academic, Organizational, and Financial, Kamalani has demonstrated strong evidence of capacity by articulating a plan in each area that meets the standards and the stated criteria, assembling an Applicant Team, and Governing and Advisory Board that possess overlapping backgrounds and experience.

Operating a charter school is extremely demanding and successful charters understand that it takes a committed group of individuals to create the institution that is the charter school. For a brand new charter school, the governing board along with the school's leader, teachers and staff will all be called upon to execute the plan that they articulated in securing their charter. No one individual will make this happen. Based upon all of the documents and information presented, staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, applicant has met standard in all areas, with the exception of some concerns that must be addressed during the pre-opening year before the proposed school is allowed to open. Therefore, staff recommends approval of this application, provided that the applicant works with staff during the start-up period to address the concerns described in this submittal. Staff looks forward to working with Kamalani in its efforts to provide a high-quality arts integrated choice for the public school students and families in Central Oahu.

Staff recommends the approval of Kamalani Academy's application.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Motion to the Commission:

"Moved to approve the charter school application for Kamalani Academy."

Exhibit A
Recommendation Report for Kamalani Academy



State Public Charter School Commission 2015-2016 Recommendation Report

Charter Application for
Kamalani Academy

Evaluation Team

Team Lead: Cindy Henry

Evaluators: Sherri Morgan

Leila Shar

Sylvia Silva

Introduction

In 2012, the Hawaii State Legislature passed Act 130, replacing the state’s previous charter school law, Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) Chapter 302B, with our new law, codified as HRS Chapter 302D. Act 130 instituted a rigorous, transparent accountability system that at the same time honors the autonomy and local decision-making of Hawaii’s charter schools. The law created the State Public Charter School Commission (“Commission”), assigned it statewide chartering jurisdiction and authority, and directed it to enter into State Public Charter School Contracts (“Charter Contract”) with every existing charter school and every newly approved charter school applicant.

The 2015-2016 Request for Proposals and the resulting evaluation process are rigorous, thorough, transparent, and demanding. The process is meant to ensure that charter school operators possess the capacity to implement sound strategies, practices, and methodologies. Successful applicants will clearly demonstrate high levels of expertise in the areas of education, school finance, administration, and management as well as high expectations for excellence in professional standards and student achievement.

Evaluation Process

Building off of the advice and training from national experts and experience gained in the last application cycle, the Commission’s Operations Section created standardized evaluation forms, provided evaluator training, and assembled the Evaluation Team based on the national best practices, policies, and standards needed to authorize high-performing charter schools. The highlights of the process are as follows:

Proposal Evaluation. The Evaluation Team conducted individual and group assessments of completed applications. The Commission’s Operations Section conducted a completeness check to ensure the Evaluation Team only reviewed complete submissions.

Capacity Interview. After the initial review, the Evaluation Team conducted an in-person or virtual assessment of the applicant’s capacity. The interview also served to clarify some areas of the application.

Request for Clarification. After receiving initial clarification through the capacity interview, the Evaluation Team identified any areas of the application that required further clarification. Applicants had the opportunity to respond to the Evaluation Team’s Request for Clarification in writing to address these issues.

Due Diligence. The Evaluation Team considered any other available information relevant to each application.

Consensus Judgment. The Evaluation Team came to consensus regarding whether to recommend the application for approval or denial.

The duty of the Evaluation Team is to recommend approval or denial of each application based on its merits. The Commission’s Executive Director, with assistance from the Operations Section, is charged with reviewing this recommendation report, the testimony at public hearings, comments from the Department of Education, and other information obtained during the application process in making his final recommendation to the Commission. The authority and responsibility to decide whether to approve or deny each application rests with the Commissioners.

Report Contents

This Recommendation Report includes the following:

Proposal Overview

Basic information about the proposed school as presented in the application.

Recommendation

An overall judgment regarding whether the proposal meets the criteria for approval.

Evaluation Summary

A summary analysis of the proposal based on four primary areas of plan development and the capacity of the applicant to execute the plan as presented:

1. Academic Plan
2. Organizational Plan
3. Financial Plan
4. Evidence of Capacity

Rating Characteristics

Rating	Characteristics
Meets the Standard	The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation; presents a clear, realistic picture of how the proposed school expects to operate; and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the plan effectively.
Does Not Meet the Standard	The response meets the criteria in some respects but has substantial gaps, lacks detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas and does not reflect a thorough understanding of key issues. It does not provide enough accurate, specific information to show thorough preparation; fails to present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate; and does not inspire confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the plan effectively.
Falls Far Below the Standard	The response does not meet the criteria in most respects, is undeveloped or significantly incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation; raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan; or the applicant's capacity to carry it out.

Evaluation Report

A report, attached as **Appendix A**, detailing the strengths and weakness of the proposal based on evaluation criteria.

Proposal Overview

Proposed School Name

Kamalani Academy

Mission and Vision

Mission: Kamalani Academy believes that each of our students is born with great abilities. We use the arts to release those talents. The arts enhance the learning of core academic subjects and, also, provide students with vital skills such as creativity, communication, leadership, and collaboration.

Vision: A space where children become leaders, prepared for a Twenty First Century we cannot even imagine.

Geographic Location

It is planned that KA will be located within the facility previously occupied by Our Lady of Sorrows School, 1403-A California Avenue, Wahiawa, HI 96786.

Anticipated Student Population

KA expects its student population to be representative of the surrounding community. To determine an anticipated student population, KA obtained enrollment information from the following schools: Wahiawa, Iliahi, Kaala, Wheeler, Hale Kula, Helemano and Solomon Elementary Schools, and Wahiawa and Wheeler Middle Schools. All of the schools are within a three mile radius with the exception of Solomon Elementary. The student population is as follows: 640 students, 64% free and reduced lunch, 7% ELL and 11% with disabilities. KA anticipates a student population of 202 students in year 1, with subgroups representative of the identified demographics.

Contribution to Public Education System

Many of the schools in the KA geographic area demonstrate poor academic performance. KA is committed to improving academic performance through arts integration, which has been demonstrated to improve academic outcomes.

