

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
<http://www.chartercommission.hawaii.gov>

RECOMMENDATION SUBMITTAL

DATE: November 19, 2015

TO: Catherine Payne, Chairperson

FROM: Kalehua Krug, Commissioner
Ernest Nishizaki, Commissioner
Thomas Hutton, Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM: Action on Renewal Application and Criteria for State Public Charter School Contracts
Expiring on June 30, 2017

I. DESCRIPTION

Recommendation that the Commission approve the Renewal Application and Criteria for State Public Charter School Contracts Expiring on June 30, 2017, as presented in this submittal.

II. Policy Context

Renewal, Nonrenewal, and Revocation: Pursuant to §302D-5(a), Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”), “[a]uthorizers are responsible for executing the following essential powers and duties: ... (6) Determining whether each charter contract merits renewal, nonrenewal, or revocation.”

Additionally, HRS §302D-18(h) states that “An authorizer shall develop revocation and nonrenewal processes that . . . [p]rovide charter contract holders with a timely notification of the prospect of revocation or non-renewal and the reasons for such possible closure[.]”

Delegation of Duties: Pursuant to §302D-5(d), HRS, “[a]n authorizer may delegate its duties to officers, employees, and contractors.”

III. 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. Under this contract, no school would face non-renewal for poor performance.

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 that time, the Commission determined that any school that achieved “exemplary performance” under the second Charter Contract (as defined at a future time and based on outcomes on the Commission’s performance frameworks) would receive an automatic two-year extension of its Charter Contract.

After approval of the discussion draft at the July 9, 2015 Commission meeting, Commission staff began to actively solicit comments from the Hawaii Public Charter School Network (“HPCSN”), charter schools, and other stakeholders. In response to feedback from schools that more time was needed for stakeholder input, the period for stakeholder input that was originally approved by the Commission was extended for an additional month. Those stakeholder engagement efforts are chronicled in the October 8, 2015 submittal available at the following link:

http://sharepoint.spcsc.hawaii.gov/SPCSC/Documents/V_REVISED%20Submittal%20Renewal%20Criteria_2.pdf

At the October 8, 2015 General Commission Meeting, the Commission decided to defer a decision on the renewal criteria until more input could be gathered at a charter-wide school meeting that would allow for group discussion and collaborative input on the renewal criteria. That meeting was held November 10, 2015. Over 50 school leaders, governing board members, HPCSN, and other stakeholders participated in the meeting facilitated by Commissioners Krug and Nishizaki.

Based on the discussion at the renewal criteria meeting, the proposal for the contract renewal criteria and application has been revised further, and the latest changes are reflected in this submittal. The revisions take into account the problems, issues, and solutions that were presented at the meeting but attempt to balance conflicting viewpoints, additional outside stakeholder concerns, and the Commission’s responsibilities to children, the public, and its mission of authorizing high quality charter schools throughout the state.

A summary of the renewal criteria is provided below, but should be read in context of the entire submittal for a comprehensive understanding.

A. Summary of Renewal Criteria

1. The three-year average percentile ranking will be used to calculate a school’s bracket.
2. The four brackets have been reconfigured in the following manner:

Bracket	3-year average percentile ranking	Overall Rating in Organization and Financial Frameworks	Additional Indicator Point Value	Length of Contract 3.0
1	90 or higher	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Framework	Optional; informational only	5-year
1	90 or higher	Does not meet in either Organizational, Financial or both	Optional; informational only	4-year
2	50-89	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Frameworks	35 or more	5-year
			34 or fewer	4-year
2	50-89	Does not meet either Organizational, Financial, or both	Optional; informational only	4-year
3	21-49	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Frameworks	35 or more	4-year
3	21-49		34 or fewer	3-year
3	21-49	Does not meet either Organizational, Financial, or both	Optional; informational only	3-year
4	20 or below	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Frameworks	40 or more	3-year with co-created interim academic targets
4	20 or below		39 or fewer	2-year with co-created interim academic targets
4	20 or below	Does not meet either Organizational, Financial, or both	Additional Indicators used to help inform interim academic targets	2-year with co-created interim academic targets

3. A new Additional Indicator will be added to those described in the submittal: one for “Innovative Practices.” This indicator gives a school the opportunity to describe one or more unique or innovative practices that contribute to the school’s success of fostering the development of the “whole child” and distinguish the school’s academic or cultural program. This Additional Indicator has a potential value of ten points.

4. The Additional Indicators section of the application will be evaluated by a team consisting of one Commissioner, one Commission staff member, and one charter school community member. No school community member will evaluate a school with which he or she is associated, and for this evaluation school names will be redacted to ensure an unbiased evaluation.

5. Hawaiian Immersion schools will be eligible for four-year contracts if meeting standards under both the Organizational and Financial Performance Frameworks. Immersion schools not meeting both the organizational and the financial standards will be eligible for three-year contracts. These schools will have the option of completing the Additional Indicators section of the application to provide information on, and context for, the school’s on-going performance. Hawaiian Immersion schools may become candidates for Academic Monitoring should preliminary Hawaiian Language State Assessment indicate a need for improvement.

6. The statistical overview of current performance contract period section of the application has been removed.

7. The Governance section of the application has been removed.

In addition, the following areas of concern that fall outside of contract renewal criteria will be addressed by the following resolutions:

Resolution 1:

The contract renewal criteria described in this submittal is to be used to evaluate schools’ performance on the current contract ending June 30, 2017, the results of which will determine the length of each school’s “Contract 3.0” that will begin July 2017.

The academic criteria that will be used to evaluate schools’ performance of the next contract, “Contract 3.0,” will be determined with the school during the spring of 2017, before the contract is signed. The Commission will work with each school to co-create academic renewal targets that will take into account the individual needs of the school and its student body. The co-created criteria must fit within sound research-based authorizer practices, contribute to the development of a high-quality charter school portfolio, and be premised upon the expectation that all students can attain high levels of achievement.

Resolution 2:

Commissioner Krug and the Academic Performance team will host an School-Specific Measures (“SSM”)

discussion group to review the current SSM guidance, gather feedback on how to improve the review process, and to consider the development of school partnerships and outside resources to assist the schools in developing high-quality measures.

