

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: July 11, 2017

DATE OF MEETING: July 13, 2017

TO: Catherine Payne, Chairperson

FROM: Mitch D’Olier, Chairperson, Applications Committee

AGENDA ITEM: V. B. Action on Charter Application for Proposed Charter School,
North Shore Charter School

I. DESCRIPTION

Action on Charter School Application for Proposed Charter School, North Shore Charter School.

II. AUTHORITY

Charter School Applications: Pursuant to §302D-5(a), Hawaii Revised Statutes, “[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 (AS DESCRIBED BY THE APPLICANT)

Proposed School Name: North Shore Charter School

Mission: “North Shore Charter School (NSCS) will be a 7th - 8th grade Public Charter School located on Oahu's North Shore that engages students, families, and faculty in a Common Core driven, Project and Problem-Based Learning (PBL) curriculum that combines technology, live instruction, and community partnerships to investigate and respond to local, regional, and global issues related to sustainability, agriculture, marine science, and economic development. NSCS will employ cross curricular study, collaboration, formative assessments, and reflection to emphasize the core values of Mindfulness, Responsibility, Collaboration, and Perseverance among teachers, administrators, and students to create a rigorous and innovative learning environment for students to become valuable contributors in their communities.”

Vision: “NSCS believes that students learn best by experiencing and responding to real world problems. By using Project and Problem-Based Learning (PBL), students at NSCS will become self-directed learners who value education and the impact they can have on local, regional, and global issues. As a result, graduates of NSCS will have the problem solving and critical thinking skills to be successful students in high school and college, and future leaders in their respective careers and communities.”

Geographical Area: “Pending approval from the Charter School Commission, North Shore Charter School will lease space from the Queen Liliuokalani Church, at 66-090 Kamehameha Hwy, Haleiwa, HI 96712. NSCS will have full access to Emerson Hall, parking and drop-off area adjacent to the hall, and the existing outdoor space on the property during all instructional days.”

Key Components of the Educational Model: “The North Shore Charter School will employ a Common Core driven Project and Problem-Based Learning (PBL) curriculum for 7th and 8th graders that combines technology, live instruction, and community partnerships to investigate and respond to local, regional, and global issues related to sustainability, agriculture, marine science, and economic development. NSCS will drive success for the identified student population (coming primarily from the Kahuku and Waialua Complex areas) by targeting areas of need related to academic achievement, chronic absenteeism, and character development specific to 7 – 8 th grades. The PBL curriculum at NSCS will focus on Common Core standards and assessment strategies to develop the critical thinking and problem solving skills necessary for student success on the Hawaii State Assessment, and in high school, college, and careers. The content of NSCS’s PBL curriculum will also provide relevant, real world learning opportunities for students that are proven to improve student engagement and their attitudes towards learning. Therefore, NSCS will drive success for students by focusing on the skills necessary for success, and also create an engaging and relevant learning environment that will reduce the above average rate of chronic absenteeism. Finally, NSCS will also create a safe and supportive learning environment that is specific for young adolescents that is unique among public and private schools on the North Shore of O’ahu. The NSCS program will focus on the character development of this specific age group to better prepare them for success in high school and beyond.”

Enrollment Summary

| Grade Level | Number of Students | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| | Year 1 2018 | | Year 2 2019 | | Year 3 2020 | | Year 4 2021 | | Year 5 2022 | | Capacity 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 50 | | 50 | | 75 | | 75 | | 100 | | 100 | |
| 8 | 50 | | 50 | | 75 | | 75 | | 100 | | 100 | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotals | 100 | | 100 | | 150 | | 150 | | 200 | | 200 | |
| Totals | 100 | | 100 | | 150 | | 150 | | 200 | | 200 | |

IV. BACKGROUND

Each application was reviewed by an evaluation team assembled by Commission staff. The Evaluation Team assigned to the North Shore Charter School application was comprised of Amy Cheung (Team Lead), Beth Bulgeron, Derek Scott Hall, Cindy Henry, Sylvia Silva, and Danny Vasconcellos.

The Evaluation Team’s role in the applications process is to evaluate the application against the evaluation criteria in order to develop recommendations for approval or denial to the Commission. In developing its recommendation, the Evaluation Team reviewed the application; conducted a capacity interview with applicant group members; and reviewed the applicant’s response to the Request for Clarification. The Evaluation Team does not consider public hearing testimony, any comments that have been submitted by the DOE, or the applicant’s response to the Evaluation Team Recommendation Report in developing its recommendation.

Key components of the evaluation process are as follows:

- **Interview:** As required by Section 302D-13, HRS, the evaluation team conducted interviews with North Shore Charter School on April 6, 2017. The RFP required the proposed school director, proposed key school personnel, and members of the governing board to attend the interview and conduct a ten minute presentation on the main elements of their proposed charter school. The applicant group members that attended the interview were: Amy Chiang (governing board member), Jessica dos Santos (governing board member), Sumner Garber (governing board member), Patricia Holmberg (governing board member), Colin Kennedy (governing board member), Brianne Randle (governing board member) and Paul Stader (governing board member).

- **Request for Clarification:** Following the interview, the Evaluation Team may issue a Request for Clarification in order for the applicant to clarify certain elements of the proposal in writing. The Evaluation Team issued a request for Clarification to North Shore Charter School on April 17, 2017. North Shore Charter School submitted a completed Request for Clarification on May 1, 2017.
- **Public Hearing:** Section 302D-13, HRS requires the Commission to hold a public hearing to allow the public an opportunity to provide its input on each charter application. As such, the Commission held a public hearing on the applications submitted as part of the 2016- 2017 applications cycle on May 11, 2017. The RFP required the proposed school director, proposed key school personnel, and members of the governing board to attend the public hearing and conduct a ten minute presentation on the main elements of their proposed charter school. Four applicant group members, two community members, and the executive director of the Hawaii Public Charter School Network provided oral testimony in support of North Shore Charter School. Written testimony was submitted for this applicant from 60 individuals.
- **Evaluation Team Recommendation Report:** This report is produced by the Evaluation Team culminating the review of the application, capacity interview, and request for clarification. Additionally, the applicant has the option to respond in writing to the recommendation report. If the applicant opts to write a written response to the Evaluation Team Recommendation Report, the Evaluation Team may also write a rebuttal to the applicant’s response. The Evaluation Team Recommendation Report was sent to North Shore Charter School on May 22, 2017. North Shore Charter School did not submit a written response to the Evaluation Team Recommendation Report.
- **DOE Comments Solicited:** Commission staff solicited comments from the Department of Education (“DOE”)—particularly the Leilehua-Mililani-Waiialua Complex Area Superintendent, Bob Davis, and the Castle-Kahuku Complex Area Superintendent Matt Ho— on the North Shore Charter School application. The DOE Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance emailed Commission staff the comments that it compiled from the Complex Area Superintendents and principals regarding North Shore Charter School.
- **Executive Director (Staff) Recommendation:** This recommendation is completed by the Executive Director, and appears in the section below.

The Evaluation Team Recommendation Report (**Exhibit A**), and Comments from the DOE (**Exhibit B**), are attached to this submittal.

New Information Cannot Be Considered

Section 302D-5, HRS prohibits the Commission from providing technical assistance to charter applicants where the technical support would directly and substantially impact an authorizer decision related to the approval or denial of the charter application. Because of this, the applications process does not allow applicants to refine and finalize their applications once the application is submitted since applicants must be able to acquire the necessary expertise and develop a high quality application on their own.

At the beginning of the applications process, applicants were advised that the information submitted in the application should be a complete and accurate depiction of the applicant group’s proposed plan. Applicants had the opportunity to provide clarifying information through the Request for Clarification responses. However, applicants may not provide any new information

beyond the clarifying information provided to the Evaluation Team through the Request for Clarification because such new information would not have been completely evaluated by the Evaluation Team. For the purposes of the applications process, new information means any information that substantially differs from what is provided in the application and is revisionary in nature. Removal or addition of significant elements of curriculum that substantially change the academic plan, submittal of a substantially revised policy, or changing the geographic location or grades served are examples of new information.

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. A simple way to avoid the consideration of new information is to focus on the criteria stated in the RFP, in the application template, the evaluation report and specifically Exhibit A of the evaluation report. Clarifying questions Commissioners may have should focus on the specific criterion or criteria in question.

V. INFORMATION FOR CONSIDERATION

Evaluation Team Recommendation Report

In creating its Recommendation Report for North Shore Charter School, the Evaluation Team assessed the following:

- North Shore Charter School's application was assessed against the evaluation criteria presented in the RFP;
- Capacity interview; and
- Request for Clarification.

Following the review of the application, capacity interview and Request for Clarification, the Evaluation Team came to a consensus on its recommendation to deny the charter application for North Shore Charter School. In order to receive a recommendation for approval, an application must meet the standard of approval in all four core areas of the application. The recommendation to deny the North Shore Charter School application was due to the applicant failing to meet the standard of approval in all four core areas of the application.

North Shore Charter School did not meet the standard of approval and satisfy the criteria outlined in the RFP with its academic plan, organizational plan, financial plan and applicant capacity sections.

The Evaluation Team found that the application lacked clear, detailed, comprehensive responses in key areas throughout the entire application. The evaluation team found that this lack of details and explanations in the four core areas of the application resulted in an application that did not provide the Evaluation Team with a clear picture of how the school will operate.

Applicant Response

The applicant did not submit a response to the Recommendation Report.

DOE Comments on North Shore Charter School

The DOE Office of Strategy, Innovation and Performance emailed Commission staff comments that it compiled from the Complex Area Superintendents and principals from Kahuku High and Intermediate (Kahuku) and Waialua High and Intermediate (Waialua) regarding the North Shore Charter School application. There were various concerns raised by the DOE in their comments. Among these are:

- The description of the proposed charter school does not seem to have a strong middle school model and appears unable to match the supports at HIDOE schools.
- Project based learning is currently incorporated in many courses at Kahuku.
- Intermediate school students at Kahuku have separate facilities and separate lunch in the cafeteria
- Intermediate school students at Waialua will have their own building and separate bell schedules for recess and lunch next school year.
- Kahuku intermediate students are engaged in the middle school concept since each student has a team of four core teachers assigned to them to meet individual student needs. A similar concept will be implemented at Waialua where there will be one team of teachers for seventh grade, and one team of teachers for eighth grade.
- The proposed charter school will cause an increase in traffic in the area between Sunset Beach and Haleiwa.

Executive Director (Staff) Recommendation

In developing the executive director (staff) recommendation, the RFP states that the following will be considered:

- Evaluation Team Recommendation Report, Applicant Response, Evaluation Team rebuttal
- Public hearing testimony
- DOE comments

While the Evaluation Team Recommendation Report covers a variety of issues, the executive director 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 executive director 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 the executive director reaches a conclusion for the Committee'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.

Overall, the applicant failed to satisfy the criteria in all four sections of the evaluation. The application lacked clear, detailed, comprehensive responses in key areas throughout the four core areas of the application. The academic plan does not meet the standard since the applicant did not present clear academic goals or targets. The academic plan also did not account for how school culture would be developed or how staffing plans would be implemented. The organizational plan lacked clarity and does not include admission and enrollment policies as required. The financial plan does not meet the standard because the budgets provided did not contain sufficient information nor was the proposed financial plan viable for the start-up period, and for its first three years of operation. Importantly, the HIDOE comments on the application articulated that

much of what the applicant intends to provide are currently provided by the district schools.

It is the Recommendation of the Executive Director to support the review team's ratings in each of the four core areas of the application and therefore support the overall recommendation of a non-approval of this applicant.

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 the Evaluation Team 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.

VI. SCOPE OF COMMISSIONER REVIEW

To make a recommendation to the full Commission regarding the approval or denial of each application, the RFP states that the Applications Committee will consider the following:

- Executive Director (Staff) recommendation
- Evaluation Team Recommendation Report, Applicant Response, Evaluation Team rebuttal
- Public hearing testimony
- DOE comments

Applications Committee Meeting

At the Applications Committee Meeting on June 29, 2017 applicant group member Colin Kennedy testified in support of the North Shore Charter School application. No written testimony was received. The Committee took action to recommend to the full Commission the denial of the North Shore Charter School application.

VII. RECOMMENDATION

Recommending the denial of the North Shore Charter School application.

Exhibit A

Evaluation Team Recommendation Report for North Shore Charter School



State Public Charter School Commission 2016-2017 Recommendation Report

Charter Application for
North Shore Charter School

Evaluation Team

Team Lead: Amy Cheung

Evaluators: Beth Bulgeron

Derek Scott Hall

Cindy Henry

Sylvia Silva

Danny Vasconcellos

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 2016-2017 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 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

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 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

North Shore Charter School

Mission and Vision (as described by the applicant)

Mission:

“North Shore Charter School (NSCS) will be a 7th - 8th grade Public Charter School located on Oahu's North Shore that engages students, families, and faculty in a Common Core driven, Project and Problem-Based Learning (PBL) curriculum that combines technology, live instruction, and community partnerships to investigate and respond to local, regional, and global issues related to sustainability, agriculture, marine science, and economic development. NSCS will employ cross curricular study, collaboration, formative assessments, and reflection to emphasize the core values of Mindfulness, Responsibility, Collaboration, and Perseverance among teachers, administrators, and students to create a rigorous and innovative learning environment for students to become valuable contributors in their communities.”