Cognitive studies draw relationships between academic success and artistic experience by suggesting skills practiced in an arts setting will transfer to other situations and content areas. Having access to arts integrated instruction has a more powerful effect on student learning than either gender or socioeconomic background. What's more, these same studies discovered improved attendance rates as well as student abilities to sustain the benefits of arts integrated learning long after exposure to the arts integrated setting. While there are many variables that help determine a student's cognitive successes, and while test scores are only one measure of that success and may fluctuate given complex circumstances beyond a child's school life, quantitative evidence consistently points to positive relationships between learning through the arts and cognitive performances.

KA can contribute significantly to public education by introducing arts integration into the heart of Oahu. Educators from surrounding schools will be invited to participate in arts integration workshops at KA. KA has already developed a partnership with Dr. Jamie Simpson-Steele at the UH Institute for Teacher Education. This will permit UH students to student teach, to do internships, and to perform research at KA, where they will learn about arts integration first hand.

The Hawaii Arts Alliance provides arts education support and services to the public schools. KA, through its partnership with the Hawaii Arts Alliance, can contribute greatly to the development of arts education curricula that can benefit the entire DOE network of schools.

KA has begun discussions with DOE Specialists Gina Nakahara and Petra Schatz with an interest towards further enhancing arts integration in the public schools.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Capacity	
	2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		20__	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K	25		25		25		25		25		25	
1	25		25		25		25		25		25	
2	25		25		25		25		25		25	
3	25		25		25		25		25		25	
4	25		25		25		25		25		25	
5	25		25		25		25		25		25	
6	52		52		52		52		52		52	
7			52		52		52		52		52	
8					52		52		52		52	
9												
10												
11												
12												
Subtotals	202		254		306		306		306		306	
Totals	202		254		306		306		306		306	

Executive Summary

Enter the proposed school name

Kamalani Academy

Recommendation

Approve

Summary Analysis

The application for Kamalani Academy meets the standards for approval in all of the four areas. The application has an innovative and rigorous academic plan that includes a balance of content area skill development and arts integrated projects with ongoing assessments and data analysis guiding instruction for mastery. The written proposal presents sound management and facilities plans, and the level of supports and board member experience outlined demonstrate the ability to implement the organizational plan successfully. While the Kamalani financial plan marginally meets the criteria for the financial plan, there were gaps identified in the proposed fiscal management of the school. Specifically, the Evaluation Team had concerns regarding the lack of internal control procedures, appropriate delineation of roles, responsibilities and processes, vendor and contractor selection procedures, and the Year 1 cash flow contingency plan. However, the Evaluation Team’s concerns regarding the proposed school’s financial plan can be satisfactorily addressed with completion of all pre-opening assurances in Year 0. The Evaluation Team recommends approval of the Kamalani Academy application contingent upon successful completion of Year 0 start-up requirements being met. It is additionally recommended that if any pre-opening assurances are not met on time that the school not be allowed to proceed with opening.

Summary of Section Ratings

Opening and maintaining a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan and identifying highly capable individuals to execute that plan. It is not an endeavor for which strengths in some areas can compensate for material weakness in others.

Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must receive a “Meets the Standard” rating in all areas.

Academic Plan

Meets the Standard

Financial Plan

Meets the Standard

Organizational Plan

Meets the Standard

Evidence of Capacity

Meets the Standard

Academic Plan

Enter the proposed school name

Rating

Kamalani Academy

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

Kamalani Academy will organize its curriculum into two integrated blocks: arts and humanities and science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Within each block, instruction will not only address specific knowledge, skills and dispositions unique to each content area, but also provide integrated process and products through which students construct and demonstrate understandings across content. There is a commitment to rigor and a plan to prepare young people for career, college, and community.

Through the arts, KA students will have options for understanding new material, engagement, and action/expression (Universal Design for Learning). Positive Behavioral Instructional Support (PBIS) and the principles of Na Hopena A’o will nurture a safe environment; the social and emotional growth of each child will be grounded in a sense of self and a sense of place.

Ongoing assessments, data analyses and results will identify improvement needs and guide instruction for mastery.

Analysis

The evaluation committee finds the academic plan meets the standard overall and noted limited concerns with sections II C and IIF.

In section IIB, Kamalani Academy cites developmentally appropriate and well defined outcomes, solid rationale for standards integration, and examples to provide evidence of a thorough understanding of how to align outcomes and standards with their academic philosophy. Identified materials aligned with standards and again, examples were provided to link how the materials would support student success and meet those standards.

A portfolio approach was described. A clear and thorough description of the components and standards addressed for each page of the portfolio was present. There is a clear description of assessment instruments such as Dibels, Star and TenMarks, SBAC that will inform instruction.

Instructional strategies focus on a strong emphasis on the arts. Kamalani Academy provided clarity in the specific strategies that support their emphasis on the arts as well as other best practices. These include: cooperative learning, place-based learning, project-based learning, visual thinking, and inquiry-based learning.

Kamalani Academy provides an overall sound plan for special populations and at-risk students. There is a response to intervention plan, appropriate support materials and assessments that demonstrate best practices. The concern in section IIC is regarding transportation of students needing services. There is mention of the services being offered at the student’s home school when the school does not offer transportation. This issue although addressed in the request for clarification simply notes if the IEP determines transportation is required for a student, the school will provide it. A more definitive explanation of how that transportation will be accomplished is needed.

The school provides a coherent plan in section II D for developing the school culture. Na Hopena A'o outcomes are articulated and there are plans for the explicit teaching and assessments of the concept. The school has chosen Positive Behavior Instructional Support (PBIS) as the foundation of their student discipline.

Plans for professional development include being responsive to the assessed needs of students and staff. PBIS training, a professional induction to establish commitment to the school's vision and provide support, and a summer seminar of arts integration are few of the features for development that supports the school's mission and academic plan.

In section II F, the concern expressed by the evaluation committee was in regard to the start time of both staff and students at 7:45 AM. In order to support the school's culture and begin the day with a daily gathering, teachers/staff members should have the opportunity to begin their day at least 15 minutes before the students' arrival. The committee is hopeful that with this weakness identified, the school will reconsider this issue.

