DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR

CATHERINE PAYNE
CHAIRPERSON

STATE OF HAWAII
STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION
(ʻAHA KULA HOʻĀMANA)
1111 Bishop Street, Suite 516, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel: (808) 586-3775 Fax: (808) 586-3776

RECOMMENDATION SUBMITTAL

DATE OF SUBMITTAL: July 22, 2016

DATE OF MEETING: July 28, 2016

TO: Mitch D'Olier, Chairperson Applications Committee

FROM: Yvonne Lau, Acting Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM: VII. Action on Charter School Application for the IMAG Academy

I. DESCRIPTION

Recommendation that the Committee recommend to the full Commission that it deny the charter school application of the IMAG Academy.

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

Proposed School Name: The IMAG Academy

Mission: "The IMAG Academy mission is to provide a small, family-like environment to prepare mindful citizens through engaging our students in community-centered concerns and projects. We focus on creating a continuum of experiences, in and outside of school, where the strengths and potential of the individual, family and community can flourish."

Vision: "The IMAG Academy vision is to become a community resource raising generations of innovative, mindful, accepting, and giving (IMAG) citizens grounded in their knowledge and capabilities to create and sustain ethnically diverse, successful, and peace-filled communities."

Geographical Area: The IMAG Academy is proposing to be located in Waipahu. Although the exact address is not known at this time, the applicant plans to locate the school on Waipahu Street, between the streets of Moku'ola/Managers Drive, and Waipahu Depot Street. This area provides a number of leasing opportunities with the applicant's initial space and facility requirements, as well as growth over time.

Program Synopsis: The IMAG Academy will be a traditional face-to-face, "brick and mortar" school focused on a student's mastery and achievements in acquiring real world and relevant knowledge, skills and capabilities. It is a school where everyone can do their best work as an individual or as part of a group. It will be an engaging, community-centered, project-based learning environment.

Our academic plan is focused on creating a foundation to enhance innovative thinking and creative solutions from all school members; students, teachers, staff and parents. It is based on positive human interaction and connected relationships. At the core is an IMAG culture of leadership, mentorship, collaboration and IMAG decision making.

The three main elements of our instructional framework; academic rigor, real-world relevance and a safe and nurturing environment, provide The IMAG Academy with an educational program that celebrates achieving high academic and social expectations. Non-negotiable, this 3-prong approach ensures a 360 degree support system where all members can excel. The ultimate success, as prescribed by our student outcomes, is when innovation, mindfulness, acceptance, and giving are inherent within our student's decision making process and solutions.

Collaboration between student and teacher results in an individualized goals and achievement plan that include identifying specific tasks or products as a form of assessment of what the student will accomplish in a specific timeframe. As important, teachers will use both informal and formal forms of assessment to better understand student learning and growth and to gather feedback to modify instructional techniques and strategies.

Project based learning provides a hands-on and real world component helping students with different learning styles to engage and see the relevance in what they are learning. More important, research has shown that increasing a child's social and emotional intelligence can provide the necessary layer of safety and nurturing for learning to take place. Two of these elements are part of our academic framework and have shown repeated success for our anticipated student population.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2017		Year 2 2018		Year 3 2019		Year 4 2020		Year 5 2021		Capacity 2023	
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	60		60		60		60		60		60	
1			60		60		60		60		60	
2					60		60		60		60	
3							60		60		60	
4									75		75	
5											75	
6											75	
7	75		75		75		75		75		75	
8	75		75		75		75		75		75	
9			75		75		75		75		75	
10					75		75		75		75	
11							75		75		75	
12									75		75	
Subtotals	210		345		480		615		765		915	
Totals	210		345		480		615		765		915	

IV. BACKGROUND

The Evaluation Team assigned to the IMAG Academy application was comprised of Cindy Henry, Leila Shar, Sylvia Silva, and Sherri Morgan. In conjunction with the application, the Evaluation Team interviewed applicant group members and reviewed the applicant's responses to the Request for Clarification. The applicant group members that attended the interview were Sheila Buyukacar, Michael Nakata, Randy Shiraishi, and Deborah Bond-Upson.

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

In addition, the Commission held a public hearing on the application on May 12, 2016. One concerned individual submitted written testimony in support of IMAG Academy, including a list of

373 names of supporters. Three applicant group members provided oral testimony in support of IMAG Academy.

Further, staff solicited comments from the Department of Education ("DOE")—particularly the Pearl City-Waipahu Complex Area Superintendent Robert Luke—on the application. However, the Commission did not receive any comments from Mr. Luke on this application.

Final Application Recommendation Report.

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for the IMAG Academy be denied. The Recommendation Report states that the academic plan, organizational plan, and evidence of capacity did not meet the standard for approval.

The report finds that the academic plan does not meet the standard due to a lack of clear student outcomes with explanations of the rigorous academic standards that will be used. Among the key concerns about the academic plan were:

- There is no clear description of course outcomes;
- The application does not explain in detail how the academic standards will be used and how it will contribute to student success;
- There is no clear explanation of how course materials will support the overall academic plan; and
- The academic plan indicates a reliance on the instructional method of project based learning by using traditional materials.

The report notes that the application does not meet the standard for the organizational plan because it does not provide a sound plan for leading the development of the school from its pre-opening phase to the opening of the proposed school. The evaluation team noted that the organizational plan lacks detail and requires more information to be provided in one or more areas. The report noted that the key concerns regarding the organizational plan were:

- The application does not identify a single location that is large enough to accommodate one campus. Instead, it provides three addresses as site locations, and does not provide details on how the school will operate on all three campuses in terms of how each campus will be staffed, and what support plans would be in place in case of an emergency.
- The start-up plan identifies only one person who will address the majority of the tasks that will have to be completed in year 0.
- The individuals on the governing board could not articulate their level of commitment to the proposed school until a charter is awarded.

The report notes that the application meets the standard for the financial plan because the standard criteria are materially met. However, the evaluation team noted a few concerns regarding the financial plan which could be remedied by:

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

- Explore the school lunch program to gain a better understanding to properly reflect the program revenues and expenses in its operating budget.

The report finds that the applicant does not meet the standard for evidence of capacity because the applicant does not inspire confidence in its capacity to carry out its proposed plan. Above all, the evaluation team finds that the applicant has not provided evidence that its key members possess the collective qualifications including a demonstrated understanding of challenges, issues and requirements associated with running a high quality charter school.

Applicant Response.

The Applicant Response attempts to clarify some key concerns brought forth in the Final Application Recommendation Report.

In regard to the academic plan concerns, the response:

- Explains that reputable content curriculum was selected, and its outcomes are easily attainable, and thus did not explain the outcomes in detail due to space limitations.

In regard to the organizational plan concerns, the response:

- Affirms the applicant's use of one person to address many of the start-up tasks, stating that she is the "school director and only original founding member" and because of this it "would naturally require her to be involved with more areas than most founding members."
- Notes that a veteran charter school developer has been recruited to mentor the school director as she oversees the start-up tasks.
- Acknowledges that confusion could have been caused because of reference to multiple campuses in the application. The applicant states that they will be "in one geographic location which span across one to two blocks on Waipahu Street."

In regard to the financial plan concerns, the response:

- Notes that it has been working with their business manager to review and solidify necessary internal controls, compliance practices, and operating procedures.

In regard to the capacity concerns, the response:

- Suggests that the applicant has the capacity to open a charter school and indicates an understanding of the challenges and a willingness to learn and move forward.

Evaluation Team Rebuttal.

The Evaluation Team did not submit a rebuttal to the Applicant's Response.

V. DECISION MAKING STATEMENT

Introduction.

Scope of Commissioner Review.

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

Staff Recommendation Focuses on Key Points.

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

The Academic Plan did not meet standard.

The Evaluation Team found that IMAG's Academic Plan was deficient in four specific areas:

- No clear description of course outcomes;
- The application does not explain in detail how the academic standards will be used and how it will contribute to student success;
- No clear explanation of how course materials will support the overall academic plan; and
- The academic plan indicates a reliance on the instructional method of project based learning by using traditional materials.

When considered altogether, it indicates that the Applicant's Plan is not yet complete, nor ready to be implemented. The Evaluation Team found that overall there appears to be a surface level knowledge but not a deep understanding of the academic program. The Academic Plan presented has requisite pieces of the academic program in place but did not include sufficient explanation and integration of these pieces into a comprehensive, coherent and internally aligned plan. Additionally, it must fit with the proposed school's mission and vision, organizational and financial plans.

The Applicant's response acknowledges the points made by the Evaluation Team and offers to make the necessary changes. This further evidences that the Applicant needs more time to fully understand the requirements necessary to meet standards and that the Academic Plan that was submitted does not meet the standards.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's Findings.

The Organization Plan did not meet standard.

The Evaluation Team found that IMAG's Organization Plan did not meet standard because it did not provide a sound plan for leading the development of the school from its pre-opening phase to the opening of the proposed school. Essentially, there was discussion on a number of components of the organizational plan, but like the Academic Plan, was not well integrated and cohesive. The Applicant has a general idea of where the school would be located but the plan put forth raised more questions than it answered and as such evidenced that the plan is not ready to be implemented.

Additionally, the Evaluation Team raised concerns that there was not enough support in the start-up year to implement school development and opening. In the applicant's plan there is heavy reliance on one person. The governing board's uncertainty at this time, as to their level of commitment in the development of this proposed charter school, intensified the Evaluation Team's concerns.

The opening of the charter school is one of the most difficult challenges for any new charter school. As evidenced by the experiences of our newest schools, a difficult start-up process will inevitably affect the charter school's first year of operations. For this reason, applicants were asked to write a start-up plan that clearly identifies the tasks, and also designates the people that will be responsible for delivering on those tasks. This is a vital piece of the application that must demonstrate an understanding of the process and details necessary to successfully open a charter school. The Applicant's Organizational Plan did not meet standard.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's Findings.

The Financial Plan met the standard.

IMAG's Financial Plan is coherent overall and aligned internally with the proposed school's mission and vision, Academic and Organization Plans. The Applicant's Financial plan described their financial oversight and management and an operating budget that materially met standards. The evaluation team noted five areas of concern regarding the financial plan which could be remedied during the start-up Year 0.

The Applicant acknowledged the concerns and has stated that they will be working with their business manager to address those concerns.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's Findings.

The Evidence of Capacity does not meet standard.

The Evaluation Team found that the Applicant did not meet the standard for evidence of capacity. Overall, the Applicant presented an Academic and Organizational Plan that was not ready to be implemented and requires further work.

Operating a charter school is extremely demanding and successful charter operators understand that it takes a committed group of individuals to create the institution that is the charter school. For a brand new charter school, the governing board along with the school's leaders, teachers and staff will all be called upon to execute the plan that they articulated in securing their charter. No one individual will make this happen and the group commitment must exist now, not after the charter is granted.