Resolution 3:

A working group of Commission and school representatives will be formed to discuss the issues related to the Organizational Performance criteria. The purpose of the working group will be to brainstorm together about potential ways to make compliance monitoring and reporting less burdensome and more efficient, while also gaining a better understanding of the legal requirements and policy drivers that inform the criteria and the challenges for schools. The goal of the working group will not be to revise the Organizational Performance Framework per se but examine how the individual criteria measures can best be collected and evaluated to provide meaningful information about the health of the school's organizational structure and compliance.

Timeline for Renewal

- **July of 2016:** Preliminary Renewal Performance Reports issued (containing summary of Performance Framework results already released)
- **Fall of 2016:** Fourth year of Strive HI, third year of APF results
- **Fall of 2016:** *Final Renewal Performance Reports* issued (update of Preliminary Reports; will include summary of already published results)
- **December 2016:** Schools complete Contract Renewal Application
- **January 2017:** Schools begin to work with Commission to set individual academic renewal criteria to be incorporated in Contract 3.0 (contract starting July 1, 2017).
- **June 2017:** Contract 2.0 expires
- **July 2017:** Start of term of Contract 3.0 (length of a school's Contract 3.0 will depend on school's performance under Contract 2.0 pursuant to the criteria set forth in this submittal)
- **Fall of 2017:** Fourth year of APF results

Renewal Criteria for Non-Hawaiian Immersion Charter Schools

Step 1: First, all public schools statewide (Department of Education (DOE) and charter) will be grouped by grade division (elementary, middle, and high). For this limited purpose, multi-division schools will be grouped by highest division served. Then, using the APF scores of charter schools (which comprise the weighted Academic Performance Index (API) and, if applicable, any School-Specific Measures (SSMs)) and

the Strive HI API scores of DOE schools, all schools within each grade division will be ranked by academic performance. For example, if a school serves grades Kindergarten through 8th grade, it will be compared to all middle schools statewide, but its weighted APF score, rather than its straight Strive HI API, will be used to reflect the academic performance of its population more accurately.

Step 2: Next, each school’s average percentile ranking¹ will be calculated using three years of data. This average percentile ranking will determine the bracket of renewal eligibility into which each school falls, as well as any additional criteria that will be used in the analysis.

Bracket 1	Average Percentile Ranking of 90 or higher
Bracket 2	Average Percentile Ranking of 50-89
Bracket 3	Average Percentile Ranking of 21-49
Bracket 4	Average Percentile Ranking of 20 or below

a. Bracket 1: Three-Year Average Ranking of 90 or Higher

If the average percentile ranking for three years is 90 or higher, such an exceptional school will automatically be eligible for a full **five-year contract**, provided the school meets expectations in the overall annual performance ratings under both the Financial and Organizational Performance Frameworks. (In the alternative, the school still could opt for a two-year extension of the current contract, but based on feedback from schools it is assumed that any school performing this well will prefer a full, five-year contract.) If the school does not meet both the financial and organizational expectations, it will be eligible for a four-year contract. Additional Indicators are optional for schools in this bracket.

b. Bracket 2: Three-Year Average Ranking of 50-89

A school with an average percentile ranking of between 50 and 89 that meets expectations in both the Organizational and Financial Performance Frameworks and earn 35 or more Additional Indicators points will be eligible for a contract term of **five years**. If the school meets both organizational and financial expectations but earns 34 or fewer points for Additional Indicators, it will be eligible for a **four-year contract**. If the school does not meet expectations in either or both of the Organizational or Financial Performance Frameworks, then completion of the Additional Indicators section is optional and the school will be eligible for a **four-year contract**.

c. Bracket 3: Three-Year Average Ranking of 21-49

When a school’s three-year average percentile ranking falls within the range of 21 to 49, but the school meets expectations under the Organizational and Financial Performance Frameworks and earns 35 or more Additional Indicators points, the school will eligible for a **four-year contract**. If the school meets both organizational and financial expectations but earns 34 or fewer Additional Indicators points, it will be

¹ Since percentile ranks are derived from a normal distribution (bell curve), they are not on an equal interval scale and are not suitable for averaging. A normal curve equivalent (NCE), on the other hand, is on an equal interval scale and is suitable for statistical calculations. In order to determine the three-year average percentile rank for each charter school, the percentile ranks for each relevant year (school years 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016) will be converted to NCEs, averaged, and then converted back to percentiles.

eligible for a **three-year contract**. When a school falls into this bracket but does not meet expectations in either or both of the organizational or financial performance areas, the Additional Indicators are optional and the school will be eligible for a **three-year contract**.

d. Bracket 4: Three-Year Average Ranking of 20 or Below

If a school's average percentile ranking is 20 or below, but the school meets expectations in Organizational and Financial performance and earns 40 or more points for the Additional Indicators, the school will be eligible for a **three-year contract** with co-created academic interim targets. If the school does not meet either or both organizational or financial expectations, or if it meets the organizational and financial expectations but earns 39 or fewer Additional Indicators points, it will be eligible for a **2-year contract** with co-created interim academic targets. Progress towards meeting those targets will be regularly tracked. If they are not being met or are not on track to being met, increased monitoring and intervention will result.

Additional Indicators

The ***Additional Indicators*** consist of specific information that a school may or must provide in its application, depending on its average ranking bracket. The purpose of the ***Additional Indicators*** section of the renewal application is to afford the school more opportunity to tell the story behind its numbers. There are six sections under Additional Indicators: **Trend Indicators, Demographic Comparison, Gap Rate Analysis, the School's Renewal Narrative, Academic Growth of Underserved Students, and Innovative Practices.**

A scoring team made up of one Commissioner, one Commission staff member, and a member from the school community at large will evaluate Additional Indicators. School names will be redacted during the review session to ensure unbiased evaluation, and the charter school community member will not evaluate a school with which he or she is associated.

1. The ***Trend Indicators*** have a potential value of ten points. In this section, the school can highlight upward trends in its academic performance on most Strive HI indicators.
2. The ***Demographic Comparison*** section has a potential value of ten points. In this section the school can compare its academic performance to other "like schools," *i.e.*, schools that serve similar student populations in similar geographic settings, and can propose a definition of the "like schools" to which it should be compared. For example, a rural school serving a high poverty student population could propose to compare its academic data to those of other schools within its complex area other rural schools statewide, or other schools serving a high poverty student population. This will allow the school to demonstrate how it is filling a compelling educational need in its community.
3. The ***Gap Rate Analysis*** section has a potential value of ten points. This section is focused on the difference between the academic performance of high needs students (students who qualify for Special Education Services, Free and Reduced Lunch, or are English Language Learners) and that of non-high needs students for the school year 2015-2016. If the school's gap rate is

smaller than the statewide gap rate (demonstrating that the academic achievement of high needs students is close to that of non-high needs students), then the school will receive ten points. If the school's gap rate is greater than the statewide gap rate, then the school still will have the opportunity to earn up to five points by providing a comprehensive plan for increasing the academic performance of its high needs students. If no gap rate is calculated for a school, this Indicator will be calculated by comparing the school's overall proficiency rate to the statewide high needs proficiency rate.