To summarize, the academic plan meets the majority of the criteria leading to a "meets standard" view of the evaluation committee. It is recommended Kamalani Academy carefully considers transportation for special needs students and the structure of the school's starting time.

Organizational Plan

Enter the proposed school name

Rating

Kamalani Academy

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

Kamalani Academy proposes a governance structure that consists of a governing board that governs the school, a school principal that operates under the direction of the governing board, and Academica, a national charter school service provider that will assist with all levels of the school's operations, such as Support Charter Application Process & Renewal, Bookkeeping, Board Meeting Services, Record Keeping, Financial Projections & Statements, Lottery, Governmental Compliance, Etc. In addition, there will be two boards that will advise the school's governing board; Community Advisory Board, and Kamalani Advisory Board; and an affiliation agreement will be annually purchased from Doral Academy Inc. for Principal Resources, Training, Accreditation Support, Etc.

The Advisory Board has been in operation with the governing board for two years. The membership composition is intended to have expertise in education, finance, Hawaiian culture, and other areas that may assist the board to conduct the school. The governing board will periodically consult with the Advisory Board whose purpose is to provide advice and does not have decision-making authority.

The Community Advisory Board will be an expansive representation of the community's groups including community church organizations. The Community Advisory Board will meet quarterly with the school's governing board and the school's academic leaders and will benefit the governing board by providing perspective, feedback, and recommendations that will assist with maintaining successful curriculum, establishing spending priorities, and for continuous quality improvements.

Academica, as a national education service provider will establish a Hawaii office and will be closely involved with the daily financial, organizational, and administrative school operation activities. In the application process the governing board has provided repeated verbal and written reassurances that it will review any recommendations made by Academica but that the full governing board will make the final decisions regarding the school. The governing board has also provided reassurances that they understand that the contract with Academica will require a review by the Department of the Attorney General before Kamalani Academy can agree to its terms.

Analysis

The Organizational Plan **meets the standard** for approval due to the sound management and facilities plans, that have detailed and realistic targets and experienced individuals leading the development and management of the projects of the start-up phase. Beyond year 0, the national level supports and experienced local governing board inspire confidence in the proposals, and the governing board's continued understanding and embrace of its legal responsibilities, as a public state entity, will safeguard success for the proposed school.

The application presents a sound management plan for the start-up period. During this phase, the school's principal and two governing board members will donate 500 hours each to meet the demands of school development in year 0. In addition, there are standing commitments from two additional individuals for 200 hours each to provide project management and project coordination services. Because all hours will be donated, this plan aligns to the proposed financial budget.

The management plan for the start-up period was presented as a chart, attachment BB. The chart format presented a breakdown of tasks and identified milestones that made the work reasonable and provided step-by-step assignments for each task and then targeted timelines to completion. Individuals alone are not assigned each task. Instead a collection of people with particular skill sets and prior leadership experience in the area, are grouped together so there are two or more assigned to the development and implementation tasks. Last, the presentation of an organized matrix of work tasks and the skill level of assigned individuals, showed the sophistication of the group and inspired confidence in their ability to successfully carry out its school implementation management plan.

The number one challenge for charter schools is facilities and Kamalani Academy has a favorable proposal. The location was previously a K-8 school and there is a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound plan for securing and renovating the buildings. Although not an enrollment preference, the proposal presented that the school intends to serve economically disadvantaged students. This supported the school's rationale for a Wahiawa campus, which would decrease the travel and commute burden that would otherwise prevent targeted families from being able access the school's services.

The applicant identified viable brokers and consultants to ensure buildings would meet the required County Building, Planning and Fire Codes, as well as the requirements of the school's arts integration Academic Plan. There is a thorough preparation already underway to be ready for year 0 school implementation requirements. An architecture firm, Design Partners, was engaged and visited the site, and needed improvements were assessed and presented in the application. Turner-Agassi Charter School Facilities Fund, a nationally experienced education facility developer for charter schools, will finance those improvements and lease the facility. To ensure the improvement project meets the school's timeline for build-out, the planning and design firm PBR Hawaii and Associates Inc., has been engaged and will be responsible for the building permits.

Although the school is adding grades and increasing its population in year 2 of operation, in anticipation of the growth the applicant states all facility preparations will be completed in year 0, thus no preparations will be done during year 1. This plan showed a thorough understanding of the inherent challenges of a school's first year and a judicious approach to mitigate such challenges thereby increasing its chances at successfully opening the school on time. In addition, the application states the service provider, Academica, and architect, Design Partners, will be responsible for the planned addition of two portable buildings in year 3. Therefore there is a plan in place that releases the School Principal from any facility burdens that would distract from the focus on academic performance. Due to modest budgets it isn't often that charter schools are able to achieve this level of balance between operations and human resources making this proposal impressive.

Financial Plan

Enter the proposed school name

Rating

Kamalani Academy

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

The financial leadership team for Kamalani Academy will be provided by the Governing Board who will oversee all aspects of the school’s fiscal management. Financial planning, statement preparation and other reports will be provided by contractors hired by the Governing Board.

The following chart provides the budget revenues, expenses and operating gains for years 0 through 3.

	Total Revenue	Total Expenses	Total Gain/(Loss)
Year 0	25,000	25,000	0
Year 1	1,247,350	1,226,475	20,875
Year 2	1,568,450	1,482,885	85,565
Year 3	1,889,550	1,764,055	125,495

Analysis

The Financial Plan meets the standard for approval because the standard criteria are materially met. However, specific requirements must be addressed during the pre-opening year to fully satisfy the criteria requirements before a charter is awarded to the school. The specific requirements to be satisfied before the charter is awarded include:

1. Development of internal control procedures;
2. Description of roles, responsibilities and processes with appropriate delineation to insure proper financial oversight and management;
3. Development of sound criteria and procedures for vendor and contractor selection;
4. Development of a year 1 cash flow contingency plan in the event revenue and/or cost projections are not met in advance of opening.

The internal controls and compliance practices response provides an adequate explanation of how the proposed school will establish and maintain strong internal controls and ensure compliance with all financial reporting requirements.

The proposed school will be contracting with a service provider, Academica. “Academica will be responsible for the school’s bookkeeping, financial reporting and financial liability”. The service agreement will need to be reviewed by the proposed school’s attorney general to ensure terms and conditions comply with State requirements.