Based upon all of the documents and information presented, staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, Staff agrees with the Evaluation Team that applicant has not met standards in three of the four areas. IMAG's Application contains key pieces, but needs more work. Additionally IMAG needs the commitment of more individuals in the creation of the institution it seeks to create. IMAG will need to demonstrate a fully integrated Academic, Organizational and Financial plan that demonstrates their capacity to implement a high-quality charter school.

Staff recommends the denial of IMAG Academy's application.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Motion to the Commission:

"Moved to recommend to the Commission to deny the charter school application for the IMAG Academy."

Exhibit A

Recommendation Report for the IMAG Academy

State Public Charter School Commission
2015-2016 Recommendation Report

Charter Application for
The IMAG Academy

Evaluation Team
Team Lead: Cindy Henry
Evaluators: Sherri Morgan
Leila Shar
Sylvia Silva

Introduction

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

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

Evaluation Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

approve or deny each application rests with the Commissioners.

Report Contents

This Recommendation Report includes the following:

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

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

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

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

Rating Characteristics

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

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

Proposal Overview

Proposed School Name
The IMAG Academy

Mission and Vision
Mission: The IMAG Academy mission is to provide a small, family-like environment to prepare mindful citizens through engaging our students in community-centered concerns and projects. We focus on creating a continuum of experiences, in and outside of school, where the strengths and potential of the individual, family and community can flourish.

Vision: The IMAG Academy vision is to become a community resource raising generations of innovative, mindful, accepting, and giving (IMAG) citizens grounded in their knowledge and capabilities to create and sustain ethnically diverse, successful, and peace-filled communities.

Geographic Location
The proposed location will be in the city of Waipahu and part of the HI DOE Waipahu area complex. According to HI DOE reports, our population is 60,305 people with approximately 12,300 (20%) of them between the ages of 5-19. Public school enrollment for school year 2014-15 was 8,413. Our neighboring cities are Kapolei, Ewa, Ewa Beach, Pearl City, and Mililani.

Although the exact address is not known at this time, the applicant plans to locate the school on Waipahu Street, between the streets of Moku'ola/Managers Drive, and Waipahu Depot Street. This specific area is between two of the largest elementary schools in Waipahu. This area provides a number of leasing opportunities with the applicant's initial space and facility requirements, as well as growth over time. This location affords partnership opportunities with a variety of businesses and organizations; Filipino Community Center, Waipahu YMCA, and Ballet Hawaii.

Anticipated Student Population
The proposed student population will provide IMAG with both academic and social and emotional challenges. The socioeconomic demographics of Waipahu includes a high percentage of students who qualify for the free and reduced lunch program and a higher percentage than the state average are considered English Language Learners. In addition, the applicant expects 30 to 40% of kindergartners to be attending formal education for the first time and will require school readiness and transitioning strategies for both students and families. The applicant also believes at least 50-60% of students to initially score below the state's targets on Hawaii state summative tests.

The applicant believes the majority of proposed students will be Filipino (60+%) with several other culturally diverse ethnic groups represented, such as Native Hawaiian, Micronesian, and Samoan. In all groups, family and friends can play a critical role in their level of academic success. School pride and a sense of belonging are important; therefore a positive school culture that provides a safe and nurturing social and learning environment for all students is essential.

Contribution to Public Education System
Significant contributions to both the community and to the public education system will be made immediately and in lasting ways. The following summarizes these contributions.

Contributions to students and families. The IMAG Academy will provide our community an **educational choice** like no other in our area. It would offer students a small, family oriented school as the only tuition free option to the extremely large campuses throughout all school levels in the central leeward area. Our focus on social, emotional and relationship development provides our students a **mindful and purposefully designed safe and nurturing environment at a universal, schoolwide level.** Our **community-centered project based instructional strategy** will offer experiences for all types of learners and will help provide an environment where students will be able to transfer and adapt their knowledge and skills learned in the classroom to solving concerns of real businesses. It will provide the essential ingredient of relevance to student motivation, engagement, and learning. The central leeward area has over 44,000 of the 180,000+ students within the public school system spread across some of the largest campuses within all school levels. The IMAG Academy will **increase the area's public, tuition- free schooling capacity for 915** students.

Contributions to our community and educational system. As we work to strengthen family privilege for all of our students, our **parent communication and engagement programs** will provide great family time and connections. Our school schedule is built to ensure interaction and collaboration on a weekly and on-going basis with our **community partners**. This type of open partnerships will only strengthen our student's sense of value and belonging and will serve as a model for other schools and communities.

Our **readiness programs** for kindergarteners and 7th graders will introduce the classroom and school environments to learners and families that are making important transitions in their formal education. This program will be available to all students and families within the state. Our **intersession and summer programs** will be available to all students. The IMAG Academy Lab will provide families a safe and nurturing environment and a chance to experience community centered project based learning first hand. As important, these programs will also provide **educator training and professional development** in the School Family Framework and community centered project based learning. Educators will be able to learn, collaborate, and experience the exciting supported and supportive teaching community we practice during our regular school year.

Dissemination of knowledge to others. We are driven by our vision to be a community resource and we have purposefully built our school organization to collaborate and share. Our schedule invites partners from the community which would include other schools. The IMAG Academy Lab is specifically designed as a collaborative space for students, partners, parents and educators to come together and experience learning and innovative solution development with our community opportunities and concerns in mind.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2017		Year 2 2018		Year 3 2019		Year 4 2020		Year 5 2021		Capacity 2023	
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	60		60		60		60		60		60	
1			60		60		60		60		60	
2					60		60		60		60	
3							60		60		60	
4									75		75	
5											75	
6											75	
7	75		75		75		75		75		75	
8	75		75		75		75		75		75	
9			75		75		75		75		75	
10					75		75		75		75	
11							75		75		75	
12									75		75	
Subtotals	210		345		480		615		765		915	
Totals	210		345		480		615		765		915	

Executive Summary

Enter the proposed school name	Recommendation
The IMAG Academy	Deny

Summary Analysis

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for The IMAG Academy be denied. The applicant did not meet the standard in the academic plan, organizational plan, or in evidence of capacity.

The academic plan does not meet the standard due to a lack of clear student outcomes with explanations of the rigorous academic standards that will be used. Additionally, the academic plan includes a focus on project-based learning, but the curriculum listed is very traditional, leaving the Evaluation Team unconvinced that the academic plan can be implemented successfully.

The organizational plan does not meet the standard because it does not provide a sound plan for leading the development of the school from its pre-opening phase to the opening of the proposed school. There are substantial gaps in the proposed facilities plan. Particularly, the Evaluation Team does not have confidence that the applicant has a high level of understanding of the requirements to meet county codes for public school buildings.

The applicant did not provide compelling evidence that there is capacity to carry out the proposed plan effectively. The Evaluation Team found material weaknesses in the depth of knowledge of the academic plan, as well as the process for hiring the proposed school's principal. There is little evidence of capacity in how the applicant plans to conduct a credible assessment of commercial spaces. Furthermore, there is a lack of evidence that financial roles, responsibilities, and processes are in place that will ensure that the proposed school will employ proper internal controls.

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	Financial Plan
Does Not Meet the Standard	**Meets the Standard**
Organizational Plan	Evidence of Capacity
Does Not Meet the Standard	**Does Not Meet the Standard**

Academic Plan

Enter the proposed school name	Rating
The IMAG Academy	Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

The IMAG Academy will be focused on a student's mastery and achievements in acquiring real world and relevant knowledge, skills and capabilities. It is a school where everyone can do their best work as an individual or as part of a group. It will be an engaging, community-centered, project-based learning environment.

Project based learning provides a hands-on and real world component helping students with different learning styles to engage and see the relevance in what they are learning. More importantly, research has shown that increasing a child's social and emotional intelligence can provide the necessary layer of safety and nurturing for learning to take place.

Analysis

Although some sections meet the criteria, there is concern over the sections that do not meet the criteria. Overall, there appears to be a surface level knowledge but not a deep understanding of the academic program.

To begin, section II B 1 does not meet the standard. A clear description of course outcomes is required. A list of topics to be studied is provided; however, this list lacks the clear description of student outcomes. The next section requires an explanation of the rigorous academic standards that will be used. While The IMAG Academy provides a list of numbered standards from the Common Core Standards, there is no detail to demonstrate understanding of how the standards will contribute to student success, nor is there the required explanation of vertical alignment.

Material selections are appropriately aligned with core curriculum standards and published by reputable academic authors; however, there is not a clear explanation of how the materials support the overall academic plan. Specifically, the academic plan indicates a reliance on the instructional method of project based learning; the evaluation committee did not understand how the traditional materials would support project-based learning.

Section II C was answered through the request for clarification. The manner of presentation still lacks clarity for the reader to understand a complete system of intervention and differentiation. For example, the provided explanation quoted "Assessments within a specific content area would identify student's learning style, content and product interest, and process knowledge." There is no mention of what type of assessment would be used to provide all the details that were noted as necessary to help with ensuring performance and learning is improved. In the clarification of how instruction will be differentiated for English Language Learners, there is admirably the inclusion of a 0.5 English Language Learner (ELL) staff member to support differentiating lessons. This would have been the appropriate space to note specific materials and details that might support ELL students given that the school

anticipates 97 students will be part of a formal ELL program. This is an area that will need further development.

The IMAG Academy articulated a clear description of the school culture highlighting a model of community–centered project-based learning with a focus on social and emotional development. Staffing plans include three teachers at each grade level to set up an environment of collaboration. The community aspects for school family are clearly a strength of this program.

In conclusion, while the social-emotional learning and the cultural focus of the school are well explained and are sure to create an environment of collaboration and support, there are elements in assessment and instruction that need to be more clearly delineated. Research tells us that the collection and analysis of data improves learning and instruction. The addition of these concepts would enrich and clarify the overall academic plan.

Organizational Plan

Enter the proposed school name	Rating
The IMAG Academy	Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

The IMAG Academy proposes a governance structure that consists of the school's governing board, the School Director, an Advisory Board, and advisors to the governing board. The school will also form The IMAG Foundation, a nonprofit organization to support the school in funds development, fiscal sponsorship, and strategic-visioning.

The school's governing board is charged with five identified areas of responsibility to ensure academic, organizational, and financial success.

The School Director reports to the governing board and provides guidance, resources, and support, to all school members.

An Advisory Board will be made up of representatives from these stakeholder groups: students, parents, teachers, staff, and community. The purpose of the Advisory Board is to ensure the active and effective representation of the key stakeholders and will have a collaborative line of communication to the school's governing board and to the school director. The school's governing board will manage the Advisory Board.

