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: August 8, 2016

DATE OF MEETING: August 11, 2016

TO: Catherine Payne, Chairperson

FROM: Yvonne Lau, Acting Executive Director

AGENDA ITEM: VII. Action on Charter Application for Proposed Charter School, Accelerated Learning Laboratory - Hawaii

I. DESCRIPTION

Recommendation that the Commission approve the charter school application of Accelerated Learning Laboratory – Hawaii.

II. AUTHORITY

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

III. APPLICANT PROFILE

Proposed School Name: Accelerated Learning Laboratory – Hawaii

Mission: "Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii ("ALL") will provide its students with equal access to the most effective educational system this nation has to offer, regardless of their ethnicity, social status, economic privilege, or gender. ALL shall demonstrate that all students can exceed learning expectations when their innate skills are nurtured through pedagogy grounded by 'Cognitive Science Research' and 'Best Instructional Practices.' ALL shall nurture students' metacognitive and soft skills in a challenging, supportive, and civil environment. ALL's innovative practices and outcome data shall be made available to educational and research institutions."

Vision: "Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii (ALL) shall empower its students to control their own destiny and the destiny of their nation, by providing them with equal access to the highest quality education possible, regardless of their ethnicity, cultural identity, social status, economic privilege, or gender. ALL's model shall provide a challenging, rigorous and meaningful education to all its students at their functional level. ALL shall employ an individualized growth model supported by pedagogy grounded on 'Cognitive Science Research' and 'Best Instructional Practices.' ALL's model shall continuously improve, guided by data driven analysis of its practices and instructional tools, and continuing research in the science of learning and teaching. ALL's pedagogical strategies and design concepts shall be available to educational and research institutions for public benefit and improvement of educational practices."

Geographical Area: ALL will be located in the general area of Kapolei/Ewa Beach. The school's facility is not yet built, but ALL is currently negotiating to have a facility built in one of three planned developments under construction: Kapolei West, Ewa Beach, or Hoopili.

Program Synopsis: ALL's instructional methods are supported by empirical research on human learning and motivation, within the Cognitive and Behavioral Sciences, and on "Best Practices" pedagogical techniques that have consistently demonstrated effectiveness and efficiency when rigorously evaluated. Many of ALL's pedagogical protocols facilitate learning by helping students gain awareness of their own cognitive processes and by helping students refine their natural mental abilities through various means: consolidation of knowledge into organized hierarchical related chunks; analogical reasoning and logical extrapolation; learner activated, meta-cognitive strategies; active learning; and other self-regulated mental behaviors.

ALL's instructional methods foster and embed various skills that are necessary for academic success, such as responsibility for one's own success or failure; pride in product; the desire to make meaningful contributions; commitment to academic integrity; and passion to make decisions and learn through objective self-analysis. As a result of students being given increased opportunities to direct their own educational activities, motivation and performance are greatly amplified.

ALL's academic model is a "systems-engineered" multi-push design. All aspects of the "system" that impact student learning, are considered, developed, and designed to enhance learning outcomes. These aspects include institutional culture, classroom culture, classroom design, people flow, instructional materials and methods, furniture, organizational structure, record keeping and data collection and evaluation.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2017		Year 2 2018		Year 3 2019		Year 4 2020		Year 5 2021		Capacity 2022	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K	20		30		35		35		35		35	
1	20		25		35		35		35		35	
2	20		25		30		35		35		35	

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2017		Year 2 2018		Year 3 2019		Year 4 2020		Year 5 2021		Capacity 2022	
3	20		25		30		35		35		35	
4	20		25		30		35		35		35	
5	20		25		30		30		35		35	
6	20		25		30		30		35		35	
7	20		25		30		30		35		35	
8	20		25		30		30		35		35	
9												
10												
11												
12												
Subtotals												
Totals	180		230		280		295		315		315	

IV. BACKGROUND

The Evaluation Team assigned to the ALL application was comprised of Danny Vasconcellos, Jr., Beth Bulgeron, Ben Cronkright, and Jeff Poentis. 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 Jennifer Wittman, Marcus Calhoun-Lopez, Serei Kay, David Lee Jones.