Academica will be supervised by the Board’s Treasurer. As a third party provider in the business of providing these services, it is assumed proper internal control procedures will be developed and followed. However, the proposed school should develop these internal control procedures during the pre-opening period.

The criteria required that the description must also explain the plans and procedures for conducting an annual audit in accordance with state law. The “how” of securing the audit and the “what”, plans and procedures for conducting the audit, was not thoroughly explained. During the pre-opening period, the proposed school should develop the process and criteria for selecting its auditor, especially since the external audit firm will share somehow in the supervision of the service provider, Academica.

The financial oversight and management response described the roles and responsibilities and the appropriate delineation among the proposed school leadership team, management team and governing board regarding school financial oversight and management.

The proposed school will be hiring a service provider to perform the day-to-day roles and operations of the proposed school’s fiscal requirements. While specific cash oversight is discussed in the application, there is no real discussion or explanation of interactions between the school leadership and Academica. Emphasis is on governing board and Academica relationship. Frequent interactions would be necessary as Academica is operating as the “back office” for the school.

While it can be implied there will be proper segregation of duties, there should be some explanation of the processes – for example, the process of invoice payments: approval of invoices for payment, how invoices will be provided to Academica for payment, how generated checks will be provided to the school for appropriate signature, etc. Although a draft service agreement is provided in the supporting documents of the application, a general sense of the procedures are not discussed. The proposed school should be required to develop the description of roles, responsibilities and processes so that appropriate delineation regarding financial oversight and management will be clearly understood.

There is a concerning section in the Academica service agreement, “Financial Solicitation and Coordination”. As an approved charter school and state agency, financing agreements are generally not allowed. Hopefully, this section will be removed from Academica’s standard agreement when reviewed by the school’s state attorney general.

The Vendor and Contractor selection response does not include a description of sound criteria and procedures for selection. This question required a description of sound criteria and procedures for selecting vendors or contractors. This requirement was not met but must be remedied during the start-up Year 0 and as a pre-opening assurance.

The Financial Plan Workbook did include the year 1 cash flow contingency plan. One of the clarifying questions asked the proposed school of a contingency plan in the event enrollment is 10% or more below projection. The proposed school included a 5% contingency in their budgeting. Although a 15% reduction in enrollment is discussed in the application, including various areas of potential cost reductions, it was difficult to evaluate as an overall contingency plan summarizing the various items discussed in the narrative was not provided.

Another clarifying question had to do with the school’s lack of budget for office equipment for office/administrative staff. It is not clear the proposed school understood the question, however this operational issue can be addressed during the proposed school’s pre-opening year with the development of the proposed school’s contingency plan development.

Evidence of Capacity

Enter the proposed school name

Rating

Kamalani Academy

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

Members of the Academic Team include Governing Board members Rae Takemoto, Dr. VerlieAnn Malina-Wright, Dr. Patrick Macy, Principal Martha Evans and Advisory Board Members Dr. Jaime Simpson Steele, Albert Nahale-a, Evan Anderson, Lei Ahsing.

Dr. Macy, as a former Teacher, Principal, and School District Superintendent has experience in school leadership, governance, administration, and performance management. Rae Takemoto is currently the Director for The President’s Arts Turnaround Program in Hawaii and is the former Arts Integration Curriculum Specialist at Pomaikai’I Elementary School. She has extensive experience in curriculum development, instruction, and assessment. Dr. VerlieAnn Malina-Wright is a nationally and internationally known expert in educational administration and indigenous cultures. She has experience in educational leadership, administration, assessment, performance management and governance. Dr. Jamie Simpson-Steele is an Assistant Professor at the University of Hawaii and former teacher. Her experience is in instruction, assessment, parent engagement, and arts integration outcome research. Albert Nahale-a is an educator at Kamehameha Schools and former Principal at Laupahoehoe Community Public Charter School. He has experience with leadership, administration, and parent and community engagement. Evan Anderson currently works as the Arts Integration Coach at Voyager Charter School and has experience with instruction, leadership, and curriculum. Lei Ahsing is currently the Education Director for Hawaii Arts Alliance and has experience with curriculum, leadership, administration, and community engagement.

Kamalani Academy’s essential partners are Academica Nevada, Doral Academy, Turner-Agassi Charter School Facilities Foundation and Our Lady of Sorrows parish.

Academica Nevada, a national charter school management company, will provide business support services to Kamalani Academy. They will also assist the Board with: creating budgets and financial forecasts, monitoring and assuring compliance, locating and securing a facility, maintaining financial records, providing human resource services, coordinating board meetings, ensuring regulatory compliance.

Turner-Agassi Charter School Facilities Foundation (TACSFF), a facilities development company, will provide facility financing and related services to Kamalani Academy. TACSFF has numerous sources of development funds available for quality school facilities and has previously funded many school sites with Academica and Doral Academy.

These partners will each have clearly delineated roles and responsibilities in their respective contracts enabling the KA Board, Leadership Team, Faculty and Staff to meet the vision and mission of the school.

Mrs. Evans has served in numerous academic and organizational leadership roles throughout her career. An additional member of the proposed school’s leadership team will be an Arts Integration Curriculum Specialist. The members of the Governing Board who will play a substantial role are Steve

Davidson, Jarrett Macanas, and Ku`uipo Laumatia. Principal Evans and her Arts Integration Curriculum Specialist will be important, as well. Two resident staff of Academica Hawaii, Bob Howell and Ryan Reeves of Academica Nevada, and Turner-Agassi, a charter school facilities support foundation, will support them.

Analysis

The evidence of capacity section meets the standard of approval because there is evidence that the key members of the proposed school's academic team having the collective qualifications and capacity to implement the school's academic plan successfully. The proposed school identified key members of their team, including governing board members, school leadership, school management, and essential partners who will play an important role in the school's development and operation. Additionally, the proposed school's academic team includes sufficient capacity in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and performance management.