The school will also continue to have a group of Advisors**.** These are professionals not able to commit to serving as a governing board member but who can provide expert and professional guidance and advice on specific and pertinent areas of concern as needed. Advisors complement the collective skill set of the board's membership and have a line of communication to the governing board.

Analysis

The Organizational Plan does not meet the standard**.** Although the Organizational Plan meets the criteria in some respects there are substantial gaps in its operational plans that would negatively affect the start-up phase. The Organizational Plan lacks detail and requires additional information in one or more areas and does not provide enough specific information to present a realistic picture of how the school expects to carry out the proposals.

The application explains that although the geographic area where the school will be will provide leasable space needed to meet the school's future growth plans, it does not offer a single space large enough to accommodate one campus. Three addresses were provided as site locations and one will be used only periodically. The application does not present sufficient detail to provide a clear, realistic, picture of how the school expects to operate on two campuses, possibly three. The application fails to mention its multi-campus plan in any section other than the facilities section. This evidences a failure to consider how multiple campuses will affect the delivery of academics, operational requirements, and financial impacts. For example the applicant fails to describe how it will staff each campus, how one School

Director will operate multiple sites, or in cases of emergencies what support plans will be in place for teachers on the site without the Director.

The Organizational Plan does not provide a sound plan for leading the development of the school from its pre-opening phase to the opening of the proposed school. The failure for the start-up plan to identify more than one individual with experience and applicable knowledge to address the Project Plan tasks exposes a key weakness that plagued the application beyond the Organizational Plan section. Although the application states that the rest of the board members have agreed to work on areas of the plan specific to their area of knowledge, and have agreed to head corresponding governing board committees, the proposed school's Principal, Sheila Buyukacar, is the point of contact for the majority of the sections of the plan and is named the assistant in the rest of the sections. Ms. Buyukacar, having had the lead during the application period as well as being the selected School Principal presents a serious concern that there is an unrealistic distribution of the year 0 tasks to enable the applicant to be successful. During the Capacity Interview, members of the applicant team stated they were unable to articulate the level of commitment they would provide for year 0 activities, until the charter was awarded. As such, the applicant failed to show that the collective group, and specifically the individuals of the applicant governing board, has collaborated together on these proposed school plans. This lack of commitment and preparation raises concerns that all members are not ready to carry out the proposals in the application and therefore the governing board did not demonstrate it possesses sufficient capacity. If governing board members have not discussed time expectations and the level of commitment it expects prior to the submittal of a charter application, it is not adequately prepared at this time to open and successfully run a charter school.

The Commission has approved three schools since its start in 2012, and every school has struggled to open and maintain a viable school from its start-up Year 0 through its first year of operation. These schools had a team of capable and committed individuals ***at the outset***, and not after it received a charter. The authorizer must consider the numbers of families and students that will be affected if a school fails. For these reasons the evaluation team finds that there are substantial concerns with the IMAG Academy's Organization Plan, with the governing board's ability to carry out a school implementation plan, and with the viability of the proposed plan.

Financial Plan

Enter the proposed school name	Rating
The IMAG Academy	Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

The financial leadership team for IMAG Academy will be comprised of the governing board, board treasurer, school director and business manager. The school director and business manager will be responsible for transaction-level oversight and ensuring that adequate procedures and controls are in place.

IMAG Academy has been awarded a charter school start-up federal grant of $172,000 per year for three years, contingent upon the school being awarded a charter.

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

	Total Operating Revenue	Total Operating Expenses	Total Operating Gain/(Loss)
Year 0	304,315	279,683	24,632
Year 1	1,390,714	1,367,142	23,572
Year 2	2,276,466	2,133,530	142,936
Year 3	3,160,276	2,986,869	173,407

Analysis
The Financial Plan meets the standard for approval because the standard criteria are materially met despite a few specific concerns that should be remedied by:

1. Development of internal control procedures;
2. Description of roles, responsibilities and processes with appropriate delineation to insure proper financial oversight and management;
3. Development of sound criteria and procedures for vendor and contractor selection;
4. Development of a year 1 cash flow contingency plan in the event revenue and/or cost projections are not met in advance of opening; and
5. Explore the school lunch program to gain a better understanding to properly reflect the program revenues and expenses in its operating budget.

The internal controls and compliance practices response does not provide a clear description or an adequate explanation of how the proposed school will establish and maintain strong internal controls and ensure compliance with all financial reporting requirements. The proposed school will follow generally accepted accounting principles and the National Charter School Resource Center's best practices. The criteria also required the description to explain the plans and procedures for conducting an annual audit in accordance with state law. An annual audit will be conducted and the coordination of this project is the responsibility of the Finance Committee and a contract for services will be entered

into annually.

The proposed school should develop the specific internal control procedures that will need to be done. In addition, the proposed school should develop the process and criteria for selecting its auditor.

The financial oversight and management response described the roles and the appropriate delineation among the proposed school leadership team, management team and governing board regarding school financial oversight and management. The business manager will post and maintain transaction ledgers and will also prepare the financial reports as necessary. While the governing board will review and make financially sound decisions based on financial statements and the board treasurer will review the financial reports prepared by the business manager, it is not evident that there is sufficient segregation of duties, that different individuals are responsible for different elements of related activities, especially recordkeeping. Also, it is not clear that independent checks on performance, carried out by individuals who did not do the work, are being done. By having the business manager post and maintain transaction ledgers and then prepare financial reports, if an error occurs in the posting of a transaction it is not clear if this error would be found in the described response.

The proposed school should be required to develop the description of roles, responsibilities and processes so that appropriate delineation regarding financial oversight and management will be clearly defined.

The Vendor and Contractor Selection response does not include a description of sound criteria and procedures for selection. As provided in the response, "the criteria for selection will be based on the services needed and the contractor's ability to provide the services with the appropriate credentials." The proposed school should be expected to develop sound criteria and procedures for the selection of vendors and contractors.

The Financial Plan Workbook does not meet standard because the plan raises concerns about the school's financial team's capacity and the school's viability over the period under review. The year 0 revenue of $304,315 includes $294,315 from federal grants. If grants are not received a significant shortfall may result. This shortfall, if not made up by funding from another source, will severely impact the school's ability to implement its academic plan, starting with the hiring of its teachers in January for school opening in July/August or other purchases planned in preparation of starting the school year.

The proposed school should develop a contingency plan to identify and address potential revenue exposures.

Although not required, the school plans to have a lunch program for the high free/reduced lunch population it intends to serve. However, the budget for this lunch program is only $28,063 for the year to serve a student enrollment of 210 students. The calculation assumed cost for only those students eligible for a reduced lunch which was 64% or 135 students. However, a lunch program should be provided for all students, so the cost of this program and the corresponding revenue should have been included in the budget. The proposed school should research the school lunch program and properly reflect the gross revenues and expenditures associated with the program.

Evidence of Capacity

Enter the proposed school name	Rating
The IMAG Academy	Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

IMAG Academy has identified the following individuals as key members of its applicant team:

Sheila Buyukacar, the school's proposed principal, has developed and launched the DreamSmart curriculum and program that incorporates project based learning and structures of the Conscious Discipline framework. Sheila also served as the Executive Director of The Baby Hui nonprofit organization, which focused on parent engagement initiatives.

Deborah Bond-Upson is the CEO of Learning Bond, LLC, an organization established to help build and implement education innovations. She has experience in curriculum development, assessment, and teacher professional development.

Melissa Hawkins is a classroom teacher whose experiences include creating and implementing math, language arts and science programs for elementary students, as well as using formative assessment. She has incorporated the Habits of Mind concepts in her classroom. She also has experience as a charter school governing board member.

Randall Shiraishi has experience as a Hawaii Job Corps youth counselor and supervisor and was responsible for implementing a student evaluation process and assessment program. In addition to his administrative duties, he developed and operated a student civics/leadership program involving student community service. Mr. Shiraishi also has experience as a charter school governing board member.

Analysis

The evidence of capacity does not meet the standard for approval because the applicant does not inspire confidence in its capacity to carry out the proposed plan effectively. The applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence that its key members possess the collective qualifications—including a demonstrated understanding of challenges, issues, and requirements associated with running a high quality charter school—to implement the proposed school's Academic, Organizational, and Financial Plans.

The Academic Plan does not meet standards. While the social-emotional learning and cultural focus of the school are well explained and are sure to create an environment of collaboration and support, there are elements in assessment and instruction that need to be more clearly delineated. Research tells us that the collection and analysis of data improves learning and instruction. Overall, the deficiencies seen in the Academic Plan demonstrate the applicant's lack of academic capacity.

The applicant also failed to demonstrate evidence of capacity to implement the Organizational Plan. Lack of capacity is demonstrated by the applicant's inability to develop an adequate start-up plan. The start-up plan fails to identify more than one individual with experience and applicable knowledge to address the Project Plan tasks. This evidences a key weakness that plagued the application beyond the Organizational Plan section.

Finally, although the applicant's financial plan substantially met the standard, the applicant failed to demonstrate evidence of the capacity to implement sound financial practices at this time. The applicant addressed all aspects of the criteria but failed to provide evidence of capacity by providing fully developed policies and procedures for vendor and contractor selection and appropriate delineation regarding financial oversight and management. This raises concerns about the applicant's financial capacity and the school's viability over the period under review.

Evaluator Biographies

Cindy Henry

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

Sherri Morgan

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

Leila Shar

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

Sylvia Silva

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

Appendix A

2015-2016 Evaluation Report for The IMAG Academy

Evaluation Criteria Overview

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

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

Opening a successful, high-performing charter school depends on having a complete, coherent plan. It is not an endeavor for which strength in one area can compensate for material weakness in another. Therefore, in order to receive a recommendation for approval, the application must demonstrate evidence of capacity to implement the proposed plan, meet the criteria for all main sections of the application (Academic Plan, Organizational Plan, Financial Plan, and Applicant Capacity), and present an overall proposal that is likely to result in the successful opening of a *high-quality charter school*, as defined in the Request for Proposals ("RFP").

Note on Evidence of Capacity

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

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

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

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

Evaluation Report

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

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

Section II.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		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion II.B.1		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant did not provide a clear description of course outcomes for each course at each grade level; only topics of study were listed. For example, for grade 2 mathematics, the course outcome listed is "Operations (add/subtract)." A course outcome for grade 2 mathematics could be "Students will know/understand/be able to add and subtract numbers through 1000 using what students have learned about place value."		
Criterion II.B.2		
Strengths: The applicant is using appropriate standards. The applicant will be using The Buck Institute for PBL which will provide for rigorous standards. **Weaknesses:** The applicant did not provide enough detail in how the chosen standards will demonstrate an understanding of how each set of standards will contribute to the success of student learning. For example, the applicant states that the chosen set of standards provides baselines acceptable across the USA, and that they provide a vertical connection, but there is no detail provided. Additionally, in Attachment D, geometry is missing from grade 2.		