4. The ***School's Renewal Narrative*** section has a potential value of ten points. The purpose of this section is to allow a school to tell its story in terms of educational leadership and school management. In this section, the school would describe lessons it has learned and significant adjustments it has made along the way. Significant adjustments might include actions such as an overhaul to curriculum, teaching methodologies, staffing, leadership, or professional development focus. This section should highlight corrective actions that already have been taken to improve student academic performance. It should demonstrate reflective school leadership that has been proactive in identifying shortfalls and taking decisive action to improve key academic outcomes. This section should not highlight plans for the future. Findings from the school's most recent accreditation report on the school by WASC, if applicable, could be cited here.

5. The ***Academic Growth of Underserved Students*** section is for up to 15 **bonus points**, since not all schools will be eligible based on their student populations. In this section, a school can earn up to 10 points by demonstrating that its students are entering the school in the school's major entry years with academic deficiencies of at least two years in Language Arts and Math, and showing it is making sufficient academic gains (measured by student growth) to put them on pace to reach grade level proficiencies by graduation.

Additionally, if a school has a high student mobility rate and can demonstrate it is aggressively addressing the impact of high mobility of their student population, then the school can earn up to five additional **bonus points**.

6. The ***Innovative Practices*** section provides an opportunity for a school to highlight the unique practices and innovative programs that contribute to the school culture and development of the whole child. This indicator is worth up to ten points. This indicator does not have an evaluation rubric; it will be evaluated, and the points will be assigned, by the scoring team.

B. Hawaiian Immersion Schools and Mālama Honua

In the spring of 2015, third and fourth grade students were given the first administration of the Hawaiian Language State Assessment. In the spring of 2016, third and fourth grade students will take the second administration of the test, and fifth and sixth graders will take the assessment for the first time. This will provide results for two grade levels in the spring of 2017; the first assessment for each grade level will constitute a pilot and will be used only to validate the test, school wide data will not be released to evaluate the academic performance of the school. (See table below.)

Hawaiian Immersion Timeline

Fall of 2015	Fall of 2016	December 2016	June 2017	Fall 2017
Second year of APF results, where grades taught primarily in Hawaiian could be disregarded.	First year of HLSA results for grades 3 and 4.	Contract renewal process begins	Contract 2.0 expires	First year of HLSA results for grades 5 and 6; second year of results for grades 3 and 4.
<i>No school level results from Hawaiian Language Standardized Assessment (HLSA) for grades 3 and 4.</i>	<i>HLSA test results released to schools and Commission to determine baseline.</i>		New Contract terms begin	

When the contract renewal process begins in December of 2016, the Commission will only have one year of baseline academic performance data for two grade levels. With only one year of baseline data, it is impossible to make an accurate assessment of a school’s overall health in regards to academic performance. Therefore the proposal is that each Hawaiian immersion school automatically receives a four-year contract renewal term, unless the school fails to meet standard under the Organizational or Financial Performance Framework, in which case it will receive a three-year contract renewal term.

The default four-year term was chosen for several reasons. By spring of 2017, schools will still only have one year of Hawaiian Language State Assessment results for third and fourth graders. This will enable the school to set annual academic performance expectations for third and fourth graders for Contract 3.0, but requires the schools to set targets annually as the HSLA data becomes available for higher grade levels. In addition, within the new contract period, Hawaiian immersion schools would be eligible for Academic Monitoring, which could allow the Commission to closely monitor academic progress and allow the schools to closely track the success of school improvement efforts.

Similarly, the proposal is to grant Mālama Honua a four-year contract, again subject to its meeting standard on organizational and financial performance expectations. Mālama Honua will not have academic results in the fall of 2015, since currently it only expanded to the third grade this school year. Like the Hawaiian immersion schools, it will have its first set of academic data in the fall of 2016 when it receives the results from the assessment of its first third grade class and will have to make academic projections and targets annually for contract 3.0.

This plan provides a clear and fair method for determining the term of contract renewal for charter schools in the spring of 2017 and will be used only for determining the length of Contract 3.0, starting July 1, 2017. The criteria measures school performance relative to other schools statewide and allows schools to demonstrate upward trends, compare performance to schools serving a similar demographic, and be recognized for closing the achievement gap rate between high needs students and non-high needs

students. In addition, the criteria allow for schools to tell the story behind their numbers and to highlight their reflective and proactive school leadership as well as innovative practices.

C. The Preliminary Renewal Performance Report and Final Renewal Performance Report

HRS 302D-18(b)³ and Hawaii Administrative Rules §8-505-12⁴ require the Commission to issue a charter school performance report and charter contract renewal application guidance to any charter school whose charter contract is in its final contract year. The performance report shall summarize the charter school's performance record to date, based on the data required by this chapter and the charter contract, and shall provide notice of any weaknesses or concerns perceived by the authorizer concerning the charter school that may jeopardize its position in seeking renewal.

The Preliminary Renewal Performance Report will be issued in July of 2016, before the 2015-2016 APF data are available, but will contain the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 APF and financial data. The Final Renewal Performance Report (see Figure 1 on the following pages) for each school will be issued by November 14, 2016, after 2015-2016 data are added but before each school completes its Renewal Application. The Performance Report therefore will not contain information not already known by the school.

The information will include school's APF score for three years, percentile rank for each year, 3-year average percentile ranking, and performance rating on the Financial and Organizational Frameworks. A copy of the Final Renewal Performance Report will be incorporated into the Renewal Application. This is intended to provide a clear, easy-to-understand report that is convenient for reference when filling out the Renewal Application and is intended to make the process as seamless as possible.

Upon the Commission's adoption of this contract renewal, the issuance of the preliminary and final performance reports will include more detailed application guidance as required by statute. The procedural guidance for contract renewal will be issued with these preliminary and final renewal performance reports and will be submitted to the Commission for approval at a later date.