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, and no written or public testimony was presented.

Further, staff solicited comments from the Department of Education ("DOE")—particularly the Campbell-Kapolei Complex Area Superintendent, Heidi Armstrong—on the application. However, no comments were submitted by Ms. Armstrong.

Recommendation Report.

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for ALL be approved. The Recommendation Report states that the academic plan, organizational plan, financial plan, and evidence of capacity

meet the standard of approval and notes that the application presented a "compelling proposal that is intended to provide a challenging, rigorous, and meaningful model of education." However, the Evaluation Team has noted that ALL's charter approval be contingent on addressing concerns regarding facilities acquisition, the year 0 budget, and its governing by-laws.

The report finds that the academic plan meets the standard and that it "provides a clear and convincing picture of a highly effective charter school" and "outlines goals and objectives that are aligned to state and national desired student outcomes and looks to foster growth in all students." Highlights on the academic plan include:

- Instructional methods promote instructional strategies that are research proven and aligned with the Common Core standards and outcomes;
- The scope and sequence of the curriculum design and implementation is driven by an emphasis that provides students with the opportunity to grow and develop cognitively; and
- Tools and resources that will align with the objectives outlined in the curriculum and instructional design.

The report also finds that the applicant's organizational plan meets standard because it provides specific information that shows clear and realistic plans of operations. However, the Evaluation Team has noted that this approval is conditional on the applicant meeting pre-opening assurances which would remedy the concerns that were identified. Among the noted areas of concern were:

- Ensuring that the bylaws conform with Chapter 302D, HRS; and
- The ability to secure a facility in the timeframe allowed for a pre-opening charter school

The report also finds that the financial plan meets the standard for approval. However, the Evaluation Team is recommending approval of a charter be contingent on the applicant submitting details related to its year 0 budget including a description of revenues and expenses.

The report notes that the evidence of capacity meets the standard since the applicant has demonstrated the necessary expertise and competency to execute its plans as noted in the application. The members of the applicant team are employed by ALL-Tucson, a high performing charter school in Arizona. Because of the success of ALL-Tucson, the Evaluation Team is confident that the applicant has the collective qualifications to implement the academic, organizational, and financial plans successfully.

Applicant Response

The Applicant Response to the Recommendation Report acknowledged the areas of concern brought forth by the Evaluation Team. The applicant noted that it is willing to include securing a facility as part of their pre-opening assurances, has revised its bylaws, and sought to assure the Evaluation Team that the year 0 budget is sufficient to absorb start-up costs.

Evaluation Team Rebuttal.

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

Applications Committee Meeting.

At the July 28, 2016 Applications Committee meeting, three applicant group members provided oral testimony in support of the application. No written testimony was submitted. The Committee

expressed concerns regarding the amount of support for the school within the Leeward Oahu community since the applicants acknowledged that they did not engage in community outreach efforts in preparing their application. Additionally, the Applications Committee had concerns over the teacher work day being out of compliance with the collective bargaining agreement. The Committee did not take action on the application, and instead chose to defer action on this application to the full Commission.

DECISION MAKING STATEMENT

Introduction.

Scope of Commissioner Review.

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

Staff Recommendation Focuses on Key Points.

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

The Academic Plan meets standard.

The Applicant presented an Academic Plan that provides rigorous and relevant educational opportunities to students within Leeward Oahu with equal access to high quality education regardless of their ethnicity, social status, economic privilege, or gender. ALL looks to demonstrate "that all students can exceed learning expectations when their innate skills are nurtured through pedagogy grounded by 'Cognitive Science Research' and 'Best Instructional Practice'." ALL's self-developed curriculum allows for students of all grade levels and abilities to go through curriculum that far exceeds the grade level minimum and allows for growth beyond that of ordinary college prep curriculum.