The applicant also demonstrates evidence of capacity to implement their organizational plan. This capacity is demonstrated by the management plan for the start-up period that has a detailed and thorough plan with itemized tasks, timelines, and adequate resources allocated to each task. Additionally, partnering with a qualified service provider allows the principal of the school to focus on implementing the academic plan by providing support with operational duties, including facilities.

Finally, the applicant demonstrates that their financial team's individual and collective qualifications for implementing the proposed school's financial plan successfully is sufficient. The capacity is demonstrated based on qualifications and experience; however, additional description of roles, responsibilities and processes with appropriate delineation to insure proper financial oversight and management need to be further developed.

Evaluator Biographies

Cindy Henry

Ms. Henry is the Commission's Education Specialist/Title 1 Linker. She has twenty years of education experience, including teaching in a variety of settings in California, as well as serving as a Regional Program Director and Director of a charter school. She has a BA in Sociology from Chico State University and a MA in Education from Grand Canyon University.

Sherri Morgan

Sherri Morgan, M.A. is currently the Executive Director/Superintendent of Long Valley Charter School in the rural northeast of California. After teaching mathematics in Arizona, she has been a teacher and administrator in California charter schools for the last 20 years and cares deeply about the growth of charter programs of excellence.

Leila Shar

Ms. Shar is the Commission's Financial Performance Manager. She has over 20 years of experience in financial and operations management, including holding the position of Chief Financial Officer of the Queen's Development Corporation, a subsidiary of the Queen's Health System. In addition to overseeing financial operations, she has developed strategic plans for large Hawaii corporations and managed three large physician office buildings, with responsibilities ranging from oversight of renovations to leasing. She holds a Master in Business from the University of Michigan.

Sylvia Silva

Ms. Sylvia Silva is the Commission's Organizational Performance Specialist. Prior to working with the Commission she worked for its predecessor agency, the Charter School Review Panel (CSRP). Before her work in charter school authorizing she had 7 years of experience at the school level in school operations including school pre-opening/start-up phase systems and policy development, registrar functions, and school book-keeping. She holds a B.A. in Business Administration from Chaminade University of Honolulu.

Appendix A
2015-2016 Evaluation Report for Kamalani Academy

Evaluation Criteria Overview

The Application Requirements and Criteria are the essential tools for the Evaluation Team, used in both their individual and team assessments of each application. The Evaluation Team presents both ratings on a scale and narrative analysis of each section of the application as compared to the Application Requirements and Criteria. Throughout the application evaluation process, evaluators will update their analysis to include additional information (due diligence, capacity interview, etc.) as it is presented. Within each section and subsection, specific criteria define the expectations for a response that “Meets the Standard.” In addition to meeting the criteria that are specific to that section, each part of the application should align with the other sections of the application. In general, the following definitions guide evaluator ratings:

Rating	Characteristics
Meets the Standard	The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation; presents a clear, realistic picture of how the proposed school expects to operate; and inspires confidence in the applicant’s capacity to carry out the plan effectively.
Does Not Meet the Standard	The response meets the criteria in some respects but has substantial gaps, lacks detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas and does not reflect a thorough understanding of key issues. It does not provide enough accurate, specific information to show thorough preparation; fails to present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate; and does not inspire confidence in the applicant’s capacity to carry out the plan effectively.
Falls Far Below the Standard	The response does not meet the criteria in most respects, is undeveloped or significantly incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation; raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan; or the applicant’s capacity to carry it out.

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 material weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must demonstrate evidence of capacity to implement the proposed plan, meet the criteria for all main sections of the application (Academic Plan, Organizational Plan, Financial Plan, and Applicant Capacity), and present an overall proposal that is likely to result in the successful opening of a *high-quality charter school*, as defined in the Request for Proposals (“RFP”).

Note on Evidence of Capacity

Throughout the evaluation of the application, the Evaluation Team assessed the applicant’s capacity to execute the plan as presented. In total, a high-quality application demonstrates evidence that the applicant has the capacity needed in all key areas in order to open and operate a *high-quality charter school* that improves academic outcomes for students. This evidence includes:

- Individual and collective qualifications (which may include, but is not limited to, documented and relevant credentials and experience reflected in the resumes of all members and an understanding, as demonstrated by the application responses, of challenges, issues, and

requirements associated with running a *high-quality charter school*, as defined in the RFP) to implement the Academic Plan successfully, including sufficient capacity in areas such as school leadership, administration, and governance; curriculum, instruction, and assessment; performance management; and parent or guardian and community engagement.

- Individual and collective qualifications for implementing the Organizational Plan successfully, including sufficient capacity in areas such as staffing, professional development, performance management, general operations, and facilities acquisition, development, and management.
- Individual and collective qualifications for implementing the Financial Plan successfully, including sufficient capacity in areas such as financial management, fundraising and development, accounting, and internal controls.

Evaluation Report

I. School Overview

The School Overview section is not separately rated by evaluators. However, the Evaluation Team will consider each section of the application to assess its alignment with the statements in the School Overview section, as it provides the foundation for the entire application.

II. Academic Plan

A strong Academic Plan is coherent overall and aligned internally with the proposed school's mission and vision; Organizational Plan; and Financial Plan.

Section II.B: Curriculum and Instructional Design

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
---	--	--

Criterion II.B.1

Strengths:

Two integrated blocks of humanities and STEM adequately and cohesively cover topics of study.
 Outcomes for each block thoroughly expressed for each grade level.
 Developmentally appropriate outcomes.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.B.2

Strengths:

Thorough description of rigorous standards includes C3, NGSS and CCSS.
 Rationale for integration includes sound concrete examples.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.B.3

Strengths:

Materials properly aligned to standards and desired outcomes.
 Specific concrete examples demonstrate understanding of academic plan.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.B.4

Strengths:

Clearly expressed targets for student gains. Weaknesses: Goal#2 does not adequately address students who are more than 1 year behind
Criterion II.B.5
Strengths: Demonstrates good understanding of state’s academic accountability system Clear and thorough description of plan for utilizing portfolios. Highly detailed portfolio plan Weaknesses: Description of roles and responsibilities of instructional leaders would benefit from more specificity.
Criterion II.B.6
Strengths: Instructional strategies clearly support arts integration and mission of school Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.B.7
Not Applicable
Criterion II.B.8 (sub-criteria a through j)
Not Applicable