D. The Application for Charter Contract Renewal

The Application (**Exhibit 1**) requests essential information about the school and will contain a copy of the Final Renewal Performance Report. The application is intended to provide the Commission with pertinent information about the past and future operations of the school. The Application also details assurances that outline expectations for the upcoming contract term. The Application also includes detailed instructions about how to complete the Additional Indicators section and gives clear criteria for the evaluation of those indicators.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Moved that the Commission:

Approve the Proposed Contract Renewal Criteria as set forth in this submittal.

Exhibit 1: Application



**State Public Charter School
Commission
Charter Contract Renewal Application
and Guidance**

**Charter Application for
<Name of Charter School>**

Charter Contract Renewal Criteria, Process and Application

Pursuant to HRS §302D-18, the Hawaii State Public Charter School Commission (“Commission”) has adopted the process articulated in this application for the renewal of existing charter school contract. New contracts will have terms of one to five years and will be awarded based on performance, demonstrated capacities, and particular circumstances of each charter school. The Commission may grant a renewal of a charter contract with specific conditions for necessary improvements to a charter school. All charter schools that currently have contracts that expire on June 30, 2017, are eligible to apply for a new contract via this process. The applicant should promptly review and verify information pre-populated in this application by the Commission for accuracy and call any discrepancies to the Commission’s attention.

In July 2016, the Commission will issue a preliminary Charter School Performance Report (for the purpose of contract renewal). In the fall of 2016, the Commission will issue a final Charter School Performance Report to each charter school and provide a Charter Contract Renewal Application Guidance to all charter schools whose charter contract ends on June 30, 2017.

The Report summarizes the charter school's performance record to date, based on the data required by HRS§302D and the charter contract, and will provide notice of any weaknesses or concerns the Commission has concerning the charter school that may jeopardize its position in seeking renewal. A copy of the final performance report is incorporated into this pre-populated application for the applicant’s convenience and reference.

This renewal application fulfills the requirements of HRS§302D-18 and Hawaii Administrative Rules §8-505-12 to provide an opportunity for the public charter school to:

- (1) Submit any corrections or clarifications to the performance report;
- (2) Present additional evidence, beyond the data contained in the performance report, supporting its case for charter renewal;
- (3) Describe improvements undertaken or planned for the school; and
- (4) Detail the charter school's plans for the next charter term.

The Commission’s renewal decisions will be guided by the contract renewal criteria that the Commission approved on November 19, 2015, which are based on the July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017 contract and consistent with HRS§302D.



Hawaii State Public Charter School Commission 2017 Charter Contract Renewal Application for Charter Contract term July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017

School Basic information				
Name of School	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>			
School location & address(es) <i>(list all if there are multiple campuses)</i>	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>			
School website address	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>			
School telephone and fax number	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>			
Type of Charter	<input type="checkbox"/> Startup	<input type="checkbox"/> Conversion	Geographic Area(s) served	<Commission to pre-populate /school to verify>
Hawaiian Immersion	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No		
Original Chartered Grade Span	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>		Current Grade Span	<Commission to pre-populate /school to verify>
School Hours			Year Opened	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>
Applicant Information				
Governing Board Chair Name				
Governing Board Chair Address / Telephone#				
Governing Board Chair Email address				
Date renewal application approved by governing board			Date renewal application received by Commission	<i>(for Commission use)</i>

School's Mission, Vision, and Essential Terms	
Mission Statement	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>
Any revisions to the school's Mission	
Vision	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>
Any revisions to the school's Vision	
<p>Is the school meeting its Essential Terms as delineated in the current contract?</p> <p>Essential Terms are defined as the critical characteristics that define a charter school's program and addresses the program and the school's fidelity to their program.</p> <p><i>For each Essential Term, provide an explanation (no more than 2 paragraphs) as to whether or not your school has met its essential terms over the course of the current contract.</i></p>	
Essential Term 1	<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>

Should the school's charter be renewed, state any changes to this Essential Term the school seeks to make for the next contract term here:

Essential Term 2

<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>

Should the school's charter be renewed, state any changes to this Essential Term the school seeks to make for the next contract term here:

Essential Term 3

<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>

Should the school's charter be renewed, state any changes to this Essential Term the school seeks to make for the next contract term here:

Essential Term 4

<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>

--

Should the school's charter be renewed, state any changes to this Essential Term the school seeks to make for the next contract term here:

Essential Term 5

<Commission to pre-populate/school to verify>

--

Should the school's charter be renewed, state any changes to this Essential Term the school seeks to make for the next contract term here:

School Enrollment Trends							
	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		
	Projected Enrollment	Final Enrollment Count	Projected Enrollment	Final Enrollment Count	Projected Enrollment	Final Enrollment Count (total #=blended +virtual, if offered)	# of students waitlisted
Pre-K							
K							
Grade 1							
Grade 2							
Grade 3							
Grade 4							
Grade 5							
Grade 6							
Grade 7							
Grade 8							
Grade 9							
Grade 10							
Grade 11							
Grade 12							
Total							

Commission to pre-populate this information and school to verify

School to fill in this information

Charter School Programs

Grade	Number of hours per week traditional “brick & mortar” students required to meet at school	Number of students in blended¹ program, if applicable	Number of hours per week students in blended program receive in person instruction	Number of students in virtual² program, if applicable
Pre-K				
K				
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				

¹ A blended program is defined as the delivery of instruction at the school for a minimum of five hours a week in combination with online learning or instruction where the student has some control over time, place, path, or pace of learning.

² A virtual program is defined as a school that uses an online instructional model with students typically spending fewer than five hours per week in a school building.

For Hawaiian Immersion Schools Only:

For each grade level served, list the number of class periods taught primarily in Hawaiian and the number of class periods taught primarily in English.

Grade Level	# of Class Periods Taught Primarily in Hawaiian	# of Class Periods Taught Primarily in English
Pre-K		
K		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		

Charter School Performance

On or before July 1, 2016, all charter schools will receive a preliminary Renewal Charter School Performance report, and by November 14, 2016, will receive their final Renewal Charter School Performance Report. This report will determine the school's renewal contract length eligibility. The school's report is duplicated here for your reference.

Final Charter School Performance Report

Academic Performance

Academic Performance Indicators	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015	SY 2015-2016
1. <i>INFORMATIONAL</i> : Academic Performance Framework (APF) score	[score]	[score]	Data available in Fall 2016
2. School percentile ranking	[ranking]	[ranking]	Data available in Fall 2016
3. Three-year average school percentile ranking	[ranking]		

Organizational Performance

In order for a school to receive an overall rating of "Meets Standard," the school must satisfy the "Meets Standard" expectations described in the "Overall Rating Criteria" table below. The individual rating criteria for each of the Organizational Performance Indicators are also provided below.