Criterion II.B.3
Strengths: The applicant is proposing to use reputable publishers for curricular materials. **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.B.4
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** There is a lack of clarity in the descriptions of how the identified assessments will accurately measure progress toward identified goals and targets. For example, how will a "teacher assessment" be utilized to measure goal #7, and what is it measuring? How is goal #8 being measured? The Evaluation Team was unable to determine how these goals and targets are going to be measured.
Criterion II.B.5
Strengths: The applicant plans to develop individual achievement goals and learning plans. **Weaknesses:** There is no clear or comprehensive description of the use of student data. The applicant states "assessment is conducted at many different levels," but there is no detail on what assessments, what different levels, and what information will be gathered. Additionally, the applicant's hiring plan is unclear. When will teachers start? It appears as though they are expected to start in February or March, which implies that the applicant is not going to be able to employ teachers who are already under contract with another school.
Criterion II.B.6
Strengths: The foundation of "Creating the School Family" supports the applicant's mission and vision. **Weaknesses:** There is insufficient detail for instructional strategies and interventions. For example, the application states that evidence of Achieved Goals and Learning will be collected to document a student's accomplishments and successes. There is no detail on what instruments will be used. There is also no specificity on when and how interventions will take place.
Criterion II.B.7
Strengths: The applicant is planning to offer AP courses. **Weaknesses:** It is unclear whether the applicant's staffing plan will support academic requirements. For example, will the staffing plan include a qualified teacher for the AP courses being offered?
Criterion II.B.8 (sub-criteria a through j)

Strengths:

NOT APPLICABLE

Weaknesses:

NOT APPLICABLE

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

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The application description of plans to serve educationally disadvantaged students is very topical and lacks detail of the proposed intervention model. A critical piece of the applicant's plan is FORE, but there is no description in the application to explain what FORE is. The Evaluation Team determined this section of the application to be poorly written, with little detail, for a school that is anticipating serving a high population of academically disadvantaged students.

Criterion II.C.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The application states that differentiated instruction strategies will be used, but there is no specifics noted on what those strategies will be. The application states that for the ELL population assessment will occur "often" and that Springboard and Wonders will be used, but lacks detail and specificity.

Criterion II.C.3

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant will rely on FORE teams, but again, the application does not describe who makes up the team, what they will do; since this is a key to providing below grade level supports, the lack of detail indicates that there is no specific plan for academically low performing students.

Additionally, the application does not describe how curriculum will accommodate the needs of students performing below grade level.

Criterion II.C.4

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The application does not indicate how gifted and talented students will be identified.

The academic program described only provides options for Leadership and Responsibility; there is no description

of opportunities for acceleration or depth.

Section II.D: School Culture		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**

Criterion II.D.1

Strengths:

A description of the proposed school community includes a positive and collaborative environment that is tied to the applicant's mission.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.D.2

Strengths:

Social Emotional Learning goals are included and well thought out.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.D.3

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

Intentional exposure to post-secondary options is lacking. The application states that the exposure will occur through the instructional framework of the school, but there is no detailed description of what will take place to intentionally expose students to college or career opportunities.

The application also states that the community centered projects that will be used at all grade levels will expose students to careers and post-secondary education – the Evaluation Team is concerned that the applicant did not demonstrate that it has knowledge of how much money and how many people are involved in this type of learning.

Criterion II.D.4

Strengths:

The typical day of the student addresses the school culture plan.

Weaknesses:

There is no clear description of a student's perspective of a typical day. There is no description of academics and no indication of what time the day starts. If a student needs additional help and the only access is to the WATCH group, what happens to students who are unable to arrive before school?

Criterion II.D.5

Strengths:

The applicant has a foundational understanding of Chapter 19 and due process.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's discipline policy is tied to the philosophy that discipline is a "conscious guidance from another."

The description lacks the process for achieving this. The description does not include how teachers, parents/guardians, and students will be included in the discipline process.

Section II.E: Professional Culture and Staffing		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**

Criterion II.E.1.a

Strengths:

Having three teachers per grade level is clearly an opportunity for professional collaboration.

Weaknesses:

The application is missing a description of how to measure success. There are no details on mentorship, induction, or the hiring process.

Criterion II.E.1.b

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The heavy reliance on School Family leaves the Evaluation Team wondering what the applicant will do when those strategies are not effective. There is no research that backs treating everyone the same way. There are many resources dealing with students of poverty, yet the applicant does not reference anything other than School Family.

Criterion II.E.1.c

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The typical day of a teacher lacks detail. The Evaluation Team is concerned that the teacher arrives at school after students are already there; in fact, the teacher arrives in his/her classroom after students are already there. Beyond explaining that the teacher loves the culture of the school, (greeting students in the morning, getting a hug from a colleague) there is no description of what a typical day is like.

Criterion II.E.2.a

Strengths:

The applicant recognizes that each person will need ongoing coaching and support.

Weaknesses:

The Evaluation Team is concerned that all staff are not going to be innately familiar with School Family. No description of professional development is mentioned for Security, Business Manager, SASA, and other non-credentialed positions. How does their understanding of School Family affect the achievement of the proposed school's goals?

Criterion II.E.2.b

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.E.2.c

Strengths:

The description identifies conflicts with Master Collective Bargaining Agreements and an understanding of amendments that may be needed through supplemental agreements.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.E.2.d

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.E.3.a

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

Many key positions in the staffing chart are part – time (Director, Business Manager, Counselor, Operations Support staff). The Evaluation Team does not think this is a reasonable plan to successfully implement the proposed academic program.

Criterion II.E.3.b

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The application states that "in support of maintaining the school organization that creates a thriving learning environment and teaching community is our School Director." There is no detail on what the relationship between the school leader and the rest of the staff will be and how it will be fostered.

Criterion II.E.3.c

Strengths:

NOT APPLICABLE

Weaknesses:

NOT APPLICABLE

Criterion II.E.4.a

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The hiring timeline indicates that teachers will be hired in Year 0 in February. The Evaluation Team believes this is

unreasonable unless the applicant is going to be hiring teachers who are not currently under contract.

Criterion II.E.4.b

Strengths:

NOT APPLICABLE

Weaknesses:

NOT APPLICABLE

Criterion II.E.4.c

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The description lacks detail on what procedures will occur. "Applicable dismissal procedures will be followed" is not a clear description. "We shall conduct criminal history checks in accordance with Sec. 846-2.7, HRS" is not a clear description.

Criterion II.E.4.d

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.E.4.e

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

A plan for working with unsatisfactory teachers is not addressed in the application. The application did not address the issue of promoting or incentivizing teachers, either. The application does not have a detailed plan to account for staff turnover. Overall, no guidance or procedures were outlined that inspired the Evaluation Team to have confidence that the applicant is prepared to address performance.

Criterion II.E.4.f

Strengths:

The applicant identified areas that need to be addressed by supplemental collective bargaining agreements.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is relying on getting a supplemental agreement approved. If it is not approved, there is no contingency plan described to accommodate the 10 days of PD that is planned for prior to school starting.

Criterion II.E.4.g

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Section II.F: School Calendar and Schedule		
☒ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion II.F.1		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** Applicant states that the proposed schedule meets all bargaining unit agreements, but previously in the application it was noted that the applicant will need to negotiate a supplemental agreement.		
Criterion II.F.2		
Strengths: The applicant has identified multiple schedules including lower, middle, and high school. **Weaknesses:** It is unclear in the schedule when professional collaboration will occur. Teacher prep time is identified, but no prep is included in the Wednesday schedule.		

Section II.G: Supplemental Programs		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion II.G.1		
Strengths: The applicant considered their population and anticipated the need for intersession and summer school. **Weaknesses:** A description of the funding of intersession/summer program was not provided in enough detail.		
Criterion II.G.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant did not include a description of experiences or links to the academic plan.		

Section II.H: Third-Party Service Providers		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
☒ **Not Applicable**		

Section II.I: Conversion Charter School Additional Academic Information		
☐ **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.

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

Criterion III.A.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The Evaluation Team believes the board member turnover rate is going to be too high with staggered two year terms.

Criterion III.A.2

Strengths:

The Advisory Board will be comprised of stakeholder representatives; standing committees have been identified.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.3

Strengths:

The table representing the roles and responsibilities of governing board is clear and sufficiently articulated.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.4

Strengths:

Not applicable

Weaknesses:

Not applicable

Criterion III.A.5

Strengths:

Experience and expertise is evident.

Weaknesses:

The application is not clear on who the advisors are.

Criterion III.A.6
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The selection and recruitment process is not clearly delineated in the application.
Criterion III.A.7
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion III.A.8
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not present a clear description of sound plans. The description is of an ongoing important responsibility but no sound plan is written in the application.
Criterion III.A.9
Strengths: The description of stakeholder groups is clear. **Weaknesses:** The applicant fails to describe the relationship between the advisory body and the governing board. There is no indication on the frequency of meetings of advisory groups and how they will be reported to the governing board.

Section III.B: Performance Management		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☒ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion III.B.1 (including sub-criteria a through c)		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The application lacks a cohesive plan for collecting, measuring, and analyzing student data; validity and reliability have not been established in criterion response. Reporting of data to stakeholders outside of staff has not been addressed. The Evaluation Team does not feel that reliance on the resource teacher for all data analysis is reasonable beyond year 1. The application does not demonstrate a clear, effective plan to successfully implement the financial plan; the business manager position is a key position and is only part – time.		

Criterion III.B.2
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The application lacks evidence of concrete plans for corrective action beyond reflection in academic, financial, and organizational standards.
Criterion III.B.3
Strengths: Not applicable **Weaknesses:** Not applicable

Section III.C: Ongoing Operations		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion III.C.1		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** Although not required to provide transportation; is it feasible to ask at risk populations to utilize public transit to get to school?		
Criterion III.C.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The application indicates that all school members will be required to keep themselves safe, yet no detail on what type of training will occur and how this will be achieved.		
Criterion III.C.3		
Strengths: The applicant recognizes the importance to offer meal programs to their student population, and have researched options and developed contingencies. **Weaknesses:** The Evaluation Team does not feel that the options identified are feasible.		

Section III.D: Student Recruitment, Admission and Enrollment		
☒ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion III.D.1		

Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The application does not address the issue of equity in its outreach plan. The application does not demonstrate that collaboration and outreach has already been made to surrounding schools, although this is a large part of the recruitment efforts; it is unlikely that surrounding schools will be willing to distribute the applicant's flyer.
Criterion III.D.2
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion III.D.3
Strengths: The applicant anticipated and set up an appropriate lottery process. **Weaknesses:** None

Section III.E: Parent Involvement and Community Outreach		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion III.E.1		
Strengths: Evidence of adequate initial outreach to parents and community. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion III.E.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The application did not demonstrate welcoming and accessible activities for parents.		
Criterion III.E.3		
Strengths: Newsletter and weekly emails, and various ways to communicate to stakeholders is commendable. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion III.E.4		

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

Compredio is proposed to be used as a data system provider; however, there is no mention of this in the rest of the application. Additionally, the support letter implies that this may be a vendor rather than a partnership relationship. It is not clear how the partnership with Devleague will enrich or support the school.

