

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

INFORMATIONAL SUBMITTAL

DATE: September 10, 2015

TO: Catherine Payne, Chairperson

FROM: Tom Hutton, Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM: Update on Public Input Regarding Discussion Draft of Charter Contract Renewal Criteria

I. DESCRIPTION

Update on public input on discussion draft of the Charter Contract Renewal Criteria, including proposed overall annual ratings for Organizational and Financial performance.

II. BACKGROUND

On July 1, 2013, the Commission executed the inaugural one-year State Public Charter School Contract (“Charter Contract”) with each charter school, effective for the 2013-14 school year. On July 1, 2014, the Commission executed the second Charter Contract, which had a term of three years, beginning July 1, 2014, and ending June 30, 2017.

At its July 9, 2015, general business meeting, the Commission approved the release for soliciting public input of the draft Charter Contract renewal criteria for the end of the second Charter Contract, as well as proposed methodologies for assigning an overall annual rating for Financial and Organizational performance. The Commission also approved the following Guiding Principles to govern the development of the final Charter Contract renewal criteria:

1. Rather than receiving a two-year extension of their current contracts, as previously planned, exemplary schools will automatically be eligible for a new five-year contract.

2. Every school will be offered the possibility of renewal at the end of this contract term unless, in the case of a school whose performance falls in the lowest bracket, the school refuses to accept an additional probationary year in which the school must either achieve probationary benchmarks or close at the end of the probationary year.
3. A school's performance under all three performance frameworks (academic, organizational, and financial) shall be factored into renewal decisions.
4. Where the Commission's Academic Performance Framework ("APF") departs from the Strive HI Performance System ("Strive HI"), as with the APF's use of a weighted Academic Performance Index for multi-division schools and School-Specific Measures ("SSM"), the APF methodologies shall be used for renewal decisions.
5. For this round of renewals, Hawaiian immersion schools shall be considered separately from other charter schools.

III. UPDATE

Commission staff has held the following meetings so far to discuss the proposed contract renewal criteria and proposed overall annual organizational and financial performance rankings:

- July 18, 2015 - Hawaii Public Charter Schools Network meeting (for HPCSN members only);
- July 24, 2015 - Commission Webinar (recorded WebEx) (PowerPoint Slides posted on website);
- July 27, 2015 - Commission Webinar (recorded WebEx);
- August 6, 2015 - Na Lei Na'auao meeting; and
- August 24, 2015 - Ho'olako Like's Po'okumu Professional Learning Community (PLC).

In addition, as Commission has been meeting with charter school governing boards statewide, contract renewal criteria is one of the items being discussed. As of this writing these meetings have been held with five governing boards. Additionally, school representatives and other stakeholders have been submitting written comments and suggestions to the Commission's email address at info@spcsc.hawaii.gov and via the SurveyMoneky and have been discussing the proposal and suggestions with Commission staff directly. Commission staff remains available for additional meetings and continues to reach out for more discussions with schools and other stakeholders.

Information on the proposed Renewal Criteria and Feedback is posted on a special website page available from the Commission's homepage. This page includes the related staff submittals, the draft application document, recorded webinars, corresponding PowerPoint presentations, and a link to a SurveyMonkey that provides stakeholders with an opportunity to comment or provide suggestions.

Based on feedback, comments, and suggestions received so far, staff has revised the initial proposal and has incorporated revisions into its presentations as well. As of this writing revisions already planned or under discussion include the following:

- Making schools that fall into Bracket 3 for academic performance (average three-year percentile ranking of between 20 and 49) eligible for a three-year or two-year contract, instead of a two-year or one-year contract;
- Factoring the Financial Performance and Organizational Performance Frameworks into the contract term for schools that fall into Bracket 1 for academic performance (average three-year percentile ranking of 90 or higher), by assigning these schools a five-year term if they meet standard under these Frameworks and a four-year term if not;
- Factoring the Financial Performance and Organizational Performance Frameworks into the contract term for Hawaiian immersion schools and Mālama Honua, by assigning these schools a three-year contract term provided they meet standard under these Frameworks and a two-year term if not;
- Modifying the Additional Indicators and their rubrics;
- Adding a fifth Additional Indicator allowing a school that serves a majority of student who come the school in major entry years below grade level and can show that these students are on track for academic success to receive bonus points (these are bonus points so that this indicator will not disfavor schools that do not serve such a student population);
- Allowing for data-related appeals during the probationary year for those schools that accept a probationary contract for an additional probationary year instead of the non-renewal process and, during that probationary year, dispute whether the probationary terms were met;
- Allowing for a school in Bracket 4 (average three-year percentile ranking of 20 or lower) that opts for a probationary contract to be removed from probationary status should its 2016-17 academic performance show significant enough improvement, but also providing that a school with low enough performance in that year can be precluded from emerging from probationary status;
- In addition to the primary vehicle of a school results on any School-Specific Measures, which can count for up to 25% of a school's APF results, considering another anticipated proposal to factor in a school's fulfillment of its unique mission;

- Revising the contract application so that schools that fall into all four Brackets for academic performance, not just those schools in Brackets 2 and 3, can submit additional information such as information related to the Additional Indicators; and
- Inviting those schools that have received WASC Accreditation to include in their contract applications finding from their accreditation reports form WASC as evidence of their school improvement efforts.

IV. RECOMMENDATION

None; for informational purposes only.