Vision:

“NSCS believes that students learn best by experiencing and responding to real world problems. By using Project and Problem-Based Learning (PBL), students at NSCS will become self-directed learners who value education and the impact they can have on local, regional, and global issues. As a result, graduates of NSCS will have the problem solving and critical thinking skills to be successful students in high school and college, and future leaders in their respective careers and communities.”

Geographic Location (as described by the applicant)

“Pending approval from the Charter School Commission, North Shore Charter School will lease space from the Queen Liliuokalani Church, at 66-090 Kamehameha Hwy, Haleiwa, HI 96712. NSCS will have full access to Emerson Hall, parking and drop-off area adjacent to the hall, and the existing outdoor space on the property during all instructional days.”

Anticipated Student Population (as described by the applicant)

“NSCS primarily seeks to serve 7th - 8th grade students from Mokuleia to Ka'a'awa coming from the Waialua and Kahuku Complex Areas. However, the school enrollment will be open to all 7th - 8th grade Oahu students looking for an alternative public educational option. NSCS is seeking to enroll 100 students in its first year. According to Hawaii DOE Official Enrollment Count SY 16 - 17 Kahuku High and Intermediate, and Waialua High and Intermediate currently enroll a combined total of 720, 7 - 8th graders for the 2016 - 17 school year (479, 241 respectively). Therefore, if the students targeted for enrollment at NSCS only came from the primary complex areas (Kahuku and Waialua), it would account for approximately 13.9% of the total students in its opening year.

Based on the averages of Kahuku High and Intermediate, and Waialua High and Intermediate Schools for the 2015 - 16 school years, North Shore Charter School anticipates a student population that will include 12% Special Education students (SPED), 3.2% English Language Learners (ELL), and 46.65% of students receiving Free or Reduced-Cost Lunch (FRL). The anticipated student ethnicities coming from these two schools will include an average of 33.9% Native Hawaiian, 24.2% White, 17.6% Filipino, 11.2% Pacific

Islander, 2.4% Japanese, 2% Hispanic, and approximately 8.7% coming from other ethnicities.”

Contribution to Public Education System (as described by the applicant)

“North Shore Charter School will provide two distinct opportunities for students and families: the opportunity to attend a school on the North Shore solely focused on middle school grades 7 - 8, and to learn in a Project and Problem-Based Learning (PBL) environment that provides students the opportunity to investigate and respond to real world issues.”

Enrollment Summary (as described by the applicant)

| Grade Level | Number of Students | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|
| | Year 1 | | Year 2 | | Year 3 | | Year 4 | | Year 5 | | Capacity | |
| | 2018 | | 2019 | | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 50 | | 50 | | 75 | | 75 | | 100 | | 100 | |
| 8 | 50 | | 50 | | 75 | | 75 | | 100 | | 100 | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subtotals | 100 | | 100 | | 150 | | 150 | | 200 | | 200 | |
| Totals | 100 | | 100 | | 150 | | 150 | | 200 | | 200 | |

Executive Summary

North Shore Charter School

Recommendation

Deny

Summary Analysis

The recommendation of the Evaluation Team is to deny the application for North Shore Charter School since the applicant failed to meet the standards in all four core areas of the application. Overall, the applicant failed to satisfy the criteria in the academic plan, organizational plan, financial plan, and applicant capacity sections since the application lacked clear, detailed, comprehensive responses in key areas throughout the four core areas of the application. The evidence and information that was provided lacked details and explanations in these core areas which resulted in an application that does not provide the Evaluation Team with a clear picture of how the school plans to operate.

The academic plan does not meet the standard since the applicant did not present clear academic goals or targets, and did not provide a comprehensive plan for educating students with special needs. The academic plan also did not account for how school culture would be developed, or how staffing plans would be implemented.

The organizational plan does not meet the standard since the application did not provide a plan for identifying and recruiting governing board members, and did not include an admission and enrollment policy as required. Additionally, although the applicant has identified a facility that it could use, it has not assessed the facility to determine if any modifications would be needed to bring the facility into compliance to be used as a school.

The financial plan does not meet the standard because the budgets provided did not contain sufficient information nor was the proposed financial plan realistic, and viable for the start-up period, and for its first three years of operation.

The applicant's capacity does not meet the standard of approval. Although the applicant articulated a need for a dedicated middle school on the North Shore of Oahu, nevertheless it did not provide sufficient information requested in the academic plan, organizational plan, financial plan, and applicant capacity sections of the application to meet the criteria. For these reasons, the applicant has not demonstrated the capacity to operate a high quality charter school.

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

Does Not Meet the Standard

Financial Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Organizational Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Evidence of Capacity

Does Not Meet the Standard

Academic Plan

North Shore Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary (as described by the applicant)

“The North Shore Charter School will employ a Common Core driven Project and Problem-Based Learning (PBL) curriculum for 7th and 8th graders that combines technology, live instruction, and community partnerships to investigate and respond to local, regional, and global issues related to sustainability, agriculture, marine science, and economic development.”

Analysis

The academic plan **does not meet the standard** for approval because it failed to satisfy the criteria in many sections. The academic plan provided evidence of a lack of preparation, and wholly insufficient detail to ultimately meet expectations and present a clear picture of how the school plans to operate. Throughout the academic plan portion of the application, there were instances where the applicant addressed parts of the criteria, while subsequently leaving out comprehensive descriptions or explanations, or did not answer the criteria at all.

Evidence of a lack of preparation occur throughout the academic plan section of the application. One example of this is that the application did not provide outcomes for all courses that will be offered to all grade levels. Instead, what was provided was a sample of possible alignments to standards, leaving the evaluation team with uncertainty that all standards will be taught once courses are developed. For example, in the 7th and 8th grade curriculum maps there are no math standards included.

In various sections, the applicant failed to satisfy the criteria. In section II.B.4, the criteria asks for a clear list of academic goals and targets and a description of how the applicant will assess progress toward those goals. The application submitted did not include clear goals or targets, indicating a lack of understanding of the criteria. Criterion II.B.5 asks for three distinct descriptions regarding how instructional leaders and teachers will use student data, and the applicant only answered one of them – the process for teachers is defined, but the leadership roles and responsibilities are not, and the formalized process and support system to enable teachers to reflect on student progress was also not explained. Another example of a partial response is the applicant’s plan to serve educationally disadvantaged students and students with special needs. Criterion II.C.1 requires the applicant to describe its plan to serve six subgroups of students with special needs, and the application addressed only two—SPED and ELL students. The applicant did not have a plan to serve students performing below grade level, students identified as intellectually gifted, homeless students, and students at risk of academic failure or dropping out.

With regard to school culture, the applicant continued the pattern of inadequate responses to criterion. Criterion II. E. 2 required the applicant to describe its plan for developing a school culture that is conducive to a safe learning environment. The applicant’s plan for developing a safe learning environment relies on Project Based Learning, and lacks detail on how the proposed school will

adequately identify, assess, monitor, and address the social, emotional, behavioral, and physical health needs of all students on an ongoing basis. Again, the applicant's response indicates a lack of fully understanding the criterion. Criterion II.E.3 required the applicant to provide a plan for the school culture that will expose students to post-secondary educational and career opportunities at all grade levels. The plan presented by the applicant includes strong community partnerships; however, the applicant does not include how staff will be involved.

The North Shore Charter School Professional Culture and Staffing section did not include key components. Criterion referencing professional development is either lacking a clear description, contains partial responses, or includes no information at all. For example, two of the four criterion in section II.F.2 have no responses, leaving the evaluation team with no assurances that professional development opportunities will be scheduled or that there will be a staff member identified who will develop or implement a professional development plan. Also, a staffing chart was provided as an attachment, but no description of a reasonable rationale was provided to accompany the chart, as required by Criterion II.F.3.b.

Criterion II.F.4 (Staffing Plans, Hiring, Management, and Evaluation) was largely left blank, with no responses to three of the five applicable areas and "still developing" for the remaining two. Additionally, Criterion II.G (School Calendar and Schedule) was also incomplete. The applicant did not complete multiple sections which should have included an explanation of why the proposed school's schedule will be optimal for student learning as well as information on how the teacher work schedule, including planning time, will be organized.

While the majority of the application has gaps in detail, explanation, and comprehensiveness, the North Shore Charter School did provide a clear description of plans for evaluating and monitoring academic performance, including thoughtful, appropriate actions that would be taken if the school were to fall short of student achievement expectations. By highlighting the use of ongoing skills-based assessments that are interchangeable with content and focusing on assessing students' abilities to apply Common Core problem solving and critical thinking skills, the applicants have demonstrated that academic performance management may be a strength of the proposed program.

In conclusion, the applicant's inability to articulate responses to all required criteria in the application indicates that the applicant is not yet ready to begin a high-quality charter school. While the application contains many ideas that when fully developed have the potential to be of high quality and meet all of the stated application requirements, it includes too little detail on how the implementation of the academic plan will look.

Organizational Plan

North Shore Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

The applicant's Request for Proposal provides the following as the Organizational Plan: *"The North Shore Charter School Governing Board will be made up of current applicant board members and additional members who have the appropriate background and experience in Academic Management, Financial Management, Human Resources, Fundraising, and / or Legal expertise to develop the Governing Board's operational management capacity. The NSCS Governing Board will hire and manage an experienced School Director, Business Manager, and Registrar that will facilitate the school's academic and financial plans in the short and long term with support from the Governing Board to focus on academic achievement, strategic planning, proper resource management, and to meet compliance requirements by the Hawaii State Charter School Commission and the Hawaii Department of Education."*

Analysis

The organizational plan **does not meet the standard** for approval as the applicant failed to satisfy the requirements and criteria in many sections. The evidence and information that was provided lacked detail and explanation, resulting in an Organizational Plan that fails to present a clear picture of how the school intends to operate.

Throughout the organizational plan, the applicant left out comprehensive descriptions or explanations, or failed to answer the criteria at all. Criterion III.A.7 requires a comprehensive and sound plan and timeline for identifying and recruiting governing board members and a description of the necessary member skills and qualifications. However, the applicant does not provide a comprehensive and sound plan; instead the applicant merely restates the criteria by saying that new board members with experience in financial management, facilities development, and technology management will be sought and that the goal will be to have at least ten members. No explanation or description on how the board will recruit these members and reach its goal is provided.

A major requirement of the organizational plan is the submission of an admission and enrollment policy. Criterion III.D.3, in addition to the admission policy, requires applicants to provide a timeline and plan for recruitment and a contingency plan in case enrollment targets are not met. The applicant's response for this criterion was that it did not create an admission and enrollment policy. In addition to not providing the admission policy, the applicant failed to respond to any other of the requirements of this criterion.

The applicant's ability to secure a facility should be considered a strength, however, the applicant has not assessed the facility to determine whether any modifications need to be done to bring the facility into compliance nor has an assessment been done to determine what modifications needs to be done to allow that facility to serve as a school as required by the application criteria. The facility plan submitted

acknowledges that the applicant needs to assess the fire, health, and safety checks to ensure the building is up to code, as well as identify areas that need to be improved or replaced.

Another major requirement of the organizational plan is the start-up plan; the start-up plan provided by the applicant fails to meet the criteria and lacks detail and explanation. In lieu of a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound management plan for the start-up period as the criteria in the application requires, the applicant submitted a sparse chart with six items as its start-up plan. No details are provided and tasks are described in general terms; for example, under start-up funding, the tasks listed in the start-up plan are to research grant opportunities, apply for public and private grants, and hold fundraising activities. There is no description in the start-up plan detailing how much funding will be sought and from whom.

While funding information can be found in the financial plan section, the applicant's decision to not include this information in the start-up plan raises concerns that the applicant has not created a start-up plan that aligns with the academic, financial, and organizational plans. The requirement that the start-up plan aligns with the specific areas is the primary, overarching criterion for the start-up plan.

Financial Plan

North Shore Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

North Shore’s government board will provide oversight of all financial management responsibilities of the school. Under the supervision of the school’s government board treasurer, a provider will be contracted for financial reporting and bookkeeping services. At the school level, the school leader will monitor the school’s budget against daily financial activities and sign all purchase orders.

The following chart presents the budgeted revenues, expenses and operating gains or losses for years 1 through 3:

| Year | Total Operating Revenues | Total Operating Expenses | Total Operating Gain/(Loss) |
|------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | \$717,663 | \$686,115 | \$31,548 |
| 2 | \$719,243 | \$702,614 | \$16,628 |
| 3 | \$1,045,870 | \$972,995 | \$72,875 |

Analysis

The financial plan for North Shore **does not meet the standard** because it had substantial gaps, lacked details and required additional information in one or more areas. The application itself does not provide enough specific information to present a clear presentation of the school’s start up and contingency plans.

The financial plan does not provide a complete, realistic, and viable start-up and three-year operation budgets. The school’s start up plan fails to provide a comprehensive plan as to spending during the start-up period. Additionally, the applicant does not provide any reasonable assurances that the start-up period funding would be available. Year zero is solely dependent on federal and private grants, totaling \$95,000 and cash of \$7,500. According to the applicant, these grants are not secured and only \$5,000 has been fundraised. Furthermore, the school does not have sufficient funds to cover for the actual expenses prior to any federal reimbursements for the start-up period, which may severely impact the school’s ability to implement its hiring plan.