Section III.F: Nonprofit Involvement		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**

Criterion III.F.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The application did not address whether the non-profit is exclusively for the benefit of the school.

Criterion III.F.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The application does not identify how many members will be on the non-profit board. Lacks detail on the composition of the non-profit and the relationship to the school.

Section III.G: Geographic Location and Facilities		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**

Criterion III.G.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

Proposed location is unable to accommodate one campus for all students; contrary to the idea of the School Family culture that is pervasive throughout the application.

Criterion III.G.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The application does not provide a clear picture of how the staffing plan supports a multi-campus plan.

Section III.H: Start-Up Period

☐ Meets the Standard	☒ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion III.H.1		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** Heavy reliance on grant money.		
Criterion III.H.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** Unrealistic distribution of year 0 tasks.		

Section III.I: Conversion Charter School Additional Organizational Information		
☐ Meets the Standard	☐ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
☒ 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		
Strengths: School to follow GAAP. **Weaknesses:** Need more specificity of internal control procedures.		
Criterion IV.A.2		
Strengths: Major roles and responsibilities of financial oversight and management provided. **Weaknesses:** Need more specificity in roles, responsibilities, and processes so that appropriate delineation regarding financial oversight and management is clearly defined.		
Criterion IV.A.3		
Strengths: Vendor and contractor selection will be made using criteria for selection and references will be requested and contacted. **Weaknesses:** Need more specificity of procedures for vendor/contractor selection.		

Section IV.B: Operating Budget		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion IV.B.1		
Strengths: Budget is reasonable**.** **Weaknesses:** Risk in dependence on federal grant to provide 97% of year 0 revenues which, if not received, may severely impact proposed school's ability to implement its hiring plan.		
Criterion IV.B.2		
Strengths: Contingency plans reasonable.		

Weaknesses: None.

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

Section V.A: Academic Plan Capacity		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion V.A.1		
Strengths: The qualifications and experiences in leadership and curriculum of key members of the academic team is excellent. **Weaknesses:** The Evaluation Team does not believe the applicant responses demonstrate an understanding of the challenges, issues, and requirements associated with running a high-quality charter school.		
Criterion V.A.2		
Strengths: There are demonstrated ties and knowledge of the community through long-term residency and community involvement. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion V.A.3		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion V.A.4		
Strengths: Ms. Buyukacar has demonstrated experience, skills, and abilities. **Weaknesses:** The application does not provide evidence of a thorough recruiting and selection process for selecting the school director, nor does it include criteria used to screen and select the candidate.		
Criterion V.A.5		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:**		

None

Section V.B: Organizational Plan Capacity		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion V.B.1		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The start-up plan fails to identify more than individual with experience and applicable knowledge to address the Project Plan tasks.		
Criterion V.B.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		

Section V.C: Financial Management Capacity		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion V.C.1		
Strengths: Adequate set of experiences. **Weaknesses:** It is unclear who is doing the day to day activities – CPA is on governing board, but it would be irregular if governing board is doing daily work.		
Criterion V.C.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** No essential partners identified or required per applicant. However, based on prior charters approved, it has been evident that it is difficult to plan, establish, and/or implement the plan without a committed team, including essential partners.		

Exhibit B

Applicant Response for the IMAG Academy

The IMAG Academy – 2015-2016 Response to Evaluation Report

Introduction

Thank you for this opportunity to respond to the Evaluation Report. We have provided our input to your comments shared with us within Appendix A. The evaluation team's remarks were insightful and we can only hope this document will serve as a form of interactive communication that may better serve in your understanding of our in-depth capacity to open and sustain a high performing public charter school. We hope we have provided you with insight that may not have been apparent within our application and look forward to more interaction during the upcoming meetings.

II. Academic Plan

B. Curriculum and Instructional Design

Criterion II.B.1-Course Outcomes

The applicant did not provide a clear description of course outcomes for each course at each grade level; only topics of student were listed.

The example given within Appendix A of the Evaluation Report was very helpful to understand what the evaluators were looking for within this criterion. We felt since we had selected reputable published content curriculum aligned with HCCS and other national applicable standards, specific outcomes are easily obtainable, and therefore we selected to shorten our answer due to space limitations. As important, though we did not meet the specificity desired by the evaluation team, we know this level of detail will be required during our curriculum reviews and project alignment work scheduled through Feb-Jun 2017 by our part-time resource teacher, teacher/assistant, and expert volunteer team as presented within Attachment BB. In addition, our subject, unit and lesson plans will also maintain our outcomes to this level of detail.

Criterion II.B.2-Academic Standards

The applicant did not provide enough detail in how the chosen standards will demonstrate an understanding of how each set of standards will contribute to the success of student learning.

We have been working under the development and implementation of the Common Core State Standards and other national level standards for some time and as a result we selected nationally recognized standards and aligned published content curriculum to ensure horizontal and vertical integration. In addition, we automatically assumed our decision to adopt this level of standards ensured our understanding on the importance and the level of performance, knowledge and skills we wanted our students to obtain, subsequently guiding students' academic and personal successes.

Criterion II.B.4-Academic Goals and Targets

There is a lack of clarity in the descriptions of how the identified assessments will accurately measure progress toward identified goals and targets.

Our academic goals and targets provide us with insight and positive and negative indicators at the individual, cohort and school levels. In this section we grouped the description of each measurement into either an academic, non-academic or mission specific goal. Along with the narrative in Criterion III.B.1 (p 59-61) and examples given by the evaluators, we can easily provide detailed descriptions in a more legible format.

Criterion II.B.5-Use of student data

There is no clear or comprehensive description of the use of student data. There is no detail on what assessments, what different levels and what information will be gathered.

With the evaluator's example, we reviewed this section and other applicable sections of our application; academic goals and targets (p 13-14), instructional strategies (p 19-20), and academic

performance data evaluation (p 59-61) and have started a detailed table of the specific tools at the different levels of assessment. As important, we've included not only what information will be gathered, but also what actions we would take once the data was analyzed. This desired level of detail will continue to be outlined and finalized during our implementation activities from Feb - Jun 2017. This work can be made available upon request.

The applicant's hiring plan is unclear. When will teachers start? It implies that the applicant is not going to be able to employ teachers who are already under contract with another school.

During the 1st hiring cycle (Jan-Apr), our plan includes hiring teachers on a part-time basis via a contract vehicle similar to a summer contract (Attachment BB p 7). This was also captured within our Financial Budget Worksheet in Budget Year 0.

Depending on the teachers selected (current or retired), how their work and hours were distributed would be dependent upon the individual and group's needs. After school, weekends, online collaboration and other arrangements were expected. Although we would also prefer those hired during the startup period (Jan-Apr) were the same as we would contract for our normal school year, we realized this may not be possible.

Criterion II.B.6-Instructional strategies

There are insufficient detail for instructional strategies and interventions. No detail on what instruments will be used. There is no specificity on when and how interventions will take place.

Education is an integrated system where student learning is driven by a mixture of student needs, academic goals and knowledge and performance standards, guided by assessments, shaped by individual and cohort student data, and delivered via teacher and school-wide instructional strategies and techniques. As a system of many elements, it is difficult to pull them apart as isolated subjects. With this in mind and as instructional strategies and some of our structures identified and embedded amongst a lot of different criterion, we are sure more specific tools and exactly when and how interventions will take place could have been included within the application. Again, our 1st faculty hires, academic focused-board members, and expert advisors would also continue to identify these Feb - Jun 2017.

For example, our school-wide assessments (p 13-14) were identified via Table 3.0 with frequency targets, timing, and format. Our school family instructional strategies (p 17) are well spelled out. The when and how would be dependent upon the situation, the teacher, and the structure. As such, under the community-center projects (p 18-19), a project based instructional strategy itself, we integrate all of the nine essential elements of meaningful and academically purposeful projects (as identified by Buck Institute of Education) within our calendar and daily schedule. Within this section we provide a glimpse into our first 5 days of a semester and our daily schedule of extended blocks of traditional subjects during the morning and community project collaboration during the afternoons. The use of guest speakers, field trips and hands-on activities were provided.

As important, more instructional strategies are identified within Criterion II.C (p 22-31) and III.B.1, Academic Performance Data Evaluation Plan (p 58-61). B

Criterion II.B.7-Graduation Requirements

It is unclear whether the applicant's staffing plan will support academic requirements. For example, will the staffing plan include a qualified teacher for the AP Courses being offered?

As we will follow the current and established Hawaii State criteria, we included a weighted GPA scale in order to accommodate growth into the possibility of offering access to Honors, Advanced Placement and Advance courses. An advanced level class could logically be desired by students in year 3 as we would advance our 9th grade class into our first 10th graders (75 students). At that point we would have 6 core teachers for 150 students. Our decision to actually provide an in-school

option would be dependent upon our student's needs, faculty/personnel requirements, assessments, training, on-going support, funding, facilities, etc.
We also realized if an in-house class is not possible, there are other ways to provide advance course enrollment via partnerships with other high schools, early college programs and online courses. Of course other considerations would have to be worked out; costs, class resources, location, transportation, quality, assessment, technology concerns, etc.

C. Special Population and At-Risk Students

Criterion II.C.1-Overall plan–Educationally disadvantaged students

The application description of plans to serve educationally disadvantaged students is very topical and lacks detail of the proposed intervention model. It is poorly written, with little detail.

In this section we presented a description of our four level comprehensive student services model that ensures a system is in place to provide the best continuum of services to all of our students and families. In addition, a detailed breakdown of the steps to be taken within this model is presented in our Request for Clarification.
Although detailed descriptions that included projected student numbers, personnel resources, instructional strategies and specific program characteristics of each student subgroup was presented throughout Section C, details were not shared within this specific criterion.

A critical piece of the applicant's plan is FORE, but there is no description in the application to explain what FORE is.

Although a formal description was presented under criterion II.C.2 (p 24 and 26) and in criterion II.C.3 (p 27), we only mentioned our FORE team as an example of a Level 2 option. In hindsight, we could have defined this team in Table 4.0 or specifically defined it in this section.
It is important to remember, in addition to classroom instruction and facilitation (Level 1) our FORE teams are part of Level 2 of our comprehensive student services model and provide a structure for our professionals to collaborate with a focused look at each student. (p 27). As a team or as individuals, all instructional and student services personnel (Attachment T) use the many academic and organizational resources and support functions to provide the appropriate level of assistance for all students, to include academically low performing students.