Overall Rating Criteria

Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
Falls in the "Meets Standard" category for all 5 Organizational Performance Indicators	Falls in the "Does Not Meet Standard" category for 1 Organizational Performance Indicator or more

Individual Rating Criteria

Individual Rating Criteria	Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
On-time completion rate for Epicenter tasks	70% or higher	69-51%
Number of Notices of Deficiency issued	1 or fewer	2-3
Number of incidents of non-compliance with governing board meeting requirements	2 or fewer	3-5
Number of incidents of non-compliance with school policy requirements	1 or fewer	2
Satisfactory completion of Compliance Review tasks	1 or fewer items not completed satisfactorily	2 or more items not completed satisfactorily

School Results

Organizational Performance Indicators	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015	SY 2015-2016	Target/Standard
1. On-time completion rate for Epicenter tasks	-	-	[rate]	70% or higher
2. Number of Notices of Deficiency received	-	-	[#]	1 or fewer
3. Number of incidents of non-compliance with governing board meeting requirements	-	-	[#]	2 or fewer
4. Number of incidents of non-compliance with school policy requirements	-	-	[#]	1 or fewer
5. Satisfactory completion of Compliance Review tasks	-	-	Number of items not completed satisfactorily	1 or fewer items not completed satisfactorily
OVERALL RATING	-	-	[overall rating]	Meets standard

Note: Organizational Performance data were not collected for all indicators in SY 2013-2014 and SY 2014-2015, so these data are not included in this report.

Financial Performance

Note: The Financial Performance data for SY 2013-2014 and SY 2014-2015 are provided for informational purposes. The SY 2014-2015 data for Unrestricted Days Cash on Hand are also provided in order to determine whether there is a positive trend from SY 2014-2015 to SY 2015-2016.

Since the Overall Financial Performance Rating Criteria were developed after SY 2014-2015, they will not be retroactively applied to the SY 2013-2014 or SY 2014-2015 data; therefore, schools will not receive an overall rating for these years.

Overall Rating Criteria

Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
<p>Satisfies the “Meets Standard” category for Unrestricted Days Cash on Hand</p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p>Falls in the “Meets Standard” category for four or more <i>additional</i> Financial Performance Indicators</p>	<p>Satisfies in the “Meets Standard” category for four or fewer Financial Performance Indicators and/or Does Not Meet Standard for Unrestricted Days Cash on Hand</p>

Individual Rating Criteria

Financial Performance Indicators	SY 2013-2014	SY 2014-2015	SY 2015-2016	Target/Standard
1. Current Ratio	[ratio]	[ratio]	[ratio]	1.1 or higher
2. Unrestricted Days Cash on Hand	[#] days	[#] days	[#] days	60 days or more; 30 to 60 days AND positive trend from SY 2014-2015 to SY 2015-2016
3. Enrollment Variance	[%]	[%]	[%]	95% or higher
4. Total Margin	[%]	[%]	[%]	0% or higher
5. Debt to Assets Ratio	[%]	[%]	[%]	50% or less
6. Cash Flow	[\$]	[\$]	[\$]	\$0.00 or more
7. Unrestricted Fund Balance Percentage	[%]	[%]	[%]	25% or higher
8. Change in Total Fund Balance	[\$]	[\$]	[\$]	\$0.00 or more
OVERALL RATING	-	-	[overall rating]	

Once the Commission determines the school’s renewal performance bracket, the charter contract length is determined as follows:

Bracket	3-year average percentile ranking	Overall Rating in Organization and Financial Frameworks	Additional Indicator Point Value	Length of Contract 3.0
1	90 or higher	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Framework	Optional; informational only	5-year
1	90 or higher	Does not meet in either Organizational, Financial or both	Optional; informational only	4-year
2	50-89	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Frameworks	35 or more	5-year
			34 or fewer	4-year
2	50-89	Does not meet either Organizational, Financial, or both	Optional; informational only	4-year
3	21-49	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Frameworks	35 or more	4-year
3	21-49		34 or fewer	3-year
3	21-49	Does not meet either Organizational, Financial, or both	Optional; informational only	3-year
4	20 or below	Meets expectations in both Organizational and Financial Frameworks	40 or more	3-year with co-created interim academic targets
4	20 or below		39 or fewer	2-year with co-created interim academic targets
4	20 or below	Does not meet either Organizational, Financial, or both	Additional Indicators used to help inform interim academic targets	2-year with co-created interim academic targets

Additional Indicators²

Please refer to the evaluation rubric attached as Appendix D for criteria and point values prior to completing this section.

1. Academic Trend Indicators

Measure	Expectations	Actual
Strive HI API score	40 points growth from year 1 to year 3	Commission will pre-populate
Proficiency in ELA	Increase of 25 percentage points from year 1 to year 3 or attainment of 85% proficiency.	
Proficiency in Math	Increase of 25 percentage points from year 1 to year 3 or attainment of 85% proficiency.	
Chronic Absenteeism	Decrease of at least 10 percentage points from year 1 to year 3.	
Percentage of students scoring 15 or greater than the Explore test.	Increase of at least 30 percentage points from year 1 to year 3 or 85% of students demonstrating college readiness.	
Percentage of students scoring 19 or more on the ACT.	Increase of at least 30 percentage points from year 1 to year 3 or 85% of students demonstrating college readiness.	
Graduation rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For schools with a graduation rate of 70% or lower in 2013-2014, a rate of 87% or higher for all students and all specified subgroups. • For schools with graduation rate of 71% or higher, increase in at least 20 percentage points from year 1 to year 3 or 95% graduation rate; OR • Increase of at least 20 percentage points from year 1 to year 3 for students in specified subgroups. 	

Briefly describe your academic trends for the relevant indicators.

² HRS§302D-18(c) provides all applicants, regardless of their Bracket, the opportunity to present additional evidence towards their application for renewal. These additional indicators provide schools with the opportunity to present evidence beyond the data contained in the performance report, supporting its case for charter renewal; and describe improvements undertaken or planned for the school. At the end of this renewal application preceding the appendices, applicants may provide additional information that details the applicant charter school's plans for the next charter term, along with any other information not already addressed in other parts of this application.