The Evaluation Team stated that throughout the application and in the capacity interviews, the ALL academic plan and Applicant team provided content that evidenced a solid understanding of a

comprehensive and cohesive plan for an instructional program that engages students, teachers, and parents. ALL's academic goals and targets reflects a tiered approach that applies to a cohesive plan for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. ALL's approach allows for students to progress and grow at a rate that is rigorous but achievable no matter where the student begins. ALL will also be utilizing their internal longitudinal data system, MARC—to be implemented upon opening-- to ensure highly effective data driven school-wide decision making. Lastly, ALL's Academic plan has been proven successful at Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Tucson (ALL-Tucson), the applicant's school in Arizona. ALL-Tucson has been recognized nationally, as a top performing school.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

The Organizational Plan meets standard.

The Organizational Plan meets the standard for approval because it provides specific information that shows clear, realistic plans of operations and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the manageable plans effectively. The governing board has a diverse skill-set and members were identified with overlapping experience in key areas: Human Resources, Academics, and Finances. The Organizational Plan provides a reasonable and sound management plan that detail the start-up period for the proposed school. The governing board bylaws presented in the proposed school's Organizational Plan provided a concise description of the governance philosophy that will guide the proposed school governing board, but will require revisions to comply with HRS 302D.

The Evaluation Team recommended that approval of ALL's application be contingent on meeting the requirements of the pre-opening assurances, including the revision of ALL's draft bylaws. Additionally, although ALL has identified a geographic location and provided a reasonable rationale for selecting that location, the Evaluation Team does have a concern with the applicant's timeline for securing a facility.

Although the Applications Committee did raise concerns with the teacher work hours, the Applicant did state in their application that they would comply with all collective bargaining agreements. The adjustment of the work hours would be required as part of their pre-opening assurances and a condition of being allowed to open as a new charter school.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

The Financial Plan meets standard.

The applicant's Financial Plan provides reasonable assurance that the proposed school will have sound systems, policies, and processes for financial planning, accounting, purchasing, and payroll. The strength of ALL's Financial Plan lies in the utilization of the services of staff currently employed by ALL-Tucson for business services which already use generally accepted accounting principles. The applicant states that this outside accounting will ensure that internal finances are consistently examined for accuracy and compliance. Standard business practices, such as utilizing a uniform chart of accounts and generally accepted accounting principles, are already standard operating procedures for ALL-Tucson that will be carried over to ALL-Hawaii operations.

The application provides a realistic and viable three-year operating budget. The applicant has developed a budget that clearly stays within the per-pupil funding that would be received if enrollment projections are met and is not dependent on outside funding sources.

Although the Evaluation Team expressed concern with ALL's Year Zero (0) budget, ALL's Applicant Team provided clarification in the capacity interview and in their response to the Request for Clarification that all costs in Year 0 would be absorbed by ALL-Tucson, without providing any of those costs. The Evaluation Team recommends that approval of ALL's application be contingent on the submission of a reasonable, sound Year Zero budget to include revenues and expenses.

ALL responded to the Evaluation report and noted its experience and record of successful operations and management of ALL-Tucson, along with their pledge to donate the cost of the curriculum and longitudinal data system to ALL-Hawaii as an assurance that they will meet the requirements during the start-up year.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

Applicant's evidence of capacity meets standard.

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

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

Conclusion.

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

Staff recommends the approval of the Accelerated Learning Laboratory – Hawaii application.

V. RECOMMENDATION

Motion to the Commission:

"Moved to approve the charter school application for Accelerated Learning Laboratory – Hawaii."

Exhibit A

Recommendation Report for Accelerated Learning Laboratory – Hawaii

State Public Charter School Commission
2015-2016 Recommendation Report

Charter Application for
Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii

Evaluation Team
Team Lead: Danny Vasconcellos, Jr.
Evaluators: Beth Bulgeron
Ben Cronkright
Jeff Poentis

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
Accelerated Learning Laboratory- Hawaii

Mission and Vision
Mission: Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii (ALL) will provide its students with equal access to the most effective educational system this nation has to offer, regardless of their ethnicity, social status, economic privilege, or gender. ALL shall demonstrate that all students can exceed learning expectations when their innate skills are nurtured through pedagogy grounded by "Cognitive Science Research" and "Best Instructional Practices." ALL shall nurture students' metacognitive and soft skills in a challenging, supportive, and civil environment. ALL's innovative practices and outcome data shall be made available to educational and research institutions.