The financial plan does not provide a sound contingency plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated. The applicant does not provide a documented contingency plan, other than stating that the governing board will cut costs. When the evaluation team inquired at the capacity interview about a contingency plan, the applicant did not present effective

solutions to manage any unforeseen financial risks. Overall the applicant team did not seem prepared nor was the application thought through.

Moreover, the financial plan does not provide a comprehensive plan for evaluating and monitoring financial performance. The implementation of the financial plan will result in the school not meeting the standards in the current Financial Performance Framework from start-up to Year three, and would place the proposed school at high risk of financial failure.

Reliance on private grant funding, a lack of a contingency plan and financial performance data evaluation plan raises the concerns of the Evaluation Team regarding school viability and the financial plan as a whole.

Evidence of Capacity

North Shore Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

North Shore Charter School proposes a plan that relies on their Governing Board, with the aid of their Non-profit Governing Board, to recruit personnel and develop policies and procedures for operation of the school. Only Colin Kennedy is listed in Exhibit 4 (Attachment B), which is to list Governing Board member information. While Kennedy possesses the qualifications to govern effectively, he is the only board member out of the seven identified in the Request for Proposal to submit information. Exhibit 4 (Attachment B) is crucial to determining the capacity of those identified to serve in a school governance capacity, and is incomplete.

Analysis

The applicant has not demonstrated the capacity to open and manage a high quality charter school. Though the members of the applicant board are well-intentioned and have clear ties to the community (geographically and culturally), the inability of the applicant to provide a coherent, detailed plan for a high quality charter school negatively reflects on the group's capacity.

Applicants are required to submit the resumes of the members of the applicant board so the Evaluation Team can determine whether the individuals on the board have the experience and skillsets that they purport to have. The applicant group for North Shore Charter School submitted resumes for only two of the seven members of the applicant board. The Evaluation Team used what information was submitted but could only conclude that the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of capacity.

The abbreviated and sparse information submitted by the applicant further confirmed the Evaluation Team's assessment that the applicant has not provided sufficient evidence of capacity. The application requires the submission of a position description for the school director that includes rigorous criteria that is designed to recruit a school director with the experience and ability to launch and lead a high quality charter school that will effectively serve the anticipated student population and implement the proposed academic plan.

The job description for the school director submitted by the applicant is approximately half a page and, essentially, a generic job description that could be used by any school serving any grade. There is no mention in the job description or qualifications of the intended grades or age group of children that the school intends to serve, so there is no stated preference for educational experience in the middle school division which is the specific grade division that North Shore Charter School intends to serve. There is a cursory mention that candidates should have experience implementing project-based learning, but no

specific references to the specifics of the school's academic program and mission.

Overall, the applicant group's inability to provide the information requested to meet the criteria set in the application must serve as the predominant indicator that this group has not demonstrated the capacity to open a high quality charter school.

Evaluator Biographies

Beth Bulgeron

Ms. Bulgeron is the Commission's Academic Performance Manager. She previously was the administrator of the school improvement section in the Hawaii Department of Education's Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Student Support. She has experience as an intermediate and high school administrator and was the founding principal of a Chicago high school. She has developed standards-based curriculum and assessments for public school districts and charter schools in several states and has served as a curriculum consultant. Prior to that, she taught for seven years. She earned her BA at the University of Wisconsin, Madison and her JD and LLM in Education Law and Policy at the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law.

Amy Cheung

Ms. Cheung is the Commission's Financial Performance Manager. She previously worked as a Senior Auditor with the City and County of Honolulu, Office of the City Auditor. She is a certified public accountant in California and has also worked for other government and non-profit agencies including the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board, the State Office of the Auditor, Hawaii State Legislature, the Queen's Medical Center, and the California State Controller's Office. She earned her BS in Business Administration and Accountancy from California State University, Sacramento and a MBA from Hawaii Pacific University.

Derek Scott Hall

Mr. Hall is the Commission's Financial Performance Specialist. He previously served as the Participant Accounting Supervisor for the Hawaii Employer-Union Health Benefits Trust Fund. He is a graduate of Montana State University.

Cindy Henry

Ms. Henry is an Educational Specialist in the Hawaii Department of Education's School Transformation Branch. She previously worked at the Commission as the 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.

Sylvia Silva

Ms. Silva is the Commission's Organizational Performance Specialist. Prior to working at 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 in operations at the school level which included school pre-opening/start-up phase systems and policy development, registrar functions, and school bookkeeping. She holds a BA in Business Administration from Chaminade University of Honolulu.

Danny Vasconcellos

Mr. Vasconcellos is the Commission's Organizational Performance Manager. He previously worked at the State Office of the Auditor as an Analyst where he worked on or lead projects that required him to identify internal control weaknesses and analyze the effectiveness of state agencies. While at the Office of the Auditor, he worked on the audit of Hawaii's charter schools and a study of the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board. He also served as a researcher for the Hawaii State Legislature's House Finance Committee and has extensive knowledge of Hawaii's legislative process and funding. He holds a Master of Public Administration from the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Appendix A
2016-2017 Evaluation Report for
North Shore Charter School

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:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 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.A: Academic Plan Overview, Academic Philosophy, and Student Population

This section is not separately rated by the evaluators. However, a strong Academic Plan will demonstrate consistent alignment with the Academic Plan Overview, Academic Philosophy, and Student Population.

Section II.B: Curriculum and Instructional Design

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

Criterion II.B.1

A clear description of course outcomes for each course at each grade level that if achieved at the high school level, will ensure a student graduates with the competencies, skills and content knowledge to be successful in any post-secondary education opportunities he or she may seek to pursue, and if achieved at the elementary or middle school level, will situate the student to achieve academic success at the next level of his or her academic career.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School does not include a clear description of outcomes for each course at each grade level. The sample outlines do not provide confidence that all state standards will be taught and are too vague.

Criterion II.B.2

A clear description of the rigorous academic standards that will be used at the proposed school including:

- A rationale for inclusion each set of standards that the proposed school plans to adopt that demonstrates an understanding of how each set of standards will contribute to the success of student learning under the Academic Plan; and
- A clear articulation of how the standards based curriculum will be aligned to standards-based instruction, standards-aligned formative and summative assessments and standards-based grading and reporting of student progress.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School indicates that standards included will assist in developing content and skills needed for student success in high school, college, and careers. Clear standards maps will be used to track student

| |
|--|
| <p>mastery.</p> <p>Weaknesses: None.</p> |
| <p>Criterion II.B.3 A reasonable and sound timeline and description of how instructional materials will be developed or selected and a list of individuals that will be involved in the development or selection process. If the instructional materials have been selected, a description and explanation that clearly demonstrates how the materials support the Academic Plan. If the proposed Academic Plan includes a <i>virtual or blended learning program</i>, include a clear description of the virtual learning curriculum program(s) and a reasonable rationale for the selection of the curriculum program(s).</p> |
| <p>Strengths: None.</p> <p>Weaknesses: North Shore Charter School does not clearly demonstrate how the materials selected support the academic plan.</p> |
| <p>Criterion II.B.4 A clear list of academic goals and targets and a description of how the proposed school assesses the progress of individual students, student cohorts, and the school as a whole on the identified goals and targets. The description must clearly explain how the identified assessments will accurately measure progress toward the identified goals and targets.</p> |
| <p>Strengths: None.</p> <p>Weaknesses: North Shore Charter School does not include clear goals and targets, which indicates a lack of understanding of the criteria. Additionally, the applicant responded to this criteria with “see response to II.D.2.a” , and there is no criteria II.D.2.a.</p> |
| <p>Criterion II.B.5 A clear and comprehensive description for how instructional leaders and teachers will use student data to administer, collect, and analyze the results of diagnostic, formative, benchmark/interim, and summative assessments to inform programmatic and instructional planning decisions and make adjustments to curricula, professional development, and other school components. The description must clearly explain the roles and responsibilities of the instructional leadership team in overseeing teachers’ progress toward helping students meet their identified goals and targets and clearly describe the formalized process and supports that will enable teachers to reflect on student progress and adjust their instruction accordingly.</p> |
| <p>Strengths: North Shore Charter School defines a process for teachers that is in line with best practices.</p> <p>Weaknesses: The description provided does not include roles and responsibilities of the leadership team, nor is a formalized process and support system explained.</p> |
| <p>Criterion II.B.6 A clear description of the instructional strategies that the proposed school will use that adequately explains how these strategies support the mission, vision, and academic philosophy of the proposed school and are well-suited to the anticipated student population. The description must also include the interventions and modifications that will be made to instructional strategies if students are not meeting identified goals and targets. If the proposed school’s Academic Plan contains a <i>virtual or blended learning program</i>, the description</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>must adequately explain how the proposed instructional strategies will work with the virtual learning components to result in a coherent instructional program.</p> |
| <p>Strengths: North Shore Charter School adequately meets the criterion.</p> <p>Weaknesses: None.</p> |
| <p>Criterion II.B.7 Graduation Requirements.</p> <p>a. A clear description of the course and credit requirements for graduation, including a description of how GPA will be calculated, that meets BOE’s graduation requirements.</p> <p>b. If graduation requirements for the proposed school will differ in any way from BOE Policy 4540, an explanation of how they will differ (including exceeding BOE graduation requirements), including compelling reasons and justification for the differences, and a reasonable and sound plan for adjusting graduation requirements (including any necessary adjustments to other components of the Academic Plan) in the event the BOE does not grant a waiver from its policy.</p> |
| <p>Strengths: N/A</p> <p>Weaknesses: N/A</p> |
| <p>Criterion II.B.8 (sub-criteria a through cc) Virtual and Blended Learning. If the proposed school’s plan contains a <i>virtual or blended learning program</i>, as defined in the RFP:</p> <p>a. A clear overview of any <i>virtual or blended learning program</i> that is appropriate for the anticipated student population and clearly demonstrates that all students receive adequate support, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. State the number of anticipated students that will access either a blended model, and/or a virtual program at your proposed school. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For students accessing the virtual program, indicate the number of hours per month the student will access the virtual or distance learning program outside of your school’s site. ii. A description of the general organization of the <i>virtual learning</i> schedule (e.g., fixed daily schedule, modified schedule, open entry/open exit), including an adequate explanation of how schedules will be modified, if at all, for students that fail to meet learning goals; iii. For <i>blended learning programs</i>, an explanation of whether and how the program enhances or supports classroom instruction; iv. A description of the teacher’s role, the role of any non-teacher faculty members (paraprofessionals, counselors, parent instructional coaches), the student’s role and the parents’ role in any virtual learning program. v. Describe what, if any, additional responsibilities will be required of teachers in the virtual environment (course development/design, research, website maintenance) and describe how the school will communicate these responsibilities to teachers. Describe how the school will provide professional development appropriate to the delivery method used. vi. A plan for orientation for prospective and enrolled students, their parents, and their instructional coaches on the course delivery model prior to the |

- beginning of the school year.
- vii. A description of the degree of support provided to students using any *virtual learning* program (e.g., little or no support, school based mentoring support, school or home mentoring support).
 - viii. Describe whether a student enrolled in the virtual school can be enrolled in credit bearing instructional activities at another institution.
 - ix. A description of the student to teacher ratio in the *virtual learning* program (e.g., traditional classroom ratio, 2-3 times traditional classroom ratio, instructional helpdesk model).
- b. A video demonstration, as a URL to a video on a browser-viewable platform (like YouTube), of the proposed *virtual or blended learning program* curriculum that clearly portrays the student and teacher experience with the *virtual learning* curriculum, including both the student and teacher user interfaces.
 - c. Describe whether students will be required to regularly or periodically attend your school facility. Specify such requirements and describe the facility.
 - d. Describe how the school will ensure or facilitate student attendance at in-person school activities.
 - e. An explanation of how the proposed school will define, monitor, verify, and report student attendance, student participation in a full course load, credit accrual, and course completion that provides sufficient evidence that all students will be accounted for and engaged in a complete and rigorous educational program.
 - f. A description of the proposed school's virtual attendance policy.
 - g. Describe the virtual and blended learning program's policies regarding truancy, absence, withdrawal, credit recovery, and dual enrollment.
 - h. Describe the intervention the school will take when students are not logging in and/or completing coursework as required.
 - i. A sound plan for administering and proctoring mandated assessments, including a reasonable budget that is reflected in the Financial Plan Workbook.
 - j. Describe the plan and method for the administration of all required state assessments.
 - k. A reasonable plan to uphold the academic integrity of the *virtual or blended learning program* that describes the systems and procedures for validating the authenticity of student work. Describe procedures to ensure the integrity and authenticity of student work product and assessment scores, including the use of an academic honesty and computer acceptable use policy. Describe the intervention to be used when students fail to provide authentic work product or assessment responses. Describe the role that parents will have in promoting accountability.
 - l. Describe the data retention, security, acceptable use, electronic communication, and confidentiality policies.
 - m. An adequate explanation of measures the proposed school will take to ensure student safety, both technologically and educationally, that are compliant with applicable federal privacy laws (FERPA, CIPPA, and COPPA).
 - n. Describe how the school will provide for the health and safety of students in both online and offline activities.
 - o. Describe how the school will administer required health screenings to students in virtual programs.
 - p. An adequate explanation of how the proposed model ensures that there are minimal interruptions to learning, should technological challenges arise, including a description of the plan for technical support and troubleshooting for students, teachers, parents or guardians, and administrators. Describe the scope of technical support that will be provided, including where support staff will be located, and the hours (including weekends and holidays) and manner in which support will be accessible to students and school employees.
 - q. Describe procedures to deliver instruction when equipment, software, or connectivity at any location is lost or impaired. Specify who will pay for internet connectivity, and address minimum bandwidth and a course of action for any areas of the state that do not have the minimum bandwidth.
 - r. Describe data protection and recovery procedures in event of catastrophic system failure (including

offsite system backup).