2. Demographic Comparison

This section allows the Applicant to compare its academic results with those schools serving similar student populations. The Applicant may propose any demographic data and suitable comparison school(s), complex, or region. The proposed demographic comparison should be clearly and narrowly defined and should include data that show that the applicant is *servicing a similar population* more effectively, as evidenced by higher levels of in English Language Arts proficiency, Math proficiency, and College Readiness Measures.

Demographic Comparison (continued)

3. Gap Rate Analysis

The state gap rate between high needs and non-high needs student performance is <Commission to pre-populate>.

<Pre-populate school name>'s gap rate between high-needs and non-high needs student performance is <pre-populate>. As a result, the applicant's gap rate is <pre-populate larger/smaller> than the state average.

If the Pre-populate school name's gap rate is larger than the state average, the application can include a plan to close the achievement gap. The plan should include research proven strategies, a timeline for implementation for each strategy, and the personnel in charge of implementation and monitoring progress of the effectiveness of each strategy. If the applicant's gap rate is smaller than the state gap rate, no action is required and 10 points will be awarded.

If Strive HI does not calculate a gap rate for the school, the school's proficiency rates will be compared to statewide high-needs proficiency rate. If the school's proficiency rates are higher than the statewide high needs rate, 10 points will be awarded. The school is not eligible to write a gap analysis plan.

Gap Rate Plan (continued)

4. Renewal Narrative

The renewal narrative should highlight corrective actions school leadership already has taken to improve academic outcomes since school year 2013-2014. The narrative should demonstrate reflective school leadership that has been proactive in identifying shortfalls and taking decisive action to improve key academic outcomes, and a description of the resulting student outcomes that resulted. This section should not contain plans for the future.

The chart below contains two categories of corrective actions with examples and samples of evidence that could illustrate such actions. Examples may include excerpts from the applicant's *most recent* WASC accreditation report.

Type of Corrective Action	Examples of Corrective Actions and Related Evidence
Adjustments made to Program Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program and a description or sample of the curriculum. • Use of an assessment and accountability system to monitor student progress. • Implementation of curriculum that is developmentally sequenced based on grade level and aligned to the Common Core. • Description and schedule of systematic and regular use of data to identify and implement research-based instructional programs aligned to school improvement efforts. • Description of a well-defined professional learning program that is job-embedded, aligned to standards, and supports instructional needs. • Description of action taken to increase the effective use and amount of time for core subject learning and engagement. • Description that allocation of resources was re-aligned with overall academic needs. • Description of screening, supports, resources and interventions added to support diverse learners including students with disabilities and English Language Learners. • Evidence that the school staff has a common understanding of high-quality instruction. Instructional practices are aligned to this common understanding and are based on high expectations for all students.
Adjustments made to school structure that promote academic success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective monitoring, implementation and evaluation of progress and revision of school improvement plans. • Collection and use of data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning. • Sample student schedules before and after changes were made to maximize instructional time for core instruction. • Revisions to organizational structure made to support student achievement goals. • Description of the system in place for monitoring instructional practice for consistency and formal teacher evaluation. • Professional learning program that differentiates for the varying needs of individual personnel based in part on student achievement.

Describe what corrective actions school leadership has taken to improve academic outcomes since school year 2013-2014. The narrative should demonstrate reflective school leadership that has been proactive in identifying shortfalls and taking decisive action to improve key academic outcomes, and a description of the resulting student outcomes. This section should not contain plans for the future.

Renewal Narrative (continued)

Renewal Narrative (continued)

5. Academic Growth of Underserved Students

- A. Provide evidence that the majority of students who entered the school at major entry points were at least two years below grade level and demonstrate student growth at a rate that will allow them to achieve proficiency by graduation.
- B. If the school has a student mobility rate of 30% or higher, provide documentation of the high mobility rate (the number of students enrolled at any time during the school year and the number of full school year students) and describe interventions or measures that have been taken to aggressively address the impact of high student mobility on the educational environment.

Academic Growth of Underserved Students(continued)

Academic Growth of Underserved Students (continued)

6. Innovative Practices

This Additional Indicator gives the school the opportunity to describe a unique or innovative practice at the school that contributes to the school's success of fostering the development of the "whole child" and distinguishes the school's academic or cultural program. This Additional Indicator has a potential value of ten points.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (OPTIONAL)

Charter contract renewal applicants may present additional evidence, beyond the data contained in the Charter School Performance Report, to support their case for renewal³. Applicants may also describe improvements undertaken or planned for the school and detail the charter school's plans for the next charter contract term. (The Additional Indicators section already captures some of this evidence.) Applicants may choose to attach additional documentation to supplement this application.

³ As allowed for in HRS §302D-18(c) The renewal application guidance shall, at a minimum, provide an opportunity for the public charter school to: (1) Submit any corrections or clarifications to the performance report; (2) Present additional evidence, beyond the data contained in the performance report, supporting its case for charter renewal; (3) Describe improvements undertaken or planned for the school; and (4) Detail the charter school's plans for the next charter term.

Appendix A: General Statement of Assurances

This form must be signed by a duly authorized representative of the charter school. An application for renewal will be considered incomplete and will not be accepted if it does not include the Statement of Assurances.

As the authorized representative of the charter school, I hereby certify under the penalties of perjury that the information submitted in this application for renewal of a public school charter for _____ (name of school) located at _____ is true to the best of my knowledge and belief; and further, I certify that the school:

1. Will not charge tuition, fees, or other mandatory payments for attendance at the charter school, for participation in required or elective courses, or for mandated services or programs (Section 302D-28(h), HRS; Section 8.8 , Charter Contract)
2. Will enroll any eligible student who submits a timely and complete application, unless the school receives a greater number of applications than there are spaces for students. If the number of application exceeds the spaces available, the school will hold a lottery in accordance with charter laws and regulations (Section 302D-34(b), HRS; Section 5.2, Charter Contract).
3. Will be open to all students, on a space available basis, and shall not discriminate against any student or limit admission based on race, color, national origin, creed, sex, gender identity, ethnicity, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, age, ancestry, athletic performance, special need, proficiency in the English language or a foreign language, or academic or athletic ability (Section 302D-34(a), HRS; Section 5.1, Charter Contract).
4. Will be secular in its curriculum, programs, admissions, policies, governance, employment practices, and operation in accordance with the federal and state constitutions and any other relevant provisions of federal and state law.
5. Will comply with the federal Age Discrimination Act of 1975 and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.
6. Will adhere to all applicable provisions of federal and state law relating to students with disabilities including, but not limited to, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1974, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.
7. Shall provide services to students who are English Language Learners in compliance with all applicable federal and State laws, regulations, rules, court orders, policies, procedures, and guidance including, but not limited to, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974.
8. Will meet the performance standards and assessment requirements set by the State of Hawaii Board of Education for all students in public schools.