Vision: Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii (ALL) shall empower its students to control their own destiny and the destiny of their nation, by providing them with equal access to the highest quality education possible, regardless of their ethnicity, cultural identity, social status, economic privilege, or gender. ALL's model shall provide a challenging, rigorous and meaningful education to all its students at their functional level. ALL shall employ an individualized growth model supported by pedagogy grounded on "Cognitive Science Research" and "Best Instructional Practices." ALL's model shall continuously improve, guided by data driven analysis of its practices and instructional tools, and continuing research in the science of learning and teaching. ALL's pedagogical strategies and design concepts shall be available to educational and research institutions for public benefit and improvement of educational practices.

Geographic Location
ALL-Hawaii will be located in the general area of Kapolei/Ewa Beach, the fastest growing region in the state of Hawaii and Oahu's second largest center. The school's facility is not yet built, but ALL is currently negotiating to have a facility built in one of three planned developments under construction: Kapolei West, Ewa Beach, or Hoopili.

Anticipated Student Population
The U.S. Census Bureau reported in 2010 that Kapolei's population was 15,186 with 1,211 under the age of 5. Total households with families in the area were reported to be 3,973, and the median age was 34. We believe there will be a great need to accommodate the communities' need for exceptional education opportunities (at an affordable cost) in close proximity without a long commute. Articles cited on DOE's website reported that enrollment grew by 2,000 students in 2013, and enrollment increased for most grades in 2014. The anticipated percentage of total population is as follows: 43% poverty level; 32% performing before grade level; 5% gifted; 14% IEP; 13% ELL; <2% Homeless; (HCY), 18% at risk of dropping out (some students will likely fall into multiple categories). ALL-Hawaii anticipates a diverse population. Based on other schools' enrollment in the area (see Attachments B and Attachment C), the highest percentage of students will be Asian, followed by Caucasian and a small percentage of African American's and Hispanics. The percentage of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch is anticipated to be over 40%.Given that the school will be located in a new development, ALL-Hawaii anticipates that its biggest challenge will be two-fold: marketing the school to families while the school

is still in its construction phase, and recruiting teachers, given that the school's reputation isn't yet established in Hawaii.

Contribution to Public Education System

A priority need stated in this year's RFP was providing schools in areas where more are needed. ALL will contribute to Hawaii's general educational system by providing additional school capacity to the Kapolei/Ewa Beach area, where existing schools are nearing or already at capacity. In addition to meeting this priority need, ALL will also contribute to the system in general by provide its data, findings, and approaches to educational researchers in the state of Hawaii. It will provide academically rigorous academics to an area of the state that, given the high commute times of the area, limit the students to traditional public schools rather than college prep or private schools. Finally, it will provide support for the state's trend towards self-contained neighborhoods—where people can live, work, and learn in the same area, eliminating the need for lengthy commutes.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2017		Year 2 2018		Year 3 2019		Year 4 2020		Year 5 2021		Capacity 2022	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K	20		30		35		35		35		35	
1	20		25		35		35		35		35	
2	20		25		30		35		35		35	
3	20		25		30		35		35		35	
4	20		25		30		35		35		35	
5	20		25		30		30		35		35	
6	20		25		30		30		35		35	
7	20		25		30		30		35		35	
8	20		25		30		30		35		35	
9												
10												
11												
12												
Subtotals												
Totals	180		230		280		295		315		315	

Executive Summary

Accelerated Learning Laboratory- Hawaii

Recommendation

Approve

Summary Analysis

The application for Accelerated Learning Laboratory- Hawaii presents a compelling proposal that is intended to provide a challenging, rigorous, and meaningful model of education. The application has a clear Academic plan that demonstrates rigor and has been proven successful at Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Tucson (ALL-Tucson), the applicant's school in Arizona. ALL-Tucson has been recognized nationally, as a top performing school.

The application presents Organizational and Financial plans that provide specific information that show clear, realistic plans of operations and inspire confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the manageable plans effectively. The Evaluation Team has concerns in three areas, facilities acquisition, the year 0 budget and governing by-laws in need of revision.