- s. Describe all technological equipment and services that the school will provide, including hardware, software, connectivity, and media storage devices, and property controls and equipment tagging that will be in place. Specify any equipment or technological support that students or families will be responsible for purchasing or obtaining.
- t. A clear description of the platform dependencies for the proposed curricular materials and instructional strategies and an adequate explanation of how the proposed technology selection supports those dependencies. (For example, the proposed curriculum runs a Microsoft Windows-based application, and therefore requires Windows-compatible laptops and tablets rather than iPads.)
- u. Describe how the virtual program will provide services to all enrolled students with exceptionalities, regardless of where the student resides.
- v. Describe the virtual program's procedures for Individual Education Plan (IEP) meetings, including determining where such meetings will occur.
- w. Describe how the virtual program will implement ADA and Rehabilitation Act standards for accessibility to web-based curricula.
- x. Indicate the nature, frequency, and location of all required in-person meetings between parents and school faculty/administration, such as parent-teacher conferences, parent-teacher meetings, field trips, etc.
- y. Indicate the nature and frequency of all optional opportunities for in-person meetings and interactions such as open houses and school community meetings.
- z. Describe the procedures for parents to contact virtual charter school faculty and administrators with concerns of any nature and the procedures and required timelines for prompt and helpful responsiveness to such communications.
- aa. Describe how the school will provide adequate, timely, and appropriate technical support to students, teachers, facilitators, and instructional coaches.
- bb. Describe whether training opportunities to parents and guardians will be available.
- cc. Describe how parents access student grades and understand student progress.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School developed a tutorial bank that can be accessed by parents which is commendable.

Weaknesses:

The video tutorial wasn't clear on the student interface side.

Section II.C: Special Populations and At-Risk Students

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

Criterion II.C.1

An outline of the overall plan to serve *educationally disadvantaged students* and students with special needs that demonstrates an understanding of, and capacity to fulfill, state and federal obligations and requirements pertaining to *educationally disadvantaged students* and students with special needs, including but not limited to the following subgroups: students with IEPs or Section 504 plans; ELL students; students performing below grade level; students identified as intellectually gifted; homeless students; and students at risk of academic failure or dropping out. The plan must identify any other special needs populations and at-risk subgroups that the proposed school expects to serve, whether through data related to a specifically targeted school or geographic area or more generalized analysis of the population to be served, and describe the evidence or data that was used to determine that the proposed school should anticipate serving the population.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School's plan only includes SPED and ELL students. It did not provide a plan for students

performing below grade level, students identified as intellectually gifted, homeless students, and students at risk of academic failure or dropping out. It is not reasonable to have the SSC be the SPED teacher.

Criterion II.C.2

For **each** of the aforementioned subgroups of students with special needs (and any other subgroups the applicant identifies), a comprehensive and compelling plan or explanation for:

- a. The percentage of the anticipated student population that will likely have special needs and how the evidence or data that was used to make this determination was derived;
- b. The curriculum, daily schedule, staffing plans, instructional strategies, and resources that will be designed to meet the diverse needs of all students;
- c. Methods for appropriate identification of potential students with special needs, how these methods will be funded, and how misidentification will be avoided;
- d. Specific instructional programs, practices, and strategies the proposed school will employ to do things like provide a continuum of services; ensure students' equitable access to general education curriculum; ensure academic success; and opportunities the proposed school will employ or provide to enhance students' abilities;
- e. Monitoring, assessing, and evaluating the progress and success of students with special needs, including plans for ensuring each student with special education needs attains IEP goals and for exiting ELL students from ELL services;
- f. For proposed schools that have a high school division, plans for promoting graduation;
- g. Plans to have qualified staff adequate for the anticipated special needs population, especially during the beginning of the first year; and
- h. If the proposed school's plan contains a *virtual or blended learning program*, a clear description of how the virtual component addresses students with special needs, which may include IEP meetings and modifications, as necessary, for transitioning to or from a fully or partially virtual learning program.

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School's response to Criterion II.C.2 does not indicate how methods will be funded or how misidentification will be avoided.
The response to Criterion II.C.2d referencing inclusion is not adequately detailed.
Criterion II.C.2e. was not answered.

Criterion II.C.3

A clear illustration of how the proposed curriculum and Academic Plan will accommodate the academic needs of students performing below grade level and a clear description of the supports and instructional strategies beyond special education that will support underperforming students in meeting and exceeding standards.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School will develop and implement an RTI system to target teaching for all students.

Weaknesses:

Inclusion is not an adequately detailed response.

Criterion II.C.4

A clear description of how the proposed school will identify students who would benefit from accelerated learning opportunities through its assessment of students' needs, a clear illustration of how the proposed curriculum will accommodate those performing above grade level, and a comprehensive description of the supports and instructional strategies that will ensure these students are challenged and able to access the level of rigor that aligns with students' individualized needs.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

The methodology of PBL is adequate for providing accelerated learning opportunities, but the description of how to identify students appropriate for this methodology is not.

Section II.D: Academic Performance Management

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

Criterion II.D.1

Comprehensive and effective plans for evaluating and monitoring academic performance that explain how the proposed school will measure and evaluate performance data, including:

Academic Performance Data Evaluation Plan. A comprehensive and effective plan and system for:

1. Collecting, measuring, and analyzing student academic achievement data of individual students, student cohorts, and the school as a whole—throughout the school year, at the end of each academic year, and for the term of the Charter Contract—including identification of the student information system to be used;
2. Using the data to refine and improve instruction, including descriptions of training and support that school directors, any management team, teachers, and governing board members will receive in analyzing, interpreting, and using academic performance data to improve student learning; the qualified person(s), position(s), and/or entities that will be responsible for managing the data, interpreting it for teachers, and leading or coordinating data-driven professional development to improve student achievement; and how the person(s), position(s), and/or entities will be provided time to complete the aforementioned collection, analysis, management, interpretation, and coordination of data-driven professional development; and
3. Reporting the data to the school community.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School identifies HSA and eSIS, both of which are no longer the DOE assessment or information system.

Criterion II.D.2

A clear description of thoughtful, appropriate corrective actions the proposed school will take if it falls short of:

- a. Student academic achievement expectations or goals at the school-wide, classroom, or individual student level, including an explanation of what would trigger such corrective actions and the person(s), position(s), and/or entities that would be responsible for implementing them.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School provides a coherent description that revolves around the applicant’s mission and vision.

Weaknesses:

None.

Section II.E: School Culture

| <input type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard | <input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Criterion II.E.1. A clear and coherent description of the shared beliefs, attitudes, traditions, and behaviors of the proposed school community, and a detailed plan describing how these shared beliefs, attitudes, customs, and behaviors will be developed and implemented and create a school culture that will promote high expectations and a positive academic and social environment that fosters intellectual, social, and emotional development for all students.</p> | | |
| <p>Strengths: North Shore Charter School’s coherent description revolves around the applicant’s mission and vision.</p> <p>Weaknesses: None.</p> | | |
| <p>Criterion II.E.2 A sound plan for developing a proposed school culture that is conducive to a safe learning environment for all students and how the proposed school will adequately identify, assess, monitor, and address the social, emotional, behavioral, and physical health needs of all students on an ongoing basis. The plan should explain the types of activities that the proposed school will engage in to create the school culture.</p> | | |
| <p>Strengths: None.</p> <p>Weaknesses: North Shore Charter School’s response does not provide a sound plan.</p> | | |
| <p>Criterion II.E.3 A reasonable and sound plan for the school culture and staff that will intentionally expose students to post-secondary educational and career opportunities at all grade levels. The plan must identify the curricular or extracurricular programs that will provide students with access to college or career preparation and include research-based evidence that these programs increase educational aspirations for the anticipated student population.</p> | | |
| <p>Strengths: North Shore Charter School provides a strong plan to engage community partnerships.</p> <p>Weaknesses: North Shore Charter School does not include how staff will be involved.</p> | | |
| <p>Criterion II.E.4 <u>Student Discipline.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A clear description of the proposed school’s philosophy on cultivating positive student behavior and a student discipline policy that provides for appropriate, effective strategies to support a safe, orderly school climate and fulfillment of academic goals, promoting a strong school culture while respecting student rights. b. Legally sound policies for student discipline, suspension, dismissal, and crisis removal, including the proposed school’s code of conduct and procedural due process for all students, including students afforded additional due process measures under IDEA. c. Appropriate plan for including teachers, students, and parents or guardians in the development and/or modification of the proposed school’s policies for discipline, suspension, dismissal, and crisis removal. d. Legally sound list and definitions of offenses for which students in the school must (where non-discretionary) or may (where discretionary) be suspended or dismissed. | | |

| |
|--|
| <p>Strengths: North Shore Charter School will follow recommendations from Hawaii DOE Chapter 19 definitions of offenses. North Shore Charter School describes creating positive student behavior through collaborative and reflective PBL curriculum that encourages students to work together and be solution-focused. This allows students to seek mediation to resolve differences.</p> <p>Weaknesses: Appropriate discipline measures will be issued on a case-by-case basis, which does not allow for transparency and consistency of consequences for similar infractions. While North Shore Charter School indicates that they will cultivate positive behavior through their curriculum design, there is not a clear description of how this will be done.</p> |
|--|

| Section II.F: Professional Culture and Staffing | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard | <input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard |
| <p>Criterion II.F.1 Professional Culture</p> <p>a. A sound plan for the creation, implementation, and maintenance of a professional culture and clear explanation of how the professional culture will contribute to staff retention, how faculty and staff will be involved in school level decisions and in developing new initiatives, and how success will be assessed. Professional development and evaluation is covered in <u>Criteria II.F.2</u> and should not be discussed here.</p> <p>b. If a high proportion of economically disadvantaged students is a part of the anticipated student population, a clear description of how the proposed school will address the anticipated academic challenges posed by the lack of socioeconomic diversity and the concentration of poverty among its students.</p> | | |
| <p>Strengths: None.</p> <p>Weaknesses: North Shore Charter School does not address how success will be evaluated.</p> | | |
| <p>Criterion II.F.2 Professional Development</p> <p>a. A clear description of the appropriate goals and data-driven strategy of the proposed school for ongoing professional development, including whole staff development, grade/level/course teams, and instructional coaching. The description must explain how professional development topics will be identified and how the professional development plan will be driven by data to improve teaching and learning as well as school performance. The description must also include the process for evaluating the efficacy of the professional development.</p> <p>b. A description of professional development opportunities, leadership, and scheduling that effectively support the Academic Plan and are likely to maximize success in improving student achievement, including an adequate induction program. The description must explain what will be covered during the induction period and how teachers will be prepared to deliver any unique or particularly challenging aspects of the curriculum and instructional framework and methods.</p> <p>c. A clear description of the expected number of days or hours for regular professional development throughout the school year that includes an explanation of how the proposed school’s calendar, daily schedule, and staffing structure accommodate this plan; the time scheduled for common planning or collaboration; and an explanation for how such time will typically be used. The description must identify ways the professional development scheduling conflicts with Master Collective Bargaining</p> | | |

Agreements, explain any specific amendments that may be needed through supplemental agreements, and provide an adequate contingency plan in the event such amendments cannot be negotiated under supplemental agreements.

- d. A description identifying the person or position with the time, capacity, and responsibility for coordinating professional development and a reasonable plan for identifying ongoing professional development needs, including sufficient funds and resources (Title II funds, etc.) for implementing the professional development plan.

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

For Criterion II.F.2a, the description is not clear on how topics will be identified, nor does it include the process for evaluating the efficacy of the professional development.

For Criterion II.F.2c North Shore Charter School's response does not adequately answer the criteria. There is no detail of how the PD plan can be supported by the school's schedule, and there is no description of how the PD plan meets or conflicts with Master Collective Bargaining Units.

Criterion II.F.3

Staff Structure

- a. A complete staffing chart for the proposed school, using the Staffing Chart Template (Exhibit 2) and provided as Attachment F (required form), that clearly indicates all positions, is aligned with the Academic Plan, and proposes a salary structure that is in alignment with the proposed school's budget.
- b. A description of a reasonable rationale for the staffing plan, as demonstrated in the staffing chart, that clearly explains how the relationship between the proposed school's leadership or management team and the rest of the staff will be managed and includes justifiable teacher-student and total adult-student ratios for the proposed school.
- c. If the proposed school has a *virtual or blended learning program*, a clear description for the identification of the position(s) dedicated to IT support and a reasonable plan that clearly ensures sufficient capacity for deploying and managing technology inventory and network needs with minimal interruptions to teaching and learning, including troubleshooting support for school staff and students.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

For Criterion II.F.3b, there was no description provided - attachment Q is the org chart only.