Criterion II.C.2-Student Population Characteristics

The application states that differentiated instruction strategies will be used, but there is no specifics noted on what those strategies will be. The application states that for the ELL population assessment will occur often and that Springboard and Wonders will be used, but lacks detail and specificity.

As an instructional strategy, differentiation can be accomplished by varying the complexity in content, process and product. The specific classroom techniques are usually determined within the classroom and dependent upon the situation and student. Although, it didn't seem necessary to share these specifics here, we were able to provide a step by step process within the Request for Clarification that did identify some examples.

Criterion II.C.3-Students performing below grade level supports

The applicant will rely on FORE teams, but the application does not describe who makes up the team, what they will do; since this is a key to providing below grade level supports, the lack of detail indicates that there is no specific plan for academically low performing students.

Although a formal description identified who would be on a FORE team from an organizational level was presented under criterion II.C.2 (p 24 and 26), we only mentioned it within this criterion (p 27) as a specially created team of school professionals. In hindsight, we could have added this team in Table 4.0 or specifically defined it in this section.

Criterion II.C.4-Accelerated learning opportunities

The application program described only provides options for Leadership and Responsibility; there is no description of opportunities for acceleration or depth.

As a system, our instructional framework of both mastery of the appropriate content area and performance standards and the critical transfer and adaptation of knowledge and skills through community-centered projects brings vast and sometimes unknown opportunities of acceleration and depth to all students. This is where our student - teacher meetings in determining each student's Individual Achievement and Learning Goals (I-AGLs) and identifying the appropriate Evidence of Achieved Goals and Learning (E-AGLs) is an important part of each student's learning and growth plan. Therefore, the specific mention of acceleration and depth within this criterion didn't seem specific to this named subgroup within the application.

D. School Culture

Criterion II.D.3-Exposure to Postsecondary Education & Careers

Intentional exposure to post-secondary options is lacking. There is no detailed description of what will take place to intentionally expose students to college or career opportunities. The Evaluation team is concerned that the applicant did not demonstrate that it has knowledge of how much money and how many people are involved in this type of learning.

Our school framework is intentionally designed upon community-centered projects and essential community partnerships. The built-in weekly lunch with mentors and parents and semester presentations/meetups with community members and families provides a much deeper understanding of what opportunities are available, to include post-secondary education and careers. We would be excited to understand the evaluator's concerns in this area so we may be able to incorporate their insight and wisdom.

Criterion II.D.4-Typical Day of a Student

There is no clear description of a student's perspective of a typical day. There is no description of academics and no indication of what time the day starts. If a student needs additional help and the only access is to the WATCH group, what happens to students who are unable to arrive before school?

As we attempted to present the day from a student's perspective of a typical student, we believe a typical school day is about connecting, having a sense of belonging, and a feeling of mastery and self-efficacy. The description does state 8:25am which is the start of the day, as referenced in our daily/weekly schedule (Attachment L). In addition, we feel the goals of our academic framework were described as pasted below.

"The work during class is difficult, it's following the Common Core and Nicole tackles it and proves to herself that she can do it. Everyone's excited and everything they learn is integrated into either a hands-on application or a school/community centered project. It allows Nicole to understand how value-added business, arts, science and engineering concepts uses her knowledge and skills to solve issues and concerns within our community. Everything is connected. Seeing subjects come to life are extremely helpful to all students." (Attachment L)

Upon review of the explanation in Appendix A, we can very easily and quickly create a description based on the evaluator's specific guidance.

Criterion II.D.5-Student Discipline

The applicant's discipline policy is tied to the philosophy that discipline is a "conscious guidance from another". The description lacks the process for achieving this. The description does not include how teachers, parents/guardians, and students will be included in the discipline process.

Although we have described our school's philosophy on cultivating positive student behavior and our use of HI BOE's Chapter 19, specific processes and procedures on how these will include stakeholders is missing. Our goal is to create a supported and supportive school organization, therefore we continue to identify the essential policies and the resulting processes and procedures used successfully in other public and public charter schools and non-profit organization offering educational opportunities. As part of our startup phase and identified within our application (p 56-

57, Table 14.0), we will use committee and tasks forces to organize and continue to develop the necessary documentation.
Randy Shiraishi will head the Organizational Processes Task Force that will focus on this essential area. In fact, we are in the process of reviewing and modifying at least 6 written policies and procedures that was built during his time restructuring Halau Lokahi. In addition to those already shared within our application, here's a list of the policies we are in the process of currently reviewing; Employee handbook, Family and Student Handbook, Financial Operations Manual, Personnel Policy, Recruitment Policy, Student Misconduct & Discipline Policy.

E. Professional Culture and Staffing

E.1 Professional Culture

Criterion II.E.1.a-Creation, implementation, maintenance

The application is missing a description of how to measure success. There are no details on mentorship, induction, or the hiring process.

Although there are other structures that will need tracking, within this description (p 32), we stated we will track our turnover rates as well as request individual and group feedback to assess our success.
In addition, mentioned within this criterion, as our school culture will be continued through our hiring process, induction, and mentorship programs, the details are shared in multiple areas within the application. In addition, we stated having three teachers in each grade provides unlimited opportunities for leadership and mentorship. Attachment BB (p 7-8) holds the result of our cultural decisions evident within the hiring criteria. Our induction program is summarized within criterion II.E.2.b (p 35).

Criterion II.E.1.b-Academic challenges due to poverty

The heavy reliance on School Family leaves the evaluation team wondering what the applicant will do when those strategies are not effective. There is no research that backs treating everyone the same way. There are many resources dealing with students of poverty, yet the applicant does not reference anything other than School Family.

As described within criterion II.B.6 (p 17-18) the School Family framework is a foundation to providing a safe and nurturing environment and enables our social-emotional and communication development to flourish. As Diagram 2.0 (p 30) models, Academic standards, as well as community centered project learning will flourish as research has shown that a holistic educational environment with social, emotional and communication development at its core is well suited for our student population (p 17). As with any house, the foundation is the most important aspect of holding up the many support systems and academic and instructional strategies of a school. With the School Family, this foundation is built on helpful and respectful language, routines, rituals, and structures, enhancing connection and relationship building.
The School Family isn't just a resource or a program that deals with students of poverty, it is a lifestyle that cuts across all members of our school in creating human connection and better relationships across all levels of a school. If given the chance we would be more than happy to provide exempler examples of school-wide implementation and their incredible success in environments in more dire situations.

Criterion II.E.1.c-Typical day - Teacher

The typical day of a teacher lacks detail. The evaluation team is concerned that the teacher arrives at school after students are already there; in fact the teacher arrives in his/her classroom after students are already there. There is no description of what a typical day is like.

The School Family and the constructs of Conscious Discipline can be difficult to understand by outside personnel. One important ritual is being greeted with a personalized greeting every morning.

Among many benefits, it is an important way to notice and give value to everyone as well as start the shift from home to school. This is foundational to relationship building.
There are many reasons for a teacher arriving later than students, but this statement was trying to illustrate the excitement and engagement level of the students and the use of a quick, informal informative assessment of possible student readiness on a unit lesson.
We believe this description is focused on what our research and experience, has indicated to us as how a teacher sees their typical day at the IMAG Academy-filled with self-efficacy and hard evidence that the school supports all aspects of an engaged learning environment, a collaborative teaching community and a supportive school organization.

E.2. Professional Development
Criterion II.E.2.a-Goals and data drive strategy
The evaluation team is concerned that all staff are not going to be innately familiar with School Family. No description of professional development is mentioned for Security, Business Manager, SASA and other non-credentialed positions. How does their understanding of School Family affect the achievement of the proposed school's goals?
As this section is within the Academic Plan, most of the focus is on our instructional and student support personnel. These same processes are part of our overall training plan for our school operations personnel as well.
All personnel at the school are part of the School Family. As stated within Attachment BB (p 8- 9) all staff/employees will receive initial familiarization training on school policies, processes, and procedures to include the IMAG Practices and School Family. All employees are part of the 10 day before school orientation.

E.3. Staff Structure
Criterion II.E.3.a-Staffing Chart
Many key positions in the staffing chart are part-time (Director, Business Manager, Counselor, Operations Support Staff). The evaluation team does not think this is a reasonable plan to successfully implement the proposed academic program.
Our response is based on the overall summary of our staffing plan in Attachment G (p 4).
School Director: She will be a full time employee. As individual school level charts indicates the Director to be part-time, evaluators may have not seen the summary chart (p 4) that represents the total personnel across the entire school.
Business Manager: After talking with an experienced business manager, we were assured that a part-time Business Manager for the first two years would be sufficient, due to our size of student body (210 and 345 students respectively). In addition, other full-time positions and our plan to set up the proper policies, processes, and procedures over the first couple of months of 2017 would also provide continued task coverage.
Counselor: Although, this decision could be modified based on the needs of our enrolled students, due to our student body size in our first year of 210 students and other positions such as our resource teacher, teacher assistants, student-parent coordinator being on staff, we decided to have a part-time position.
Operations Support-Facility: Our decision to have only a part-time position for the first year was driven by the size of our facility of approximately 5500 square feet. A half time person would give us 4 hours of work each day.

Criterion II.E.3.b-Staffing Rationale
The application states that "in support of maintaining the school organization that creates a thriving learning environment and teaching community is our School Director." There is no detail on what the relationship between the school leader and the rest of the staff will be and how it will be fostered.

As the school organization is the supporting entity, the roles and responsibilities of the School Director is integrated into all levels of the organization, therefore the details on what the relationship is between the rest of the staff is intertwined throughout the application as well. Here are just two examples. As part of the instructional leadership team her roles and responsibilities are in Table 4.0 (p 15). As part of the governance structure and outlined in Table 12.0 (p 52), the school director will keep the governing board informed and will build and maintain a positive culture.

E.4 Staffing Plans, Hiring, Management, & Evaluation

Criterion II.E.4.a-Recruitment and Hiring Strategies

The hiring timeline indicates that teachers will be hired in Year 0 in February. The evaluation team believes this is unreasonable unless the applicant is going to be hiring teachers who are not currently under contract.

During the 1st hiring cycle (Jan-Apr), it was always our intention to hire teachers on a part-time basis via a contract vehicle similar to a summer contract. Depending on the teachers selected (current or retired), how their work and hours were distributed would be dependent upon the individual and group's needs. After school, weekends, and other arrangements were expected. Part-time contract hires were also indicated in our Financial Worksheets - Budget Year 0 - Description in the Notes section of Line Items 231-234.