9. Shall complete an independent annual financial audit, conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Auditing Standards and Governmental Auditing Standards and performed by a certified public accountant, no later than November 15th of every year, as required by the charter school statute (Chapter 302D-32, HRS; Section 11.3.4, Charter Contract).
10. Shall provide actual and projected enrollment data to the State Public Charter School Commission as required for funding and reporting purposes (Section 11.2, Charter Contract).
11. Shall maintain accurate and comprehensive financial records, operate in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, and use public funds in a fiscally responsible manner (Section 9.1, Charter Contract).
12. Shall comply with applicable State licensing requirements and license all teachers with the Hawaii Teachers Standard Board and meet the federal designation of "Highly Qualified" (Section 10.3, Charter Contract).
13. Shall provide verifiable information that a criminal background check has been performed, prior to their employment, on all employees of the school who will be working in close proximity to children (Chapter 302D-33, HRS; Section 10.6, Charter Contract).
14. Will obtain and keep current all necessary permits, licenses, and certifications related to fire, health, and safety within the building(s) and on school property (Section 7.3, Charter Contract).
15. Shall maintain compliance with all provisions of HRS§302D-12, and submit to the State Public Charter School Commission the names, and contact information of all members of the school's governing board and disclose whether any governing board members are or have been in the past year, an employee, contractor or vendor of the school, a relative of an employee, contractor, or vendor of the school within the past year. (HRS§302D-12)
16. Shall ensure that governing board members and employees of the charter school who are also employed by the school's affiliated non-profit organization refrain from taking official action on behalf of the charter school affecting the non-profit and from assisting the non-profit organization in matters before the charter school, and from acting as a representative for the non-profit organization in its interactions with the charter school. (Hawaii State Ethics Commission, Advisory Opinion No. 2015-2)
17. Will ensure that every member of the school's governing board shall comply with the open meeting provisions of HRS§302D-12(h) and the Hawaii State Ethics Code as stated in HRS§302D-25 (3)(c).
18. Shall be subject to collective bargaining and comply with the master agreements as negotiated by the State; provided that the school may enter into supplemental collective bargaining agreements (Chapter 302D-25, HRS; Section 10.1, Charter Contract).
19. Will provide State Public Charter School Commission with information regarding any bank account(s) held solely in the name of the charter school.
20. Will notify the State Public Charter School Commission immediately in writing of any change in circumstances that may have a significant impact on the school's ability to fulfill its goals or missions as stated in its charter.

21. Will submit in writing to the State Public Charter School Commission a request to amend its charter if the school plans to make a change to its **Essential Terms**.

Signature:	
Title:	Chair, Governing Board
Date:	

Appendix B: Renewal Application Certification Statement

Name of School:	<Commission will pre-populate>
------------------------	--------------------------------

I hereby certify under the penalties of perjury that the information submitted in this application for renewal of a public school charter contract is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and that this application has been approved by the school’s Governing Board.

Signature: Chair of Governing Board

Date

Print/Type Name:	
Date of approval by governing board:	

Appendix C: Scoring Rubric for Additional Indicators

1. Academic Trend Indicators-Minimum Performance and Growth Expectations Rubric

Type of Indicator	Measure	Minimum Performance Growth Expectations
API	Strive HI Academic Performance Index (API) score	➤ Increase of at least 40 points or more from Year 1 to Year 3
Achievement	Proficiency on Hawaii State Bridge Assessment in Reading (Year 1) / Smarter Balanced Assessment in ELA/Literacy (Years 2 & 3)	➤ Increase of 25 percentage points or more from Year 1 to Year 3 or attainment of 85% proficiency in year 3
Achievement	Proficiency on Hawaii State Bridge Assessment in Math (Year 1) / Smarter Balanced Assessment in Math (Years 2 & 3)	➤ Increase of 25 percentage points or more from Year 1 to Year 3 or attainment of 85% proficiency in year 3
Readiness	Chronic Absenteeism	➤ Decrease of 10 percentage points or more from Year 1 to Year 3
Readiness	Score of 15 or greater on the 8 th grade Explore	➤ Increase of 30 percentage points or more from Year 1 to Year 3 or 85% of students demonstrating college readiness in year 3
Readiness	Score of 19 or greater on the 11 th grade ACT	➤ Increase of 30 percentage points or more from Year 1 to Year 3 or 85% of students demonstrating college readiness in year 3
Readiness	Graduation rate – for schools with a graduation rate of 70% or lower in 2013-2014	➤ Graduation rate for all students is the same or higher than the DOE’s annual measureable objective (AMO) of 87% -AND ➤ Graduation rates for students in each specified sub-group (ELL, FRL, SPED) is the same or higher than the DOE’s AMO of 87%
Readiness	Graduation rate – for schools with a graduation rate of more than 71% or higher in SY 2013-2014	➤ Increase of at least 20 percentage points from Year 1 to Year 3 for all students or a 95% graduation rate in year 3 -OR- ➤ Increase of at least 20 percentage points for students in each specified sub-group (ELL, FRL, SPED) or attainment of 95% graduation rate in each sub-group in year 3

Score	Designation	Points awarded
Applicant meets the minimum growth expectations for three or more academic indicators	Exceeds Expectations	10 points
Applicant meets the minimum growth expectations for two academic indicators	Meets Expectations	5 points
Applicant meets the minimum growth expectations for one or no academic indicators	Does Not Meet Expectations	0 points