For Criterion II.F.3c, there was no reasonable plan described. North Shore Charter School only identified an outside contractor and Conexus.

Criterion II.F.4

Staffing Plans, Hiring, Management, and Evaluation

- a. A clear description of the proposed school's recruitment and hiring strategy, criteria, timeline, and procedures that are likely to result in a strong teaching staff that is highly effective in accordance with the state's plan under the Every Student Succeeds Act ("ESSA") and are well-suited to the proposed school, including other key selection criteria and any special considerations relevant to the proposed school's design. The description must also explain strategies, including compensation packages, that are likely to attract and retain high-performing teachers.

- b. If the proposed school offers a *virtual or blended learning program*, a clear description of the proposed school’s recruitment and hiring strategy, criteria, timeline, and procedures that are likely to result in strong virtual learning teachers that have the requisite subject-matter knowledge, technological proficiency, communication skills, and other capabilities necessary to teach effectively in the virtual learning environment.
- c. A clear description of realistic and legally sound procedures for hiring and dismissing school personnel, including procedures for conducting criminal history record checks.
- d. A thoughtful plan for supporting, developing, and annually evaluating school leadership and teachers that is likely to produce and retain a successful staff, including a description of the processes, protocols, framework, criteria, and/or tools that will be used for conducting evaluations, delivering feedback, and coaching. The plan must cite any evidence or existing research supporting the effectiveness of utilizing the specified approach. If already developed, the plan should provide any leadership evaluation tool(s) as Attachment G (no page limit) and any teacher evaluation tool(s) as Attachment H (required attachment, no page limit) that are likely to be effective. Evaluation tools must align with the criteria outlined in BOE Policy 2055 and related provisions of any Master Collective Bargaining Agreements, unless specific amendments are executed in a supplemental agreement. If amendments will be needed, the plan must describe the specific amendments that would be necessary to implement the evaluation tool(s), demonstrate an understanding of the employment environment, and include a reasonable plan for contingencies if the amendments cannot be negotiated under a supplemental agreement.
- e. An effective plan that explains how the proposed school intends to promote or incentivize satisfactory and exceptional school director, management team, and teacher performance and handle unsatisfactory school director, management team, or teacher performance, including effective planning for turnover.
- f. A satisfactory explanation of any deviations in staffing plans, including salaries, from Master Collective Bargaining Agreements, including identification of amendments that would be needed in a supplemental agreement and a reasonable plan for contingencies if such amendments cannot be negotiated under a supplemental agreement.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

For Criterion II.F.4a, Criterion II.F.4e, and Criterion II.F.4f, there was no response from North Shore Charter School. For Criterion II.F.4c, there was no description, and North Shore Charter School stated that the board is still developing policies.

For Criterion II.F.4d, there was no description, and North Shore Charter School stated that the board is still developing evaluation methods.

Section II.G: School Calendar and Schedule

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

Criterion II.G.1

A school calendar for the proposed school’s first year of operation, including total number of days school is in session, hours of instruction, holidays, days off and half days, professional development days, summer programming and/or instruction, first and last days of class and organization of the school year (quarters, semesters, trimesters,) including the beginning and ending of each segment provided as **Attachment I (no page**

limit), and a satisfactory explanation of how the calendar aligns with and clearly reflects the needs of the Academic Plan.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

The calendar was provided but there is no explanation of how the calendar aligns with Academic Plan.

Criterion II.G.2

A clear description of the structure of the proposed school's day and week that aligns with and clearly reflects the needs of the Academic Plan, including the following:

- a. A description of the length and schedule of the school week.
- b. A description of the length and schedule of the school day including start and dismissal times.
- c. The minimum number of hours or minutes per day and week that the proposed school will devote to academic instruction in each grade.
- d. The number of instructional hours or minutes in a day for core subjects.
- e. A satisfactory explanation of why the proposed school's daily and weekly schedule will be optimal for student learning.
- f. Clear information about how teachers' work will be organized on a weekly or annual basis, including teacher planning time and professional development. The number of hours or minutes in a day for teacher planning time.
- g. Clear information about the length of the school day and year, including summer school and time allocated for teacher professional development.
- h. A school calendar and student schedule which provides at least as much core instructional time during a school year as required of other public schools.
- i. Explain any aspects of the school year that are not evident on the calendar or would benefit from further elaboration.
- j. Provide as Attachment J (required attachment, no page limit), a sample weekly student schedule for at least one grade that is representative of each level the school intends to operate (lower elementary, upper elementary, middle, and/or high school). If scheduling structures are unique to each grade, please provide a sample schedule for each grade.
- k. Provide as Attachment K (required attachment, no page limit), a sample weekly teacher schedule for at least one grade that is representative of each level the school intends to operate. If scheduling structures are unique to each grade, please provide a sample for each grade. Present a typical week of instruction, including: length of the teacher's work day, supervisory time, planning periods, professional development, and any other duties the teacher performs in a given day.
- l. Provide as Attachment I (required attachment, no page limit), a copy of the proposed school calendar for year one of the school's operations that clearly demonstrates: days that school is in session, holidays, days off and half days, professional development days, summer programming and/or instruction, first and last days of class and organization of the school year (quarters, semesters, trimesters,) including the beginning and ending of each segment.
- m. A clear description, provided as Attachment D (required attachment, 1 page limit), of a school day from the perspective of a student (from their entry into the building to their exit) in a grade that will be served in the proposed school's first year of operation that aligns with the proposed school's vision and plan for school culture.
- n. A clear description, provided as Attachment E (required attachment, 1 page limit), of a school day from the perspective of a teacher in a grade that will be served in the proposed school's first year of operation that aligns with the proposed school's vision and plan for professional culture.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not provide a response for Criterion II.G.2e, Criterion II.G.2f, Criterion II.G.2g, Criterion II.G.2h, and Criterion II.G.2i.

For Criterion II.G.2j North Shore Charter School did not provide a response, however, attachment J is completed.

For Criterion II.G.2k North Shore Charter School did not provide a response, however, attachment K is completed.

For Criterion II.G.2l North Shore Charter School did not provide a response, however, attachment I is completed.

For Criterion II.G.2m North Shore Charter School did not provide a response, however, attachment D is completed (was a little over 1 page).

For Criterion II.G.2n North Shore Charter School did not provide a response, however, attachment E is completed.

Section II.H: Supplemental Programs

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

Not Applicable

Criterion II.H.1

If applicable, a description of a sound plan for any summer school programs the proposed school will offer that will meet anticipated student needs, including a clear explanation for how the programs are integral to the proposed school’s academic plan, a reasonable schedule and length of the program, and sound funding plan for the programs. If the programs will not be implemented in the first year of operation, the plan must describe the timeline for implementation.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Criterion II.H.2

If applicable, well-designed plans and identified funding for any extracurricular or co-curricular activities or programs the proposed school will offer that will meet anticipated student needs and provide enrichment experiences that are in alignment with the Academic Plan. The plans must describe how the activities and programs are integral to the proposed school’s academic plan, how often they will occur, how they will meet anticipated student needs, and how they will be funded. If the activities or programs will not be implemented in the first year of operation, the plans must describe the timeline for implementation.

Strengths:

N/A

Weaknesses:

N/A

Section II.I: Third Party Service Providers

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

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. Proposed schools are strongly encouraged to designate or establish an associated nonprofit organization to assist with fundraising and other support activities, especially during the start-up period, but this is not a requirement.

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

Criterion III.A.1

A clear description of the mission and vision of the proposed school governing board that is aligned with the proposed school's mission and vision. If different from the proposed school's mission and vision, a clear and concise description of the governance philosophy that will guide the proposed school governing board.

Strengths:

The North Shore Charter School school's mission, and the board's mission, both support a "Common Core driven, Project and Problem Based Learning curriculum."

Weaknesses:

The North Shore Charter School governing board's mission and vision appear partly aligned with the school's mission and vision. However, North Shore Charter School did not provide the required description of the governance philosophy that will guide the proposed school governing board.

Criterion III.A.2

A description of the responsibilities of the governing board as a whole, its working relationship with the proposed school, and a description of the roles and responsibilities that each member of the governing board will have (i.e. Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Treasurer, Secretary).

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

In the governance structure this proposal presents a weak governing board role.

While a list of the governing board's roles is provided, there are no details that provide how the working relationship with the school enables the governing board to be meet "legal, fiduciary, and governing responsibilities of the school as required by state law".

There is a larger emphasis on supporting and assisting roles, than on other roles that would lead to effective governance. There are concerns over North Shore Charter School's understandings about a board's statutory

charge (HRS 302D) to be responsible for the viability of the school. There are concerns for the proposed working relationship between the governing board and the school to enable the board to meet the legal, fiduciary, and governing obligations needed. There are concerns that these are indicators that North Shore Charter School lacks the capacity to implement a high quality charter school.

Criterion III.A.3

Organizational charts, provided as Attachment Q (required attachment, no page limit), that clearly indicate all positions and illustrate the proposed school governance, management, and staffing structure in: a) Year 1; and b) all subsequent years until full capacity is reached. The organizational charts must clearly delineate the roles and responsibilities of (and lines of authority and reporting among) the proposed school governing board, staff, any related bodies (such as the proposed school’s supporting nonprofit organization, advisory bodies, or parent/teacher councils), and any external organizations that will play a role in managing the proposed school. The organization charts must also document clear lines of authority and reporting between the proposed school governing board and proposed school and within the proposed school.

Strengths:

The Curriculum Coordinator oversees Teachers and reports to the School Director. This may encourage a stronger alignment between curriculum and teacher delivery, and an increase in the school’s focus on meeting academic goals. In addition, this kind of structure frees the School Director position to provide additional attention to other school operations which can be critical in a charter school.

Weaknesses:

Criteria requires clear lines of reporting and authority, however the chart presented makes some of its organizational structure less clear. For example, it is unclear who the Registrar reports to. The lines of authority flowing to and from the Registrar position are particularly important to the structure since this position oversees the Business Manager, a key school function.. It’s not often seen that a Registrar position oversees the Business Manager and/or Office Manager positions. However, this is up to the discretion of a charter school.

Criterion III.A.4

A description of an effective governance structure of the proposed school, including the primary roles of the proposed school governing board and how it will interact with the school director, any school management teams, any essential partners, and any advisory bodies. The description must include the size, current and desired composition, powers, and duties of the proposed school governing board that will foster the proposed school’s success; identify key skills or areas of diverse expertise that are or will be effectively represented on the proposed school governing board; and adequately explain how this governance structure and composition will help ensure that: a) the proposed school will be an academic and operational success; b) the proposed school governing board will effectively evaluate the success of the proposed school and school director; and c) there will be active and effective representation of key stakeholders, including parents orguardians.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School doesn’t articulate the required clear and detailed plan for the governing board to oversee the school through evaluations on the success of the school and evaluations of the School Director. Since the applicant did not provide a Leadership Evaluation Tool as required, the necessary information to properly

evaluate the proposal is missing. It is unclear if, or how the governing board will regularly evaluate school's progress or set priorities/goals.

The applicant's description of "an effective governance structure of the proposed school, including the primary roles of the proposed school governing board" is weak. North Shore Charter School's answer refers back to Criterion.III.A.2 and as such the same weaknesses there are also found here. "Primary roles" are described using general terms. North Shore Charter School does not provide a clear picture with specifics but instead uses general terms like "support" "effectively manage" by "focusing on student achievement", "uphold responsibilities", and "assist". These kinds of descriptions fail to convey a clear picture of how the school intends to operate and to meet the standard. It is unclear how the governing board plans to accomplish roles like "support" and or how these lead to effectively meeting legal, fiduciary, and governance responsibilities that provide a structure to enable a high functioning school. There are concerns that these are indicators that the North Shore Charter School lacks the capacity to implement a high quality charter school.

Criterion III.A.5

If the proposed school has a *virtual or blended learning program*, a clear description of the role the governing board will play in the virtual learning program that ensures the effective oversight of the virtual learning program, including a clear and realistic description of the requisite knowledge of virtual learning that the proposed governing board currently possesses or will endeavor to possess.

Strengths:

N/A – North Shore Charter School states it will not have a virtual learning program.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Criterion III.A.6

If the membership of Applicant Governing Board has changed from the time it submitted its Intent to Apply Packet, a reasonable explanation justifying the membership changes.

Strengths:

The criterion requires a reasonable explanation to justify any membership changes and North Shore Charter School states it has added an applicant board member who has added to the collective board's financial and legal capacity.

Weaknesses:

None.