Criterion II.E.4.c-Hiring and Dismissal Procedures

The description lacks detail on what procedures will occur. "Applicable dismissal procedures will be followed" is not a clear description. "We shall conduct criminal history checks in accordance with Sec. 846-2.7, HRS" is not a clear description.

As we felt these procedures will be guided by union, BOE and state ethics practices, to describe them here would be premature. As we have continued to review, align and finalize governance best practices into applicable policy and documents, Randy Shiraishi, our Governing Board President and Governance Committee Chair, will continue to head these efforts.

Criterion II.E.4.e-Exceptional and unsatisfactory performance

A plan for working with unsatisfactory teachers is not addressed in the application. The application did not address the issue of promoting or incentivizing teachers, either. The application does not have a detailed plan to account for staff turnover. Overall, no guidance or procedures were outlined that inspired the evaluation team to have confidence that the applicant is prepared to address performance.

As stated within this criterion, the use of our evaluation system, as described in criterion II.E.4.d, will be used for goal setting, professional development decisions/planning, performance observation, constructive feedback and coaching. We look forward to adding the necessary details or format to better illustrate the specifics the evaluators are looking for.

Criterion II.E.4.f-Deviations from Teacher's Union Agreement

The applicant is relying on getting a supplemental agreement approved. If it is not approved, there is no contingency plan described to accommodate the 10 days of PD that is planned for prior to school starting.

In addition to continuing to research and listen to union representatives about other options that may be available, our contingency stated (p 46), that if an agreement is not approved for the 10 days of PD we would identify sessions suitable to do earlier and use contracts to pay our teachers to attend.

F. School Calendar and Schedule

Criterion II.F.1-School Calendar

Applicant states that the proposed schedule meets all bargaining unit agreements, but previously in the application it was noted that the applicant will need to negotiate a supplemental agreement.

As the criterion talks about the school calendar in regards to **instructional days and hours,** there are no proposed changes as presented within the application. The number of instructional minutes and a teacher's work hours per day are within the Master Bargaining Agreements.
There are two non-instructional days/hours we will request a supplemental agreement as presented within the application (p 46).

1. An increase in the number of days of "required" professional development days prior to school beginning (reflected in the calendar).
2. An additional ½ hour on Wednesdays to accommodate a longer school-wide collaboration and professional development day (not reflected in the schedule)

Criterion II.F.2-School Day and Week Schedule

It is unclear in the schedule when professional collaboration will occur. Teacher prep time is identified, but no prep is included in the Wednesday schedule.

Teacher prep and professional collaboration can happen at a number of times during the day, as identified within the application (p 47-48).

1. Time during non-teaching subjects (mornings)
2. Time during non-teaching specialty courses (afternoons)

In addition, teacher prep time is afforded everyday to include Wednesday (p 47). "Each day employs specialty teachers in a world language, the arts or business. This time will accommodate individual, co-teaching, or grade level collaboration."
Wednesday mornings also provide teachers a time to participate in grade level or school wide professional development and collaboration.

G. Supplemental Programs

Criterion II.G.1-Summer School Program

A description of the funding of intersession/summer program was not provided in enough detail.

Although our application stated the program would be fee based with possible scholarships available (p 49-Table 11.0), we did not provide a funding plan as suggested. Although, these funds were identified and awarded within our US DOE Charter School Program grant request, they were not included within this criterion. Our expense estimates can quickly be forwarded upon request.

Criterion II.G.2-Extracurricular/Co-curricular activities or programs

The applicant did not include a description of experiences or links to the academic plan.

Our description does identify our goal to providing families a trusted and safe place and academic help (p 49), which is a very important aspect of our overall academic and school framework. As stated within our academic plan; one of the three main elements of our instructional framework that inform our strategies include a safe and nurturing environment. It is the foundation to our learning environment, teaching community and school organization. As our school decisions (in and outside of the formal school hours) are mindful of our mission and vision and the needs of our students, family and community, therefore our extracurricular and co-curricular activities are important to creating this type of environment.

III. Organizational Plan

A. Governance

Criterion III.A.1-Governing Board Vision and Mission

The evaluation team believes board member turnover is going to be too high w/ staggered 2 year terms.

Although, our choice of two year staggered terms for our board members was based on research and reviews of other charter school's bylaws, we understand the evaluator's concern about a high turnover rate as suggested in Appendix A. This change can be easily and quickly accomplished.

Criterion III.A.5-Current and Proposed Governing Board

The application is not clear on who the advisors are.
As this criterion was focused on board members, we did not include our advisors here. However, we did identify them in Criterion III.A.9 (p 58). Resumes are presented in Attachment W.

Criterion III.A.6-Governance Procedures
The selection and recruitment process is not clearly delineated in the application.
Upon reading the criterion, we believed it was focused on the startup phase of board governance procedures; therefore we answered the criterion to ensure we provided the correct items. If overarching governance procedures are required within this criterion, we are in the process of reviewing and aligning over 6 governance policies and procedures and we can easily have finalized governance documents and procedures available for your review/approval.
Along with the details presented in this criterion, we also provided a current and startup recruitment, transition, and development timeline in our Attachment BB (p 10-16). Also identified within the attachment, this important effort will be led by our Founding Board President, Randy Shiraishi.
As important, we also understand the continued work required to build and keep a strong board, therefore a Board Development Committee is a standing committee established within our Bylaws (Attachment R). It will ensure this function is formally and purposefully an on-going and year-round function of the Board (p 55-56). Also presented within Attachment R is our draft Procedures for Selection of Members (p 8-9).

Criterion III.A.8-Board Capacity & Development
The applicant does not present a clear description of sound plans. The description is of an on-going important responsibility, but no sound plan is written in the application.
We believed this criterion was focused on our startup phase; therefore a detailed description with a timeline with outcomes and tasks/activities was shared in Attachment BB (p 10-16). It outlined board recruitment, training and timing, transition and board development.
In addition, our Bylaws (Attachment R) provide details about our Board Development Committee and Procedures for Selection of Members (p 8-9). If overarching board capacity & development procedures are required within this criterion, we could easily translate our specific timelines into a more overarching document for your review/approval.

Criterion III.A.9-Advisory Bodies & Councils
The applicant fails to describe the relationship between the advisory board and the governing board. There is no indication on the frequency of meetings of advisory groups and how they will be reported to the governing board.
Within this criterion we provide the purpose of each of our bodies; advisors and advisory board. Although, our thoughts were to have this group meet at least quarterly, the frequency of meetings are not specifically identified, in order for this group to set its own meeting schedule.
We do address the initial years of each group having a single, non-voting, advisory representative to the governing board. This would provide the vehicle for the groups to report to the governing board. In addition, as part of the Board Member Responsibility Table 12.0 (p 51-52), responsibilities and actions for both advisors and our advisory board are presented.
In addition, Attachment T-Organizational Charts provides a chart and brief description of the connection between the governing board and school director.

B. Performance Management

Criterion III.B.1-Evaluating and Monitoring Performance
The application lacks a cohesive plan for collecting, measuring, and analyzing student data; validity & reliability have not been established in criterion response

Assessment is conducted at many different levels and used across all school functions in making important decisions. At the school level, we have selected those academic measurements identified across the State of Hawaii as valid and reliable; Smarter Balanced Assessments (SBAC), HSA Science and ACT (p 15-16 and 59-60). Our academic goals and targets are presented within Table 3.0 (p 15-16) with a listing of their purpose, frequency, first year targets, timing and format. We have also identified the leadership team to help collect, measure, and analyze our student data. This is an important area of concern for our founding team and has sought expert advice from a current charter school student system developer in how we can better create and build a more detailed plan that would ensure and inform our decisions and actions. We look forward to working with him on our own data information system.

Reporting of data to stakeholders outside of staff has not been addressed.
We understand the use and sharing of data is critical to all stakeholders and their decision making. As one example within this section, we stated that one of the criteria in selecting a student information system was its ease of use and capability to share information between teacher, school, and parents. Also, identified in criterion III.B.1 is the use of the data to inform our governance level committees and the Board of Directors.

The evaluation team does not feel that reliance on the resource teacher for all data analysis is reasonable beyond year 1
Within our criterion write up and the Request for Clarification, measurement, collection, and analysis is supported by our instructional leadership team; school director, resource teacher, grade level educators and students (p 15). As stated, the resource teacher is an important position in helping and coaching others in these areas. Teachers will be responsible for not only collecting data, but will use it to inform their daily lesson and project planning.
We understand the importance of the resource teacher (RT) and how he/she will support 9 teachers our first year and grow to 15 teachers our second year. In order to make sure enough focus and time is given to this important function, we have already budgeted to have two RTs starting in year 3 and three RTs in year 5.

The application does not demonstrate a clear, effective plan to successfully implement the financial plan; the business manager position is a key position and is only part-time.
After talking with an experienced business manager, we were assured that a part-time Business Manager for the first two years would be sufficient, due to the size of our student body (210 and 345 students respectively). As important is the processes we will put in place with other full-time positions, providing necessary task coverage. We also have provided the funds and time by hiring a part time business manager to set up the proper policies, processes, and procedures over the first couple of months of 2017.

Criterion III.B.2-Corrective Plans

The application lacks evidence of concrete plans for corrective action beyond reflection in academic, financial, and organizational standards.
In addition to identifying actions and personnel to collect data and monitor the results of the many measurements that were shared in criterion III.B.1, we believe we have identified a number of important and concrete actions to be taken within each area of performance. In that light, we look forward to creating the necessary processes the evaluation team is seeking.
The following are just a sample of examples taken directly from our application (p 64-65).
Academic Achievement: At the student/teacher level, we identified concrete actions from one-on-one collaborations between teachers and students and the creation of individualized learning plans

and the identification of evidence to trigger achievement or learning modifications. In addition, as a preventive measure, we've developed the FORE team, where collaboration and solutions are focused on a single student's needs. Data from both formative and summative assessments are used. Even at the board level, we have created a standing committee; Academic Performance Committee to partner with the School Director to handle academic concerns in response to data gathered with our academic performance measures.

Financial Performance: Our financial metrics were identified in criterion III.B.1 (p 61-62) and covers all of the necessary and essential indicators to provide us with both short-term health issues and long term sustainability concerns. Even at the board level, we have created a standing committee; Finance Committee to work closely with the business manager and school director in striving to ensure the proper checks and balances are adhered to. Audits are budgeted and scheduled during the summer after Year 1.

Organizational Performance: Our organizational metrics were also identified in criterion III.B.1 (p 62-63). They were selected to evaluate our organizational policies, process, procedures and decisions across the school organization. These will help us to not only respond to problems, but will aid us in seeing trends and potential concerns, enabling both the school director and board president to investigate and uncover causes in areas we may not have suspected problems. Even at the board level, we have created a standing committee; Governance Committee to provide on-going monitoring and compliance across both the school and board.