Section II.C: Special Populations and At-Risk Students		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard With reservations on II C1	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion II.C.1		
Strengths: Good understanding on the identification and support with SPED and 504 pupils Weaknesses: No overall plan provided for gifted and homeless student groups. Transportation in Year one for special education services at student’s home school is not adequately addressed and provides a serious concern for the evaluation committee.		
Criterion II.C.2		
Strengths: Demonstrates an understanding of HSTA agreement II-c-2-d: Data Day II-c-2-g: Sound plan for training Gen Ed teachers		

Concrete examples document overall plan for Special Education pupils. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.C.3
Strengths: Use of PBIS Weaknesses: Does not address question of how PBIS will support instructional strategies.
Criterion II.C.4
Strengths: Use of accepted practiced for gifted learners. Weaknesses: Detail and examples would enrich the statement, “wealth of opportunities for extended learning...”

Section II.D: School Culture		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion II.D.1		
Strengths: Well articulated plan for the development and maintenance of school culture. Clear description of how HA outcomes are integrated in the overall plan. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.D.2		
Strengths: Good plan for using HA concepts to create a safe learning environment. Clear description on how PBIS will aid in classroom and schoolwide culture. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.D.3		
Strengths: Research based solutions for exposure to college and career from SEED Foundation Weaknesses: K-7 opportunities for career exposure not defined.		
Criterion II.D.4		
Strengths:		

Description of typical day correlated back to school plan and supports the mission and vision.
Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.D.5
Strengths: Demonstrates familiarity with IDEA laws Inclusion of Board of Directors annual review of discipline policy Appropriate use of PBIS as behavioral foundation. Subscription to progressive discipline policy in alignment with HAR
Weaknesses: None

Section II.E: Professional Culture and Staffing		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion II.E.1.a		
Strengths: Staff involvement is cited as a priority for discussion, decision-making, and policy development.		
Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.E.1.b		
Strengths: Description of how the arts integration serves low income pupils		
Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.E.1.c		
Strengths: Shows understanding of BU agreements		
Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.E.2.a		
Strengths: Research based plan for PLCs with an emphasis on data, PBIS and intervention strategies.		
Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.E.2.b		

<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Focus on arts integration strategies for PD to support academic plan.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Evaluation committee is unsure there is adequate time to fully induct new teachers into the stated culture.</p>
Criterion II.E.2.c
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Knows collective bargaining unit – demonstrated capacity in this area</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
Criterion II.E.2.d
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Arts integration specialist is the primary PD coordinator; this person will have access to knowing firsthand the challenges of integration for staff and students.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
Criterion II.E.3.a
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Presentation of a structure that clearly supports mission and vision.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
Criterion II.E.3.b
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Sound rationale for specific staff</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
Criterion II.E.3.c
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Not Applicable</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Not Applicable</p>
Criterion II.E.4.a
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Recruitment efforts</p> <p>Highly qualified details meet requirements.</p> <p>Plan for staff to grow and support each other</p>

Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.b
Not Applicable
Criterion II.E.4.c
Strengths: Chart Process for background checks and hiring are appropriate Weaknesses: Suggest the addition of representatives from all stakeholder groups on hiring committee
Criterion II.E.4.d
Strengths: Evaluation plan is well articulated and utilizes research based techniques and instruments. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.e
Strengths: Unsatisfactory performance issues are adequately addressed and demonstrate knowledge in bargaining agreements Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.f
Strengths: Shows capacity for BU contract Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.g
Not yet developed

Section II.F: School Calendar and Schedule		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion II.F.1		
Strengths: Daily gathering supports school goals of HA. Weaknesses:		

Teacher and student day both begin at 7:45 am; is this feasible?
Criterion II.F.2
Strengths: Instructional minutes carefully laid out Weaknesses: None

Section II.G: Supplemental Programs		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion II.G.1		
Not Applicable		

Section II.H: Third-Party Service Providers		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable		
Criterion II.H.1.a		
Strengths: The application provided reasonable explanations and specifically states that the proposed school's board of directors will make final decisions. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.H.1.b		
Strengths: None Weaknesses: There are no findings reported in the application on what reference checks were conducted by the applicant.		
Criterion II.H.1.c		
Strengths: Not Applicable Weaknesses: Not Applicable		
Criterion II.H.1.d		
Strengths: None		

<p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.1.e</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.2.a</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.2.b</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.2.c</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Academica will not have supervisory responsibilities.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.2.d</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.2.e</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.3.a</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p>

<p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The Evaluation Team is unclear on whether Academica will defer or waive fees. During the interview, clarity was achieved. The contract with Academica will need to go through AG review.</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.3.b</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.3.c</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.3.d</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.3.e</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The application is missing operating and capital expenditures that each party is responsible for.</p>
<p>Criterion II.H.3.f</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>The governing board will determine whether they will hire more staff or go with another service provider. This demonstrates awareness of current staffing plans.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>

<p>Section II.I: Conversion Charter School Additional Academic Information</p>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable		

III. Organizational Plan

A strong Organizational Plan is coherent overall and aligned internally with the school's mission and vision, Academic Plan, and Financial Plan.

Section III.A: Governance

The governing board's mission, vision, and philosophy are not separately rated by the evaluators. However, these mission and vision statements should align with the proposed school's mission and vision and other parts of the application.

Meets the Standard **Does Not Meet the Standard** **Falls Far Below the Standard**

Criterion III.A.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.2

Strengths:

Initial questions to understand the advisory boards, the roles and the relationships to the governing board, were clarified through the amended attachment T in the Request for Clarification.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.3

Strengths:

Initial questions to understand the three organizations and how they fit together were clarified in the Request for Clarification and confirmed roles and expectations have been thought out.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.4

Not applicable as the applicant does not propose a virtual or blended learning program.