Criterion III.A.7

Demonstrated will, capacity, and commitment of current and proposed governing board members to govern the proposed school effectively by providing the following:

- a. A list of all current and identified proposed school governing board members and their intended roles;**
- b. A clear summary of members' qualifications for serving on the proposed school governing board, including an adequate explanation of how each member meets any of the considerations in HRS §302D-12 and will contribute a widerange of knowledge, skills, and**

commitment needed to oversee a *high-quality charter school*, including academic, financial, legal, and community experience and expertise;

- c. Completed and signed Board Member Information Sheets (**Exhibit 4**) and resumes for each proposed governing board member, provided as Attachment R (required form; no page limit), that demonstrates board members share a vision, purpose, and expectations for the proposed school;
- d. If not all board members have been identified, a comprehensive and sound plan and timeline for identifying and recruiting governing board members with the necessary skills and qualifications, including a description of such skills and qualifications; and
- e. If the current Applicant Governing Board will transition to a more permanent governing board, a comprehensive and sound plan for such a transition, including a reasonable timeline for recruiting and adding new members; a brief description of the individual and/or collective skills sets the anticipated board members are expected to bring, with specific reference to the skill sets described in HRS §302D-12; a description of the priorities for recruitment of additional or replacement proposed school governing board members and the kinds of orientation or training new members will receive; and identification of any bylaws, policies, or procedures changes that will be necessary for such a transition.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School provided a weak response by saying that it will recruit additional members, but did not provide a plan for how the governing board will determine whether prospective governing board members have the necessary skills and qualifications to govern a charter school. Additionally, the process that the governing board will use to select members is unclear. North Shore Charter School did not provide a detailed plan that will assure evaluators it intends to carry out what has been stated.

North Shore Charter School does not provide comprehensive and sound plans. The application does not instill confidence that the group understands charter school governance since very few specifics are provided. North Shore Charter School's answers are trite, provide little detail, and make broad generalizations. For example, the proposal says it will "seek out opportunities to undergo training exercises to become a more effective governing board" however this sweeping statement that doesn't provide evaluators with the details needed to have confidence that the outcome will be a more effective board with increased capacity to lead the school. For example, it is unclear what the applicant has done to confirm these opportunities exist, and what kinds of training the applicant will seek that will make them "a more effective governing board."

Criterion III.A.8

A clear description of effective governance procedures, including an explanation of the procedure by which current proposed school governing board members were selected and how any vacancies will be filled; an explanation of how often the board will meet both during start-up and during the school year; any plans for a committee structure and identification of chairs for any proposed committee(s); and a description of the governing board meetings, including how and where meetings will be conducted, how the governing board will provide meaningful access to the public, and if board meetings are to be conducted virtually (such as through conference calls, videoconference, or web conference).

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School held community meetings and sought members through open calls to the public.

Weaknesses:

Parts of the criteria were met but North Shore Charter School failed to provide the required “clear description of effective governance procedures”. The proposal is missing comprehensive details that would demonstrate the procedures to attaining a board that is effective at governing and fails to show a cohesive plan.

Criterion III.A.9

A clear description of any existing relationships that could pose actual or perceived conflicts if the application is approved, the specific steps that the proposed school governing board will take to avoid any actual conflicts and to mitigate perceived conflicts.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School answered only parts of the criterion and its response does not meet the standard because it is undeveloped, significantly incomplete and lacks sufficient detail.

North Shore Charter School responds, “the Board will take steps to vet applicants through the application and interview process to avoid any potential conflicts.” The response does not meet the criterion which requires “A clear description of the specific steps that the proposed school governing board will take.” North Shore Charter School did not provide enough details to show a “clear description” of the “specific steps” and the insufficient plan presented by North Shore Charter School demonstrates a lack of preparation and raises significant concerns about their capacity.

Criterion III.A.10

A clear description of sound plans for increasing the capacity of the proposed school governing board, orientation of new members, and ongoing training and development for members, including reasonable timelines, specific and thoughtful topics and capacities to be addressed, and requirements for participation.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School provided a weak response to the criterion. There is not enough development on board capacity, which indicates a lack of preparation. North Shore Charter School is still investigating board training rather than already being able to meet the standard of the criterion. This raises significant concerns about the North Shore Charter School’s capacity.

Additionally, North Shore Charter School’s emphasis on increasing fundraising capacity compared with the emphasis on thoughtful topics that would appear to increase a capacity to govern is a concern. Specifically, it mentions the topic of fundraising but not the additional skills found in HRS 302D-12(b)(3). There are additional concerns over the choices of “thoughtful topics” particularly since two members appear to have strong financial backgrounds, and another appears to have some experience or school governance knowledge, but the remaining have teaching backgrounds. There appears to be less emphasis to increase members’ skills/expertise in the areas

of charter school management or oversight and school director evaluations. This is a concern since these seem to be the lacking skills of the current membership. The uncertainty over the larger emphasis to raise governing board's capacity for fundraising is particularly interesting since there is an associated nonprofit. In summary, there appears to be a larger interest in money issues rather than governance issues for this governing board, which raises a serious concern over the applicant's capacity to govern a charter school and a serious concern over the relationship with the associated nonprofit.

Criterion III.A.11

If applicable, a clear and comprehensive description of the proposed school's associated nonprofit organization, including its current tax status and/or the plan and timeline for obtaining tax exempt status and the nonprofit's mission and purpose. The description must specifically identify ways that the proposed school's associated nonprofit organization will support the proposed school (such as community fundraising, developing partnerships, finding alternative funding sources, writing grants, and finding other ways to leverage existing resources) and specify any grants or programs that the nonprofit is planning to use. If the nonprofit's mission is not to solely support the proposed school, the description must also adequately explain any competing interests for the nonprofit's time and resources and how the proposed school will ensure such competing interests will not hinder the school's ability to operate and obtain outside supports.

Strengths:

FNSCS has been actively fundraising for the application phase.

Weaknesses:

The mission of the nonprofit is unclear, specifically whether its sole purpose is to support the charter school and whether the nonprofit will continue to provide fundraising support to the school long-term. The proposal states "...will collaborate with the Applicant Board **in the short term** to find alternative funding sources, and write grants to build revenue..." This may be why the governing board feels it must focus on fundraising as pointed out in the "weaknesses" of criterion III.A.10. The proposal is incomplete and requires more information. There is a serious concern over the school's relationship with the associated nonprofit.

Criterion III.A.12

A list of all current and identified nonprofit board members that is in compliance with the State Ethics Code and their intended roles and a description demonstrating that the nonprofit board members have the necessary experience and qualifications relevant to the above means of supporting the proposed school. If none of the current nonprofit board members have the requisite experience or capacity, the description must explain a comprehensive plan to identify and recruit individuals with the necessary experience and capacity.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School states that the nonprofit members have pledged "...to generate revenue for North Shore Charter School through fundraising, grant writing in order to build the financial capacity and stability of school through the start-up phase and beyond".

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School identifies only one intended role on the nonprofit and that is the Chair – no vice chair, treasurer, etc. are identified

In addition, North Shore Charter School does not meet the standard of the criterion because it leaves out comprehensive descriptions or explanation. The application does not provide the required “description demonstrating that the nonprofit board members have the necessary experience and qualifications relevant to the above means of supporting the proposed school. If none of the current nonprofit board members have the requisite experience or capacity, the description must explain a comprehensive plan to identify and recruit individuals with the necessary experience and capacity.”

Criterion III.A.13

Discuss the procedures to be followed in the event of closure or dissolution of the school. Identify procedures to be followed in the case of the closure or dissolution of the charter school, including provisions for the transfer of students and student records to the complex area in which the charter school is located and for the disposition of the school's assets to the State Public Charter School Commission (SPCSC). Provide assurance that the school will follow any additional procedures required by SPCSC to ensure an orderly closure and dissolution process, including compliance with the applicable requirements of Hawaii Revised Statutes [§302D-19](#).

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

The proposal is undeveloped or significantly incomplete. The application does not present a complete dissolution plan as required. There are no procedures identified for transferring of students and student records. More details are needed to meet the standard.

Section III.B: Organizational Performance Management

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

Criterion III.B.1

Comprehensive and effective plans for evaluating and monitoring organizational performance that explain how the proposed school will measure and evaluate performance data, including:

- a. Organizational Performance Data Evaluation Plan. A comprehensive and effective plan and system for maintaining, managing, compiling, and interpreting organizational performance data monthly, quarterly, annually and for the term of the Charter Contract, including descriptions of the qualified person(s), position(s), and/or entities that will be responsible for compiling data on performance and interpreting it for the school director and governing board and how the person(s), position(s), and/or entities will be provided time to complete the aforementioned compiling and interpretation.**

Strengths:

The Governing Board will receive monthly financial reports.

| |
|--|
| <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Proposal is undeveloped or significantly incomplete and there are concerns regarding the applicant’s understanding of collective bargaining. The proposal does not provide the requirement regarding “how the person(s), position(s), and/or entities will be provided time to complete the aforementioned compiling and interpretation”. This is especially important since the proposal states that the Curriculum Coordinator and Business Manager, who is only ½ time until year 3, will serve on the committees in addition to compiling, interpreting and reporting data.</p> |
| <p>Criterion III.B.2</p> <p>A clear description of thoughtful, appropriate corrective actions the proposed school will take if it falls short of:</p> <p>a. Organizational performance standards set in the Organizational Performance Framework, including an explanation of the actions that would be taken if the proposed school is issued Notices of Concern or Deficiency under the terms of the Charter Contract or if the proposed school has a corrective action plan approved by the Commission.</p> |
| <p>Strengths:</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p><u>NO ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION</u></p> <p>North Shore Charter School demonstrates a lack of preparation and raises substantial concerns regarding its capacity to implement a high quality charter school.</p> |

| Section III.C: Ongoing Operations | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Meets the Standard | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet the Standard | <input type="checkbox"/> Falls Far Below the Standard |
| <p>Criterion III.C.1</p> <p>If the proposed school will provide daily transportation, a sound plan describing the transportation arrangements for prospective students, including a description of how the proposed school plans to meet transportation needs for field trips and athletic events. If the proposed school will not provide daily transportation, what were the factors that led to this decision and what was the impact of not providing transportation?</p> | | |
| <p>Strengths:</p> <p>N/A- the school will not be providing daily transportation.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>N/A</p> | | |
| <p>Criterion III.C.2</p> <p>Sound plans for safety and security for students, the facility, and property, including descriptions of policies and the types of security personnel, technology, and equipment that the proposed school will</p> | | |

employ. If the proposed school has a *virtual or blended learning program*, the description must include physical or virtual security features to deter theft.

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The response for this section is sparse and provides little to no details; there is no description of policies but a general reference to DOE policies for safety and security. North Shore Charter School should provide clarity on whether these department policies are applicable to the school’s proposed facility and determine whether these policies will meet the school’s needs.

Criterion III.C.3

If the proposed school will provide food service, a sound plan describing the proposed school’s plan for providing food to its students, including plans for a facility with a certified kitchen, transporting food from a certified kitchen, or other means of providing food service that is in compliance with applicable laws. If the proposed school will not provide food service, what were the factors that led to this decision and what will be the impact of not providing food service?

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School should consider providing a more detailed explanation on why food service will not be available despite having a free-and-reduced lunch population of almost 50% in the area that the school intends to service. The response also does not describe the impact that this would have on the students the school will serve.

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

A sound, thoughtful, and comprehensive plan for student recruitment and marketing that will provide equal access to interested students and families and specifically describes plans for outreach to families in poverty, academically low-achieving students, students with disabilities, and other youth at risk of academic failure, as well as plans for promoting socioeconomic and/or demographic diversity, including a description of how the proposed school will attempt to make itself attractive to families with relatively higher incomes and/or levels of formal education if the proposed school is projecting a high percentage of free and reduced lunch and intends to achieve socioeconomic and/or demographic diversity.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School has already gauged community interest through various ways, such as email and social media, which resulted in interest from over 350 families (according to the applicant).

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not provide outreach plans for families in poverty, academically low-achieving students, students with disabilities, and other youth at risk of academic failure. North Shore Charter School also did not describe how socioeconomic and/or demographic diversity would be promoted.

Criterion III.D.2

If applicable, the identification and description of any enrollment preferences that the proposed school would request that are in compliance with federal and state law and any Commission policies or guidelines, including a reasonable justification for the enrollment preference request.

Strengths:

N/A – North Shore Charter School states this criterion is not applicable “...because NSCS will not be asking for any special enrollment preferences”.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Criterion III.D.3

An admission and enrollment policy, provided as Attachment S (no page limit), that complies with applicable laws and any Commission policies or guidelines, ensures the proposed school will be open to all eligible students, and includes:

- a. A reasonable timeline and comprehensive plan for the application period, including admission and enrollment deadlines and procedures and an explanation of how the school will receive and process applications;
- b. A reasonable timeline and comprehensive plan for student recruitment or engagement and enrollment;
- c. Effective procedures for lotteries, waiting lists, withdrawals, re-enrollment, and transfers in accordance with state and Commission requirements;
- d. Descriptions of reasonable pre-admission activities for students and parents or guardians, including an explanation of the purpose of such activities;
- e. A description of how the school will ensure that it will meet its enrollment targets; and
- f. A contingency plan if enrollment targets are not met.

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not complete an admission and enrollment policy as required.

Section III.E: Geographic Location and Facilities

Meets the Standard

Does Not Meet the Standard

Falls Far Below the Standard

Criterion III.E.1

Geographic Location.

- a. A description, with reasonable specificity, of the geographic location of the proposed school’s facility, including the DOE complex area(s) in which the proposed school will be located.

b. A reasonable rationale for selecting the geographic location and a comprehensive description of the research conducted, if any, to support that rationale.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School has identified a facility that the school will be located at; this facility allows the applicant group to serve the community targeted by the applicant.

Weaknesses:

None.