C. On-Going Operations

Criterion III.C.1-Transportation

Although not required to provide transportation; is it feasible to ask at risk populations to utilize public transit to get to school?

As with all our decisions, our specific services will be dependent on the needs of our enrolled students. If daily transportation will be needed to and from the school, we will find a solution with our families and student's needs in mind.

As the school bus system is being used in this area, more information can easily and quickly be gathered to ensure we understand all of the requirements, costs and repercussions.

Criterion III.C.2-Safety & Security

The application indicates that all school members will be required to keep themselves safe, yet no detail on what type of training will occur and how this will be achieved.

Although we did not include specifics within this criterion, we did state safety and security policies and emergency procedures will be published within our employee and/or student handbooks and information will be shared across a variety of media. In addition, Attachment BB (p 7) provides information about our staffing hiring plan that include all school members and their initial training to include policies, processes and procedures of the school.

Criterion III.C.3-Food Service

The Evaluation team does not feel the options identified are feasible.

We were grateful to be able to discuss our options with a national lunch program staff member at the Hawaii Child Nutrition Program. Her expertise, insight and experience with the difficulties other charter schools have had in providing a Free and Reduced Lunch program, the options shared were the only ones that we both found would possibly work in our selected location. Discussions with each caterer (FILCOM and Keiki Lunchbox) suggested our plan to be supportable and feasible. We would be more than able to share the many if-then situations we will have to address during our startup phase regarding having a food service program.

As we believe this is an important service for our students and families, we have continued to discuss the possibilities with the FILCOM center caterers and have recently found out they have extensive experience and years in providing a food service program at one of the local colleges.

D. Student Recruitment, Admission, and Enrollment

Criterion III.D.1-Student Recruitment

The application does not address the issue of equity in its outreach plan.

As we have tried to identify outreach activities that would inform students, parents and families across the spectrum of our diverse population, we would be interested to hear the evaluator's suggestions.

The application does not demonstrate that collaboration and outreach has already been made to surrounding schools.

Over the years, we have attended both the Waipahu Neighborhood Council and the Waipahu Coalition Alliance meetings. We continue to make connections with Waipahu area complex school administrators. Although, difficult to provide any type of win-win proposal without our charter, we hope our approval will enhance these connections and therefore collaboration.

E. Parent Involvement and Community Outreach

Criterion III.E.2-Parent Engagement

The application did not demonstrate welcoming and accessible activities for parents.

Within this criterion, we shared eight family programs and four parent volunteer opportunities that were focused on fulfilling family needs as well as giving parents opportunities to engage within academic and community programs. We suspect more details would provide the evaluators the needed information to consider our programs welcoming and accessible.

Criterion III.E.4 - Community Resources and Partnerships

Comprendio is proposed to be used as a data system provider; however there is no mention of this in the rest of the application. Their support letter implies that this may be a vendor rather than a partnership relationship

Comprendio is a local tech company founded and run by two Waipahu High School Math teachers. Not only will they help the IMAG Academy to create subject and organizational maps to more easily understand and assess student and organizational performance. We believe our service provider relationship is built upon a partnership relationship.

It is not clear how the partnership with DevLeague will enrich or support the school.

Dev-League's partnership is centered on providing professional development and training in computer science and coding to our teachers. This partnership would increase our teachers' capability to engage students in learning technology.

F. Non-Profit Involvement

Criterion III.F.1 - Non-Profit Status

The application did not address whether the non-profit is exclusively for the benefit of the school.

At the time of our application, the decision to be exclusively formed for the benefit of the school or not was under discussion. But, within the application, we did state how the IMAG Foundation would support the school (funds development, fiscal sponsorship and strategic-visioning assistance).

Criterion III.F.2 - Non-Profit Board Members

The application does not identify how many members will be on the non-profit board. Lacks detail on the composition of the non-profit and the relationship to the school.

At the time of our application, we did not have a non-profit entity formed and therefore many details, to include the projected number of board members were not finalized. We understand how

important it is to keep competing interests at bay and have continued to consult with several non-profit advisors to seek their advice on the necessary elements at this stage and based on our current status within the application cycle.

G. Geographic Location and Facilities

Waipahu/Mokuola Street Building Lease Options

Criterion III.G.1 - Geographic Location

Proposed location is unable to accommodate one campus for all students; contrary to the idea of the School Family culture that is pervasive throughout the application.

We believe the confusion caused was due to our use of multiple "campuses". As labeled in the picture above, we will be in one geographic location which span across one to two blocks on Waipahu Street. Like all schools, more accurate words to describe our campus would have been a multi-building set up.

Criterion III.G.2 - Facilities

The application does not provide a clear picture of how the staffing plan supports a multi-campus plan.

We believe our staffing decisions of three teachers and one assistant per grade will allow for many options as we finalize our safety, security and emergency processes and procedures based on our final building leasing location and agreements.

As described in our response to criterion III.G.3, our location selection should have been described as a multi-building set up vs a multi-campus.

H. Start-up Period

Criterion III.H.1-Project Management Plan

Heavy reliance on grant money.

In addition to a multitude of grants and fundraiser options we listed within the application, we also provided, at the interview, a list of additional fundraisers totaling $80K. As important, we also developed a contingency budget, reducing our Year 0 Budget to $135K.

It is also important to say based on multiple conversations with other charter school leaders and foundation grantor advisors, that our reliance on grants in our funding sources was based on the high return on investment (ROI) on the time and resource it takes to garner the amount of funds to open up a public charter school.

Criterion III.H.2 - Project Plan & Project Manager

Unrealistic distribution of year 0 tasks.

The startup plan identifies Sheila Buyukacar as the near full-time or full-time project manager. Therefore in order to be transparent she is the connector between all of the moving parts which is a normal project management strategy. As important to remember, she is the identified School Director and also the only original founding member. Being in these three roles; an original and

current founding member and instructional leader, would naturally require her to be involved with more areas than most founding members. On an exciting note, we have recruited the help of Elizabeth Blake, an expert and veteran Charter school developer with first hand experiences in startup to operations. Ms. Blake has agreed to work side-by-side with Ms. Buyukacar, as a mentor, lending to Ms. Buyukacar's expertise in management, fundraising and instructional leadership. During our capacity interview, two of our members provided their commitment to be involved in all areas of the startup phase. In addition, our founding board has also agreed to head a variety of committees and task forces as presented in Table 14.0 (p 56-57).
As important, the following table summarizes the areas each founding member has committed to leading or assisting. These were identified within our Attachment BB.

Attachment BB - Startup Project Management Plan Summary of Commitment		
Project Management (p 1)	Sheila	Randy & Melissa
Facility Leasing (p 1)	Shirley	
Funding & Sources (p 1)	Thelma	Randy & Sheila
Fundraisers (p 4)	Melissa	Sheila
Marketing (p 5)	Sheila	Deborah, Melissa, Michael (inadvertently left out)
Community Partnerships (p 6)	Sheila	Randy & Shirley
Staff Recruitment (p 6)	Sheila	Melissa, Deborah & SASA
Board Recruitment (p 10)	Randy	Deborah & Sheila
Curriculum (p 14)	Deborah	Melissa & 1st Hires
Curriculum Alignment (p 14-15)	Deborah	Melissa
Course Sequencing (p 15-16)	Melissa	Sheila & 1st Hires

IV. Financial Plan

A. Financial Oversight and Management

Criterion IV.A.1-Internal Controls & Compliance Practices

Need more specificity of internal control procedures

We have been in close contact with a number of charter schools and other highly-respected non-profit organizations and are in the process of reviewing them. Along with Joe Evans, our business manager or accounting services firm, we will be reviewing and solidifying the necessary internal controls, compliance practices and operating processes and procedures.

Criterion IV.A.2-Financial Oversight & Management and Criterion IV.A.3-Vendor and Contractor Selection

Need more specificity in roles, responsibilities, and processes so that appropriate delineation regarding financial oversight and management is clearly defined

We understand and will be adding specificity to our roles and responsibilities in all areas of Financial Oversight and Management. Our review of current and approved policies, processes and procedures and the development of our own will be accomplished via our business manager or with the services of an accounting services firm. Our business manager is planned to be hired in Jan/Feb 2017 and will work closely with our SASA and School Director.
As important and stated within our Attachment BB, Randy Shiraishi will be leading our governance committee with the review and alignment of essential policies and procedures.

B. Operating Budget

Criterion IV.B.1-Financial Workbook

Risk in dependence on federal grant to provide 97% of year 0 revenues which, if not received, may severely impact proposed school's ability to implement its hiring plan.

We have been honored with receiving a 3-year US DOE Charter School Program grant of $749,000. It will provide us with the necessary funds during our Year 0 - Startup phase. In addition, available monies will be in excess of what we've identified within this application during our year 1 ($84K) and year 2 ($15K) estimates we identified in Attachment GG.
In addition, we have developed appropriate contingency budgets for Year 0, as well as lower than expected Year 1 enrollment expectations.

V. Evidence of Capacity

A. Academic Plan Capacity

Criterion V.A.1-Evidence of Member Capacity - Academic Team

Applicant responses does not demonstrate an understanding of the challenges, issues, and requirements

Our detailed responses to Appendix A will hopefully serve as an indication of our understanding of the challenges and our willingness to learn and move forward towards filling in our gaps of knowledge and capacity. Our detailed implementation plan ensures we review, make necessary modifications, and contract part-timers to help.

Criterion V.A.4-School Director

The application does not provide evidence of a thorough recruiting and selection process for selecting the school director.

A thorough selection process for our director was shared within the Request for Clarification which incorporated the process of screening and selection of a candidate as identified in Attachment BB (p 7) and our Staffing Plans (p 40-42).

B. Organizational Plan Capacity

Criterion V.B.1-Organizational Capacity

The startup plan fails to identify more than one individual with experience

As shared in a previous response, criterion III.H.2, there are a number of founding board members and part-time employees that will be providing the necessary resources during our startup phase.

C. Financial Management Plan Capacity

Criterion V.C.1-Financial Mgt Team

It is unclear who is doing the day to day activities

As shared within our application, we would be hiring a part-time business manager in Feb/Mar 2017 to develop the appropriate processes and procedures so some of these tasks can be accomplished by other support staff, ie our SASA. In addition, oversight at the transaction level would be by the business manager and school director. As important

Criterion V.C.2-Essential Partners

No essential partners identified or required.

Although we've identified a number of team members and Joe Evans, 34 year veteran Accounting and Business Manager, our definition of essential partner is that there was no one partner that was required for implementing our financial plan. As saw it as a strength and flexible to come up with a solid solution.
Also, during our capacity interview, we identified Pacific Accounting and Business Services, PABS as a service we had an intention to use. We gave them a copy of his letter of intent to provide us accounting services.