Criterion III.A.5

Strengths:

The governing board has a diverse skill-set, and experience in the areas stipulated by 302D. Although not a requirement, the large group of individuals present at the capacity interview and the group contribution to the meeting provided evidence of the board's capacity and involvement. The collective group inspired confidence in the applicant's ability to carry out its proposed plan.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.6

<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The application is not consistent on its proposal of the number of members the governing board will have: bylaws say there will be seven members (pg. R4), pg. 69 says there will be nine, pg. R5 indicates there will be nine.</p> <p>Also, Page R6 Section 7 says agenda posting is 3 days before a meeting and seems to conflict with section 8 which says agenda posting is six days</p>
Criterion III.A.7
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>
Criterion III.A.8
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Application did not meet the criteria. Bylaws do not include a sound plan for orientation of new members, ongoing training, and development and training topics. Instead bylaws state they shall develop a training/orientation program, that members will attend charter school conferences. The response was sparse and didn't have detail.</p>
Criterion III.A.9
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Application did not meet the criteria. It did not provide descriptions of all advisory bodies. The Organizational Chart and the Request for Clarification confirmed the governing board will have 2 advisory bodies but only 1 is mentioned in this section and the "Community Advisory Board" is omitted. In addition, criteria ask for an explanation of relationships between advisory bodies and the leadership team and roles of different stakeholder groups as related to the board and leadership. The applicant however does not include here its affiliations with Academica, and Doral and how it relates to the board and the leadership team. Response was sparse, missing details, and short.</p>

Section III.B: Performance Management		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion III.B.1 (including sub-criteria a through c)		
Strengths:		

The use of Data Teams and a Data Wall in its Data Assessment Plan was interesting and a strength.
Weaknesses: None
Criterion III.B.2
Strengths: III-B-2-c: It is a strength that the school’s plan is for the board to be the responsible party to address school performance deficiencies.
Weaknesses: None
Criterion III.B.3
Strengths: None
Weaknesses: None

Section III.C: Ongoing Operations		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion III.C.1		
Strengths: None		
Weaknesses: Transportation service is not required but considering the population that the school states it intends to serve an inclination is to ask the applicant why they think families would be able to, or will choose to, enroll at their school when the needed services, like transportation, are not provided by the charter school but are provided at the neighborhood DOE school. The concern is whether the enrollment targets are realistic goals and thereby whether the budget is sound.		
Criterion III.C.2		
Strengths: It is a strength to the proposal that the governing board has decided to implement background checks on its volunteers, but also that volunteers will be supervised by school employees.		
Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.C.3		
Strengths: It is not a requirement for schools to provide a meal service and strengthens the plan when schools are able to. It is especially commendable when the school plans to locate in areas where we know families need this meal service. We would have liked to have seen though more details (like the detail provided in attachment BB) in the		

plans to obtain necessary permits and what requirements the school will have for vendors to be “qualified”.

Weaknesses:

None

Section III.D: Student Recruitment, Admission and Enrollment

Meets the Standard Does Not Meet the Standard Falls Far Below the Standard

Criterion III.D.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.D.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.D.3

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

Need clarification on “Any board member” versus “Founding board member”. These terms may not have been used consistently in the proposed policy.

Section III.E: Parent Involvement and Community Outreach

Meets the Standard Does Not Meet the Standard Falls Far Below the Standard

Criterion III.E.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

More detail and explanation could have been included to elaborate on the school’s philosophy regarding parent and community involvement. The application states they are “integral parts” but does not explain why. It does not say how these parts enhance the program.

Criterion III.E.2

Strengths:

None

<p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>More detail and explanation could have been included. The applicant provided a list of activities. This does not completely address the criteria that ask for “engaging” “welcoming” and “accessible” plans. Details such as frequency, efforts to increase participation, participation goals or targets, purposes for meetings, and others would have provided a clearer picture. The plans may meet all of the criteria but we cannot tell by the succinct response.</p>
<p>Criterion III.E.3</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Sincere responses should be provided for each criteria rather than references back to other sections.</p>
<p>Criterion III.E.4</p>
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>These letters in particular clearly demonstrated how the partnership will benefit the school and showed evidence of commitment:</p> <p>Letter from HTY described satisfactorily the intent and commitment, and ability of this organization to partner with the school. This partnership will make the school’s academic plan possible.</p> <p>PAF committed in-kind services through its Chair and stated it would assist with leveraging resources.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>

Section III.F: Nonprofit Involvement

Not applicable because the school does not plan to have an associated nonprofit organization.

<p>Section III.G: Geographic Location and Facilities</p>		
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard</p>
<p>Criterion III.G.1</p>		
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>It inspires confidence that the site was previously a school. Anticipating applicant will have an easier time meeting county codes and spaces will be appropriate for children and conducive to learning.</p> <p>Not an enrollment preference but the school has intentions to serve economically disadvantaged students. This supported the school’s rationale for its location.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>		
<p>Criterion III.G.2</p>		
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Applicant has a favorable facility proposal. The detailed breakdown of activities of attachment BB supported this section thus it was easy to determine the applicant had sound plans specific to renovating and securing the</p>		

buildings.

Partnership with TACSFF inspires confidence that governing board has outside experienced support for successful implementation of its facilities plan.

Being able to identify specific consultants and brokers and articulation of the work done by the vendors provided validity to the application and showed thorough preparation and an understanding of what the authorizer is requiring and the why it is required.

Facility preparations will be completed in year 0, thus no preparations will be done during year 1. This demonstrated a thorough understanding of our key challenges in school implementation. Applicant states the service provider, Academica, and architect, Design Partners, will be responsible for the planned addition of 2 portable buildings in year 3. Not tasking the School Principal with these activities also demonstrated an understanding of challenges faced by previous start-ups.

Early questions regarding roles among the groups were clarified in the Capacity Interview and Request for Clarification which strengthened this section.

Weaknesses:

None

Section III.H: Start-Up Period

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
---	--	--

Criterion III.H.1

Strengths:

The charting of the start-up plan presented the information in an easy to read and simple format. It was easy to determine the plan was sound and comprehensive. There are a lot of specific details in the "Task Description and Status" column – excellent. The "Owners" column is populated with specific individuals and every task has 2 or more people assigned. Liked the "Owners" label – speaks to the group's attitude and commitment. Timeline has very specific dates. Early questions regarding \$25,000 in funds from Academic were resolved through the Capacity Interview.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.H.2

Strengths:

The school has selected their School Principal who is an experienced school leader. She will lead the pre-opening phase and take particular ownership over the academic components of the start-up plan.