Criterion III.E.2

Facilities.

- a. **If the proposed school has obtained a facility**, a description of the facility—including address, square footage, square footage rent, amenities, previous use, and what needs to be done in order for the facility to be in compliance and meet requirements to serve as a school—demonstrating that the facility is reasonably adequate for the intended purposes, has a sound plan and timeline for renovating and bringing the facility into compliance with applicable building codes, and will meet the requirements of the Academic Plan, including the needs of the anticipated student population. If the proposed school has a *virtual or blended learning program*, or relies heavily on technology, the description must adequately explain how the facility will support the proposed technology model, including electrical capacity and access to sufficient network capacity.

OR

If the proposed school has not obtained a facility, a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound plan and timeline for identifying, securing, renovating, and financing a facility—including identification any brokers or consultants the applicant is employing—that will be in compliance with applicable building codes and meet the requirements of the Academic Plan, including the needs of the anticipated student population. The plan must briefly describe possible facilities within the geographic area in Criterion III.E.1, including addresses, square footage, square footage rent, amenities, previous use, and a general assessment of what needs to be done to bring each possible facility into compliance. If the proposed school has a *virtual or blended learning program*, or relies heavily on technology, the description must adequately explain how each possible facility will support the proposed technology model, including electrical capacity and access to sufficient network capacity.

- b. **If the proposed school plans to add students or grade levels during the first five years**, a reasonable and sound facility growth plan that shows how the school will accommodate the additional square footage necessary for additional students, faculty, and staff and sufficiently identifies any permits or rezoning that might be necessary to implement the facility growth plan.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School has obtained a Memorandum of Understanding for a specific site (the Liluokalani Protestant Church) and has also obtained the Certificate of Occupancy for the facility. The current certificate allows for a maximum occupancy of 265 people, though North Shore Charter School must confirm whether this occupancy limit is applicable for the facility's use as a school.

Weaknesses:

Though a facility has been secured, North Shore Charter School has not assessed the facility to determine whether any modifications need to be done to bring the facility into compliance nor has an assessment been done to determine what modifications needs to be done to allow that facility to serve as a school. In the Request for Clarification, North Shore Charter School stated that it is in the process of conducting this assessment; as a result, there is no solid information what might be needed and how much that would cost at this time.

Section III.F: Start-Up Period

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

Criterion III.F.1

A comprehensive, reasonable, and sound management plan for the start-up period, provided as Attachment U (no page limit), that aligns with the Academic, Organizational, and Financial Plans (including the start-up year (Year 0) budget in the Financial Plan Workbook). The management plan must detail the start-up plan for the proposed school, including specific tasks, timelines, milestones, and responsible individuals for each of the following areas

- a. Plans to obtain financing for the proposed school’s facility, highlighting the alignment of the financing plan with the timing of obtaining and renovating the facility, as described in Criterion III.E.2;
- b. Plans to fund the start-up period, including all plans for fundraising and grant writing and a description of any specific fundraising opportunities and grants the applicant has identified;
- c. Plans to market the proposed school to the school’s anticipated student population and develop partnerships with other charter schools, DOE schools, and private schools to identify possible students and achieve the proposed school’s projected enrollment, including any other ways the applicant plans to achieve its projected enrollment;
- d. Plans to hire teachers, administrative staff, and support staff during the start-up period, if any, incorporating the timelines for hiring teachers, described in Criteria II.F.4, and delivering the professional development, described in Criteria II.F.2;
- e. Plans to identify, recruit, select, and add or replace new governing board members that align with the recruitment plan described in Criterion III.A.7.d, the governing board transition plan described in Criterion III.A.7.e, and any governing board training described in Criterion III.A.10, as applicable; and
- f. Any other plans for activities that will need to be completed during the start-up period, such as the selection of curriculum materials, as applicable.

Strengths:

None. North Shore Charter School failed to provide a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound management plan for the start-up period as required by the application’s criteria.

Weaknesses:

In lieu of a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound management plan for the start-up period, North Shore Charter School submitted a sparse chart with six items as its start-up plan. No details are provided and tasks are described in general terms; for example, under start-up funding, the tasks listed in the start-up plan are to research grant opportunities, apply for public and private grants, and hold fundraising activities. There is no description in the start-up plan detailing how much funding will be sought and from whom. While that information is available in the

budget, the lack of detail or explanation in the start-up plan demonstrates an absence of alignment with the academic, financial, and organizational plans.

Criterion III.F.2

A sound plan for leading the development of the school during its pre-opening phase, including identification of capable individuals who will work on a full-time or nearly full-time basis following approval of the application to lead development and implementation of the plan to open the proposed school and a description of a viable plan to obtain the funding necessary to compensate these individuals that is aligned with the budget.

Strengths:

None. North Shore Charter School failed to provide a sound plan for leading the development of the school during its pre-opening phase as required by the application’s criteria.

Weaknesses:

While North Shore Charter School identifies specific individuals for the general start-up plan activities, it has not provided a viable plan to obtain funding for these individuals. The start-up plan is so sparse that it cannot be determined whether funding is needed and for whom.

Section III.G: Conversion Charter School Additional Organizational Information

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <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 | | |

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

Meets the Standard

Does Not Meet the Standard

Falls Far Below the Standard

Criterion IV.A.1

A clear description that gives reasonable assurance that the proposed school will have sound systems, policies, and processes for financial planning, accounting, purchasing, and payroll, including an adequate explanation of how the proposed school will establish and maintain strong internal controls and ensure compliance with all financial reporting requirements. The description must also explain the plans and procedures for conducting an annual audit of the financial and administrative operations of the proposed school that is in accordance with state law, including a reasonable annual cost estimate of the audit that is included in the Financial Plan Workbook.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not provide a clear description that gives reasonable assurance that the proposed school will have strong internal controls and will ensure compliance with all financial reporting requirements. The RFP lacks specifics of any internal control processes or procedures.

Criterion IV.A.2

A clear description of the roles and responsibilities that demonstrates a strong understanding of the appropriate delineation of such roles and responsibilities among the proposed school leadership team or management team and proposed school governing board regarding school financial oversight and management.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not provide a clear description of the roles and responsibilities that demonstrates a strong understanding of financial oversight and management. The RFP presents a process that will be monitored by the School Leader that the School has yet determined to hire and not budgeted in the Financial Plan.

Criterion IV.A.3

A description of sound criteria and procedures for selecting vendors or contractors for any administrative services, such as business services, payroll, and auditing services, including reasonable anticipated costs that are reflected in the Financial Plan Workbook.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not provide an adequate description of sound criteria and procedures for selecting vendors or contractors for any administrative services. The RFP lacks details and understanding of fiscally sound procurement practices.

Section IV.B: Operating Budget

Meets the Standard

Does Not Meet the Standard

Falls Far Below the Standard

Criterion IV.B.1

Complete, realistic, and viable start-up and three-year operating budgets, provided through the Financial Plan Workbook (Exhibit 5) as Attachment Y (required form), that align to the Academic and Organizational Plans.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

The budget is incomplete, unrealistic, and not viable for a charter school start-up.

1. Start-up year is solely dependent on federal and private grants, totaling \$95,000 and cash of \$7,500. According to the North Shore Charter School, these grants are not secured and only \$5,000 has been fund raised. This may result in an overstated Year 0 budget. The proposed charter school may end the year with a negative cash flow, not at \$6,215.79 as projected and the School may begin Year 1 in a negative position.
2. Federal funds are generally provided on a cost-reimbursement basis. The proposed charter school does not have sufficient funds to cover for the actual expenses prior to any reimbursements for Year 0, which may severely impact the School's ability to implement its academic and organizational plans.
3. The Statement of Net Assets does not reflect grants described by the applicant, reaffirming that these are unsecured resources.
4. The budget anticipates ending Year 1 and Year 2 with cash on hand below the industry standard of 30 days and generally, 60 days for charterschools.

These concerns may put the state at-risk for potential fiscal liability.

Criterion IV.B.2

Budget Narrative. A detailed budget narrative that clearly explains reasonable, well-supported cost assumptions and revenue estimates, including but not limited to the basis for revenue projections, staffing levels, and costs. The narrative must specifically address the degree to which the school budget will rely on variable income (especially for grants, donations, and fundraising) and must include the following:

- a. A description indicating the amount and sources of funds, property, or other resources expected to be available not only via per-pupil funding but also through corporations, foundations, grants, donations, and any other potential funding sources. The description must note which are secured and which are anticipated; explain evidence of commitment, and provide such evidence as Attachment Z (no page limit), for any funds on which the proposed school's core operation depends (e.g., grant award letters, MOUs); and describe any

restrictions on any of the aforementioned funds.

- b. A sound contingency plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated, including contingencies for scenarios where the official enrollment of the proposed school is substantially lower than projected and/or anticipated variable income is not received. The contingency plan must also include a Year 1 cash flow contingency, in the event that revenue projections are not met in advance of opening.
- c. If the proposed school has a *virtual or blended learning program*, a clear and comprehensive description of the necessary costs for delivery of such program, including costs associated with hardware, software, peripheral needs (cases, headphones, chargers, etc.), storage, and network infrastructure needs, as applicable.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

The budget is not well-supported and conflicts with other information provided.

- a. There is no narrative describing other funding sources, totaling \$147,500 but are shown in the budget and mentioned during the interview. These other funding sources are not secured. During the interview, North Shore Charter School said \$5,000 has been fundraised and contributions between \$25,000 and \$30,000 will be available although not secured.
- b. North Shore Charter School does not have a complete contingency plan in the event that enrollment projections or other funding sources are not met.

Section IV.C: Financial Performance Management

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

Criterion IV.C.1

Comprehensive and effective plans for evaluating and monitoring financial performance that explain how the proposed school will measure and evaluate performance data, including:

- a. **Financial Performance Data Evaluation Plan.** A comprehensive and effective plan and system for maintaining, managing, compiling, and interpreting financial data monthly, quarterly, annually, and for the term of the Charter Contract, including descriptions of the qualified person(s), position(s), and/or entities that will be responsible for maintaining the data, managing the data, compiling it, and interpreting it for the school director and governing board and how the person(s), position(s), and/or entities will be provided time to complete the aforementioned maintenance, management, compiling, and interpretation.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not provide a complete plan for evaluating and monitoring financial performance.

Criterion IV.C.2

A clear description of thoughtful, appropriate corrective actions the proposed school will take if it falls short of:

a. Financial performance standards set in the Financial Performance Framework, including an explanation of the actions that would be taken if the proposed school is issued Notices of Concern or Deficiency under the terms of the Charter Contract, if the independent auditor issues findings, or if the proposed school encounters financial difficulties.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not provide a clear description of thoughtful, appropriate corrective actions related to the financial performance standards set in the Financial Performance Framework.

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 (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

Evidence that the key members of the proposed school's academic team have the collective qualifications and capacity (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*) to implement the school's Academic Plan successfully. The evidence must include a description that:

- a. Clearly identifies the key members of the applicant's academic team that will play a substantial role in the successful implementation of the Academic Plan, including current or proposed governing board members, school leadership or management, and any essential partners who will play an important ongoing role in the proposed school's development and operation; and
- b. Describes the academic team's individual and collective qualifications for implementing the proposed school's 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.

Strengths:

Collective qualifications of the academic team are well-rounded and demonstrate capacity to implement a well-designed academic plan.

Weaknesses:

Qualifications aside, the academic plan proposed is incomplete and no amount of capacity will allow it to be implemented successfully

Criterion V.A.2

A description of the academic team's clear ties to and/or knowledge of the community in the geographic area where the facility is or will be and/or areas where the anticipated student population will come from.

Strengths:

North Shore Charter School's ties are well established in the community.

Weaknesses:

None.

Criterion V.A.3

A description that identifies any organizations, agencies, or consultants that are essential partners to the successful planning and establishing of the proposed school and/or implementation of the Academic Plan; explains the current and planned roles of such essential partners and any resources they have contributed or plan to contribute to the proposed school's development; and includes evidence of support, provided as Attachment AA (no page limit) (such as letters of intent or commitment, memoranda of understanding, and/or contracts), from such essential partners demonstrating these partners are committed to an ongoing role with the proposed school, if applicable.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

Although the Academic Plan relies substantially on community partnerships there are none identified in the North Shore Charter School application.

Criterion V.A.4

School Director.

Submit a position description for the school director. The applicant is required to provide the position description as Attachment CC (required attachment, no page limit). The position description shall include:

- a. The job description, responsibilities, characteristics, and qualifications for the school director. The position description shall include rigorous criteria that is designed to recruit a school director with the experience and ability to design, launch, and lead a *high-quality charter school* that will effectively serve the anticipated student population and implement the Academic Plan; and
- b. A timeline that aligns with the proposed school's start-up plan and a comprehensive plan for a thorough recruiting and selection process where candidates will be screened using rigorous criteria.

Submit Attachment BB to indicate that the school director is known or unknown at the time of the application.

- c. If known, identify the school director, and provide as Attachment BB (required attachment, no page limit) the school director's resume including their academic and organizational leadership record.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

The job descriptions provided are weak and not comprehensive.

Criterion V.A.5

Management Team.