2. Demographic Comparison

Score	Designation	Points awarded
<p>The Demographic Comparison will exceed expectations if it contains all of the following elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The demographic comparison is narrowly defined; 2. The data table shows clear comparisons between the applicant and the schools, complexes, or regions that form the comparison; 3. The data that indicate the applicant is offering a superior academic program as evidenced by each of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Higher levels of proficiency in both ELA and Math; and b. Higher levels of college readiness as measured by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Chronic absenteeism for elementary schools; ii. The percentage of students who score a 15 or higher on Explore for middle schools; or iii. The percentage of students who score 19 or higher on the ACT for high schools. 	Exceeds Expectations	10 points
<p>The Demographic Comparison will meet expectations if it contains the following elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The demographic comparison is narrowly defined; 2. The data indicates that the applicant is offering a better academic program as evidenced by either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Higher levels of proficiency in both ELA and Math; or b. Higher levels of college readiness as measured by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Chronic absenteeism for elementary schools; ii. The percentage of students who score a 15 or higher on Explore for middle schools; or iii. The percentage of students who score 19 or higher on the ACT for high schools. 	Meets Expectations	5 points
<p>The Demographic Comparison will not meet expectations if it lacks any of the following elements:</p>	Does Not Meet Expectations	0 points

Score	Designation	Points awarded
1. The demographic comparison is narrowly defined; 2. The data indicates that the applicant is offering a better academic program as evidenced by <i>either</i> : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Higher levels of proficiency in both ELA and Math; or b. Higher levels of college readiness as measured by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Chronic absenteeism for elementary schools; ii. The percentage of students who score a 15 or higher on Explore for middle schools; or iii. The percentage of students who score 19 or higher on the ACT for high schools. 		

3. Gap Rate Analysis

Score	Designation	Points awarded
Renewal Applicant's gap rate between high needs students and non-high needs students is smaller than the statewide gap rate in the Fall of 2016. For those schools that do not have a gap rate, the school's proficiency rate exceeds the statewide high needs proficiency rate.	Meets Expectations	10 points
Renewal Applicant's gap rate between high needs students and non-high needs students is larger than the statewide average gap rate in the Fall of 2016. If a school does not have a gap rate calculated by Strive HI, the school's overall proficiency rate will be compared to the statewide high need student proficiency rate. For those schools that do not have a gap rate, the school's proficiency rate is lower than the statewide high needs proficiency rate.	Does Not Meet Expectations	0 points

Gap Rate Analysis – Adjustment Plan

Score	Designation	Points awarded
If the applicant's gap rate is larger than the statewide gap rate in the Fall of 2016, and the applicant has proposed a comprehensive plan for closing the gap rate and effectively improving the performance of high needs Students, such plan should include the following essential criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research proven strategies; • Clear, actionable steps and deadlines for completion; and • Identified personnel or roles in charge of each step. 	Meets Expectations	5 points

Score	Designation	Points awarded
<p>If the applicant's gap rate is larger than the statewide gap rate in the Fall of 2016, the applicant has proposed a plan to close the gap rate between high-need student performance and non-high need student performance but the plan lacks essential criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research proven strategies; • Clear, actionable steps and deadlines for completion; and • Identified personnel or roles in charge of each step. 	Does Not Meet Expectations	0 points

4. Renewal Narrative

Type of Corrective Action	Examples of Corrective Action/Samples of Evidence
Adjustments made to Program Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Implementation of a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program and a description or sample of that curriculum. ➤ Use of an assessment and accountability system to monitor student progress. ➤ Implementation of curriculum that is developmentally sequenced based on grade level and aligned to Common Core. ➤ Description and schedule of systematic and regular use of data to identify and implement research-based instructional programs aligned to school improvement efforts ➤ Description of a well-defined professional learning program that is job-embedded, aligned to standards, and supports instructional needs. ➤ Description of action taken to increase the effective use and amount of time for core subject learning and engagement. ➤ Description that allocation resources were re-aligned with overall academic needs. ➤ Description of screening, supports, resources and interventions added to support diverse learners including students with disabilities and English Language Learners. ➤ Evidence that the staff has a common understanding of high-quality instruction. Instructional practices are aligned to this common understanding and are based on high expectations for all students.
Adjustments made to school structure to promote academic success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Effective monitoring, implementation and evaluation of progress and revision of school improvement plans. ➤ Collection and use of data to identify goals, assess

Type of Corrective Action	Examples of Corrective Action/Samples of Evidence
	<p>organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Sample student schedules before and after changes made to maximize instructional time for core instruction ➤ Revisions to organizational structure made to support student achievement goals. ➤ Description of the system in place for monitoring instructional practice for consistency and formal teacher evaluation. ➤ Professional learning program that differentiates for the varying needs of individual personnel based in part on student achievement.

Score	Designation	Points awarded
Renewal applicant clearly describes four or more major adjustments made since the 2013-2014 school year and explains how those changes led to increased academic gains.	Exceeds Expectations	10 points
Renewal applicant clearly describes at least three major changes made since the 2013-2014 school year and explains how those changes led to academic gains	Meets Expectations	5 points
Renewal applicant does not clearly describe major changes or does not clearly demonstrate how any changes lead to increased academic gains	Does Not Meet Expectations	0 points

BONUS POINTS

5. Academic Growth of Underserved Students ³

Score	Designation	Points awarded
Applicant provides sufficient data to demonstrate the majority of students who entered the school at major entry points were at least <u>four years below grade level</u> and have demonstrated student growth at a rate⁴ that will allow them to achieve proficiency by graduation.	Exceeds Expectations	10 points
Applicant provides sufficient data to demonstrate the majority of students who entered the school at major entry points were at least <u>two years below grade level</u> and have demonstrated student growth at a rate to allow them to achieve proficiency by graduation.	Meets Expectations	5 points

6. Impact of high student mobility.

Applicant demonstrates that student mobility impacts at least 30% of the student population and has an effective program of interventions that address the impact of high mobility on the learning environment. The applicant response should include:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of diagnostic assessments for incoming students; 		

³ Examples of baseline data may include Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, SBAC scores, NWEA, STAR, or Lexile Reading Scores.

⁴ For example, if 9th graders enter high school at a 7th grade math/ELA level, they must show a rate of growth of one and a half years of academic gains each year to be at grade level proficiency by graduation.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of wrap-around supports that are provided by the school; • A description of effective intervention strategies used by classroom teachers and school administrators to alleviate the disruption in learning; and • Effective tools of remediation used by the applicant. 	Exceeds Expectations	5 points
<p>Applicant demonstrates that student mobility impacts at least 30% of the student population and has an effective program of interventions that address the impact of high mobility on the learning environment. The applicant response will include <u>at least two of the following</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of diagnostic assessments for incoming students; • A description of wrap-around supports that are provided by the school; • A description of effective intervention strategies used by classroom teachers and school administrators to alleviate the disruption in learning; or • Effective tools of remediation used by the applicant. 	Meets Expectations	3 points