Weaknesses:

Applicant did not completely address the criteria. It doesn't completely describe its "viable plan" regarding compensation for the individuals during the pre-opening phase. The response only talks about compensation for the School Principal but does not address compensation for the other individuals listed.

Section III.I: Conversion Charter School Additional Organizational Information

Not Applicable

IV. Financial Plan

A strong Financial Plan is coherent overall and aligned internally with the proposed school's mission and vision, Academic Plan, and Organization Plan.

Section IV.A: Financial Oversight and Management

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
---	--	--

Criterion IV.A.1

Strengths:

Planning to use an experienced service provider for financial planning, statement preparation.

Weaknesses:

Internal control procedures need more development.

Criterion IV.A.2

Strengths:

Planning to use an experienced service provider for bookkeeping and financial reporting.

Weaknesses:

Need more detail/specificity in roles and responsibilities of service provider and proposed school staff to provide better understanding of appropriate delineation of roles.

Criterion IV.A.3

Strengths:

Will use RFP process for vendor/contractor selection.

Weaknesses:

Need more detail/specificity of procedures for vendor/contractor selection even if using RFP process.

Section IV.B: Operating Budget

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
---	--	--

Criterion IV.B.1

Strengths:

Reasonable budget.

Included 5% contingency in budget.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion IV.B.2

Strengths:

Assumptions for revenues and expenses provided.

Weaknesses:

Although 15% contingency discussed in application, it was difficult to evaluate as an overall contingency plan summarizing the various items was not provided.

Not clear if proposed school understood clarifying question regarding office equipment for admin use.

V. Applicant Capacity

The applicant's capacity is evaluated based on the applicant's individual and collective qualifications (including, but not limited to, documented and relevant credentials and experience reflected in the resumes of all members) and the applicant's demonstrated understanding of challenges, issues, and requirements associated with running a high-quality charter school, as defined in the RFP (including, but not limited to, the application and Capacity Interview responses).

Section V.A: Academic Plan Capacity

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
---	--	--

Criterion V.A.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion V.A.2

Strengths:

The application demonstrates a clear knowledge of the community and the geographic area.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion V.A.3

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The Evaluation Team is not clear on what the relationship is between the essential partners. They are identified and explained in the application, but not in a way that evaluators can see how they connect.

Criterion V.A.4

Strengths:

The proposed principal is well-qualified.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion V.A.5

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Section V.B: Organizational Plan Capacity		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion V.B.1		
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>The governing board will have support from an experienced Education Service Provider.</p> <p>The selection of an experienced school Principal with Hawaii DOE experience provides additional confidence that the proposed charter school will be implemented successfully.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The use of an experienced Education Service Provider does not absolve the governing board from ensuring that charter contract requirements are met. The governing board, once granted a charter, becomes a state entity along with the charter school and is ultimately responsible to the state for delivering on the charter contract and is directly responsible for all aspects of the school.</p>		
Criterion V.B.2		
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>None</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>None</p>		

Section V.C: Financial Management Capacity		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard	<input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion V.C.1		
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Proposed governing board members possess diversity of skills recommended.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Need more clarity on role of Academica.</p>		
Criterion V.C.2		
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>Partners include potential landlord, and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Not clear what relationship is between Turner-Agassi and Doral Academy with the proposed school.</p>		

Exhibit B
Applicant Response for Kamalani Academy

Kamalani Academy Response to the Evaluation Team's Final Application Recommendation Report

June 30, 2016

The Kamalani Founding Board thanks the Hawaii State Public Charter School Evaluation Team for its careful review of our application and for its favorable recommendation.

The Board recognizes that the Evaluation Team identified a number of areas of concern in its Final Application Recommendation Report. We understand that satisfactory answers to these concerns are critical to the successful opening of Kamalani Academy and we are committed to resolving each during the pre-opening period.

Thank you, again, for your recommendation to the Application Committee that our proposal for a charter be approved. We look forward to providing a high quality educational alternative to the families of central Oahu.

Exhibit C

Leilehua-Mililani-Waiialua Complex Area Superintendent's Comments on Kamalani Academy

From: [John Brummel/](#)
To: [Yvonne Lau](#)
Subject: Proposed Charter School in Wahiawa Feedback
Date: Wednesday, June 08, 2016 9:35:05 AM

Ms. Lau:

I would like to submit my feedback in response to the proposed development of the Charter School, Kamalani Academy, in Wahiawa. I am strongly against the proposed location of Kamalani Academy in Wahiawa. As the Complex Area Superintendent for the Leilehua-Mililani-Waialua Complex for the past three years, I have had the opportunity to witness the fine arts programs offered to all students in the Leilehua Complex at every school level. All of the Hawaii Department of Education schools in Wahiawa have a focus on Arts Education and have done a tremendous job of providing our students with a well-rounded education that meets the needs of every mode of learner.

Leilehua Complex has a fine tradition of high quality education for our students in the Arts. Just recently, 51 student works from Leilehua High School were honored at the Scholastic Art Awards statewide competition — the most by far of any school. The Scholastic Art Awards is the longest-running, largest and most prestigious student recognition program in the United States. Nine of those students went on to earn medals at the 2016 National Scholastic Art Awards. Two students were awarded gold medals, with the other seven students awarded silver medals. This success is a culmination of all of the hard work done by the Leilehua Complex teachers from elementary to secondary level.

The development of this charter school will impact our existing schools' enrollment. The proposed charter school will be in direct competition with our public schools in Wahiawa. I am concerned the development of Kamalani Academy could impact our schools' enrollment. Decreased student enrollment impacts staffing and could ultimately negatively impact the future of our Arts programs. The Arts programs have been established for several years in the Leilehua Complex and our Wahiawa Community is familiar and supports these programs. The loss of these programs would be a tremendous loss to the Wahiawa Community.

Thank you for taking into consideration my comments to the proposed development of Kamalani Academy. If you have any questions, you may contact me at.

Sincerely,

Dr. John Brummel

Complex Area Superintendent

Leilehua, Mililani, Waialua Complexes