Submit position descriptions for a business manager and registrar (or positions that will carry out the duties of a business manager and registrar). These positions will make up the proposed school’s leadership or management team beyond the school director. The applicant is required to provide the position descriptions as Attachment EE (required attachment, no page limit). The description must include:

- a. The job description, responsibilities, characteristics, and qualifications for the business manager and registrar. The position description shall include rigorous criteria that is designed to recruit individuals for these positions that have the experience and ability to perform the duties of each position.
- b. A timeline that aligns with the proposed school’s start-up plan and a comprehensive plan for a thorough recruiting and selection process where candidates will be screened using rigorous criteria.

Submit Attachment DD (required attachment, no page limit) to indicate that the business manager and registrar is known or unknown at the time of the application.

- c. If known, identify the individuals who will fill these positions and provide, as Attachment DD (required attachment, no page limit), the resumes for these individuals as evidence that the individuals demonstrate the qualifications, capacities, and commitment to carry out their designated roles to ensure the success of the proposed school.

Strengths:

Although North Shore Charter School has not yet identified a business manager or registrar, a search and hiring process has been identified.

Weaknesses:

None.

Section V.B: Organizational Plan Capacity

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

Criterion V.B.1

Evidence that the key members of the proposed school’s organization team have the collective qualifications and capacity (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*) to implement the school’s Organizational Plan successfully. The evidence must include a description that:

- a. Clearly identifies the key members of the applicant’s organization team that will play a substantial role in the successful implementation of the Organizational Plan, including current or proposed governing board members, school leadership or management, and any essential partners who will play an important ongoing role in the Organizational Plan; and
- b. Describes the organization team’s individual and collective qualifications for implementing

the proposed school’s Organizational Plan successfully, including sufficient capacity in areas such as staffing, professional development, performance management, general operations, facilities acquisition, development (such as build-out or renovations), and management.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School did not include resumes of all its organization team members. This is an example that demonstrates a lack of preparation and raises substantial concerns about their capacity to implement a high quality charter school.

Criterion V.B.2

A description that identifies any organizations, agencies, or consultants that are essential partners in planning, establishing, or implementing the proposed school’s Organizational Plan; explains the current and planned roles of such partners and any resources they have contributed or plan to contribute to the proposed school’s development of its Organizational Plan; and includes evidence of support, included in Attachment AA (as referenced in Criterion V.A.3), from such essential partners demonstrating these partners are committed to planning, establishing, and/or implementing the Organizational Plan.

Strengths:

N/A –North Shore Charter School states the Applicant Board has not contracted with any specific organizations, agencies or consultants as essential partners in the School’s Organizational Plan.

Weaknesses:

N/A

Section V.C: Financial Management Capacity

Meets the Standard

Does Not Meet the Standard

Falls Far Below the Standard

Criterion V.C.1

Evidence that the key members of the proposed school’s financial team have the collective qualifications and capacity (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*) to implement the school’s Financial Plan successfully. The evidence must include a description that:

- a. Clearly identifies the key members of the applicant’s financial team that will play a substantial role in the successful implementation of the Financial Plan, including current or proposed governing board members, school leadership or management, and any essential partners who will play an important ongoing role in the proposed school’s Financial Plan; and
- b. Describes the financial team’s individual and collective qualifications for implementing the proposed school’s Financial Plan successfully, including sufficient capacity in areas such as

financial management, fundraising and development, accounting, and internal controls.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School does not demonstrate financial management capacity by the application responses in the RFP or in the interview.

Criterion V.C.2

A description that identifies any organizations, agencies, or consultants that are essential partners in planning, establishing, or implementing the proposed school’s Financial Plan; explains the current and planned roles of such partners and any resources they have contributed or plan to contribute to the proposed school’s development of its Financial Plan; and includes evidence of support, included in Attachment AA (as referenced in Criterion V.A.3), from such essential partners demonstrating these partners are committed to planning, establishing, and/or implementing the Financial Plan.

Strengths:

None.

Weaknesses:

North Shore Charter School does not fully explain or describe the requested information.

Exhibit B

DOE Comments on North Shore Charter School



Lauren Endo <lauren.endo@spscsc.hawaii.gov>

Re: ATTN: Application for Proposed Charter School-North Shore Charter School Ref#28641EA

1 message

Wanelle_Kaneshiro/OSIP/HIDOE@notes.k12.hi.us

Fri, Jun 16, 2017

<Wanelle_Kaneshiro/OSIP/HIDOE@notes.k12.hi.us>

at 6:37 PM

To: lauren.endo@spscsc.hawaii.gov

Cc: Kendra_Oishi/OSIP/HIDOE@notes.k12.hi.us,

Tammi_Chun/OSIP/HIDOE@notes.k12.hi.us

Good afternoon, Lauren --

Thank you for soliciting input from HIDOE on the application for the proposed North Shore Charter School. We have reached out to the Complex Area Superintendents of the complexes in which the proposed North Shore Charter School would be servicing and the following is a compilation of the comments we received from the Complex Area Superintendents and their intermediate and high school principals:

1. As described, the North Shore Charter School would be a virtual school and, therefore, will duplicate services already available to North Shore students in grades seven and eight through the Hawaii Technology Academy and Myron B. Thompson. Both of these schools have very poor graduation rates and, therefore, similar concerns exist regarding this additional proposed charter school.
2. Common Core curriculum, by nature, is focused on problem-solving and critical thinking skills. Common Core curriculum, along with live instruction that incorporates technology, is readily available to students in seventh and eighth grade at Kahuku High and Intermediate. Project-based learning is already incorporated in many courses at Kahuku and, as is the case in all schools, will continue to grow as a methodology because project-based learning is interdisciplinary, hands-on, and an excellent opportunity for authentic assessment. Seventh and eighth graders at Kahuku participate in Hawaii History Day and the Science Fair, both of which are problem- and project-based. Kahuku students, including seventh and eighth graders, consistently win awards at district and state History Day and go on as state winners to National History Day. They have won, placed or participated at National History Day for the last 22 years. They also win and place at the district science fair and go on to states.
3. Kahuku Intermediate students have their own separate facilities as well as a separate lunch in the cafeteria. At the same time, they may have access to co-curricular programs

for credit that are interest-based because these courses are part of the curriculum. These would include such courses as drama, choral music, band, agriculture and AVID.

Next school year, Waialua High and Intermediate School will exhibit significant change. The intermediate students will have a building of their own (Q Building) as well as a separate bell schedule to include their own time slots for lunch and recess.

4 . Kahuku High and Intermediate is a 21st Century School. This means the following 21st century programs are available only to seventh and eighth graders who attend Kahuku High and Intermediate School: robotics, science fair prep, speech and debate, homework help, water polo for girls, boys and girls basketball, and boys and girls volleyball.

5 . Kahuku has long, sustained partnerships with the Polynesian Cultural Center, Brigham Young University Hawaii, and Kamehameha Schools to name a few. Both the current and the previous principal have participated in Ho'okele, a four-year leadership and learning project based on traditional Hawaiian practices, philosophy and values. Based in Ko'olauloa, the project is ocean- and aina-centered and will be promoted through Na Hopena A'o on the campus. Kahuku also has a grades 7-12 full Hawaiian language immersion program and offers Hawaiian, Spanish and Japanese language to students in grades 7-12. Additionally, the school provides agriculture, horticulture, hydroponics, aquaculture and the propagation of native and native medicinal plants and trees.

6. Middle level education research has been thriving since the 1960's. This movement recognizes that young adolescents are not simply older elementary school students nor younger high school students, but that there are dramatic changes that occur during this time of life requiring a radically different and unique approach to education. Almost 60 years ago, middle school educators saw the need for the provision of special instructional, curricular, and administrative changes in the way that education takes place for kids in early adolescence. Among those changes were the establishment of a mentor relationship between teacher and student, the creation of small communities of learners, and the implementation of a flexible interdisciplinary curriculum that encourages active and personalized learning.

Kahuku Intermediate students are fully engaged in the middle school concept with heterogeneous grouping in "houses." Each student has four core teachers assigned to them as a team, with support staff, to meet individual student needs. The seventh and eighth grade core content teachers meet weekly in SLCs (Small Learning Communities) to monitor individual student progress.

Waialua High and Intermediate School has a similar structure. WHIS is about to embark on this journey to ensure our intermediate school students receive a top notch, quality education. They will address the "whole child" by encompassing the importance of character education and teaching to their physical, social/emotional, academic and

behavioral needs. They will address the “well-rounded child” through a personalized, high quality curriculum which will prepare them for high school and post-secondary endeavors.

Waiialua Intermediate School will consist of two teams with five teachers and an educational assistant; a seventh-grade team and an eighth-grade team.

7. Kahuku's and Waiialua High and Intermediate's 7-12 configuration affords students only one transition and that is into the school as sixth graders coming to seventh grade. There is no ninth-grade transition and moving from eighth to ninth grade is seamless. This is of huge benefit to students for in many high schools, the ninth-grade failure rates, suspension rates and chronic attendance rates are the highest in any K-12 grade.

Kahuku students are already Red Raiders when they enter ninth grade and have participated as united classes in Songfest and Cheerfest as well as in May Day at PCC. This year, Kahuku's ninth-grade failure rate is 5.9 percent. The transition program to Kahuku High and Intermediate features orientation and leadership opportunities for sixth graders from our five complex feeder schools through Hawaiian practices at Waikalua Loko I'a, Papahana Kualoa, Kualoa Ranch Secret Island and Gunstock Ranch.

8. Traffic from Sunset Beach in the morning to Haleiwa and especially in the afternoon from Haleiwa to Sunset Beach can only be described as horrific. This charter school located in Haleiwa Town will only add to this substantial conflagration.

9. Kahuku High and Intermediate also targets areas of high need for students that have issues with academic achievement, chronic absenteeism, and character development and envelops students in the pros and cons of real-world problems (conservation, preservation, sustainability, water rights, pollution, obesity, food to table, etc.).

10. As written, the description of this charter school does not seem to have a strong middle school model; appears unable to match supports, programs or human resources at HIDOE schools; and it is unclear as to whether they are or are not focusing on students with chronic absenteeism, achievement and character issues.

11. The proposed charter focuses on these grades, and although it's focus has merit, there are ancillary concerns that may present itself should this charter be approved. Students now transitioning out of sixth grade already have two different and very viable choices for grades seven and eight. These options are Kahuku High and Intermediate and Waiialua High and Intermediate. Both are heritage schools. Kahuku was founded in 1897 and Waiialua in 1914. Parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents attended these schools and take great pride in that fact. Alumni will generally send their children to one or the other. Geographic Exceptions also flow freely between the two schools depending on student interests and program availability. Support for both schools by their attendant and diverse communities is very strong. It should be noted that the Sunset Beach Community had a school that incorporated grades seven and eight. It no longer exists as it was overshadowed and abandoned years ago because of what was

and is offered and available at Kahuku and Waialua. Both schools also have six-year accreditations from WASC.

For example, the Waialua Complex is uniquely connected as a partnership between three highly successful schools: Haleiwa Elementary, Waialua Elementary, and Waialua High and Intermediate. The elementary schools collaborate transitions for their students with WHIS providing a seamless pathway. Should another public charter option be developed, the equilibrium of planning, sharing information, and working in concert collectively will be truncated, potentially negatively impacting the continuity of staffing, resource allocation, programming, family involvement, and, ultimately, student outcomes. Another potential entanglement could be the confusion to families that are new to the community. This community serves a combination of generational families and those that are migrant-oriented. Having two different 7 and 8 grade options in the community has the potential to confuse families as to which is their home school? Being a rurally-based community, the student population is relatively small, thus having a consistent option for students and families provides for the focus needed to support this unique communities clientele. Another compelling reason to defer the opening of the proposed charter school is that WHIS provides strong programming and continues to innovate their offerings for students, specifically in the areas of critical thinking and problem solving. Therefore, it is with conviction that the Waialua Complex Administrators, the Waialua Complex Area Staff and the Complex Area Superintendent advocate that this charter be deferred because the current system of schooling already provides an exemplary experience for students and the community at-large.

12. It should also be noted that the schools of the Kahuku Complex (Kaaawa, Hauula, Laie, Kahuku High and Intermediate, Kahuku Elementary and Sunset Beach) are a tightly knit learning community with the united purpose of seeing their students graduate college- and career-ready. They experience the same staff development and provide a Pre-K-12 learning continuum and scope and sequence based on best practice. Their students primarily aspire to be Red Raiders.

13. Some of the information on Kahuku and Waialua that was put on the North Shore Community Hub by people promoting this charter school and, most recently, getting people to sign a petition in favor of its creation, twisted or provided data not fully explained or accurate. For instance, the promoters ranked both Kahuku and Waialua but the DOE has not ranked schools for two years and attendance data provided was way off. In fact, seventh grade attendance at Kahuku in the 2016- 2017 school year was 92.96 percent, eighth grade was 91.59%, and ninth grade was 90.20 percent.

Please let me know if you need anything else. Thank you!

-- Wanelle

Wanelle Kaneshiro-Erdmann
Policy, Innovation, Planning, and Evaluation Branch
Office of Strategy, Innovation, and Performance

Hawai'i State Department of Education

Phone: (808) 271-2207

Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient and may contain confidential and/or privileged information. Any review, use, disclosure, or distribution by unintended recipients is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.