The Evaluation Team recommends approval of the Accelerated Learning Laboratory School contingent upon successful completion of pre-opening assurances being met, including the three areas of concern: facilities acquisition, year 0 budget, and the revision of governing by-laws. Additionally it is recommended that if any pre-opening assurances are not met on time that the school not be allowed to proceed with opening.

Summary of Section Ratings

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

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

Academic Plan	Financial Plan
Meets the Standard	**Meets the Standard**
Organizational Plan	Evidence of Capacity
Meets the Standard	**Meets the Standard**

Academic Plan

Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii

Rating

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii (ALL) proposes to provide rigorous and relevant educational opportunities to students within Leeward Oahu with equal access to high quality education regardless of their ethnicity, social status, economic privilege, or gender. ALL looks to demonstrate "that all students can exceed learning expectations when their innate skills are nurtured through pedagogy grounded by 'Cognitive Science Research' and 'Best Instructional Practice'." ALL's curriculum allows for students of all grade levels and abilities to go through curriculum that far exceeds the grade level minimum and allows for growth beyond that of ordinary college prep curriculum.

Analysis

Overall, the Academic Plan demonstrates a strong and shared understanding of the highlighted mission stated above. This is a noted strength given the alignment of ALL's mission and the Hawaii State Charter School Commission's mission to authorize "high quality charter schools" statewide. The proposal seeks to serve students ranging from kindergarten through eighth grade and has a strong instructional plan that suggests that this service will be meaningful and engaging for students and families. The Academic Plan meets the standard because it provides a clear and concise plan for student growth and achievement school wide. The Evaluation team has highlighted several areas below to illustrate where the Academic Plan is successful in meeting this standard.

The mission and vision of ALL is strong and aligned with high academic standards outcomes. Throughout the application as well as the interview process it was demonstrated that the ALL academic plan provides content that supports a solid understanding of a comprehensive and cohesive plan for an instructional program that engages students, teachers, and parents. For example, the instructional methods outlined throughout the academic plan within ALL's proposal list and promote instructional strategies that are research-proven and aligned with Common Core Standards and outcomes. Furthermore, the methods and strategies highlighted within the application are strongly correlated to *Visible Learning* (Hattie 2008) strategies that have and continue to yield desired student outcomes nationally as well as internationally. This is highlighted within the applicant's description of "expert trial protocols", "learning probes", and "Need-to-Know Discussions" just to name a few.

The Curriculum and Instructional Design section of the application requires the applicants provide a description of the materials that have been selected and an explanation that clearly demonstrates how the materials support the Academic Plan. The response that ALL outlined within their plan demonstrated that the applicants met this expectation through a detailed description of appropriate research based curriculum that is responsive to the needs of each individual student. Furthermore, the scope and sequence of the curriculum design and implementation is driven by the emphasis placed on providing students with the opportunity to grow and develop cognitively within a zone of proximal development (ZPD). This demonstrates the applicant's knowledge and attention to brain research as it applies to child development. Furthermore, the applicant provides a clear picture of the tools, and

resources that will be in complete alignment with objectives outlined within the curriculum and instructional design.

Applicants are also asked to provide a list of clear academic goals and targets and a description of how the proposed school will assess the progress of individual students. The response lists a tiered approach to that applies a cohesive plan for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. For example, ALL seeks to incorporate a learner centered instructional model. This model looks to establish a baseline for every student that is appropriate for his or her development. This allows students that are operating above grade level to still continue to progress and grow at a rate that is rigorous but reasonable. This also allows for students that are below grade level to progress and grow from a space that is engaging through interventions that respond to the learners needs.

This type of approach to learning is well established and detailed throughout ALL's application. A key feature in the establishment of this approach is the applicant's' description of an internal longitudinal data system, MARC, that the school will look to implement upon opening its doors to students. As described within the outlined sections of ALL's application the MARC system looks to provide students, teachers, and school leadership with a data system that is equipped to support the entire school with highly effective data driven decisions making school-wide.

Finally, and in summary, this Academic Plan provides a clear and convincing picture of a highly effective charter school. The plan outlines goals and objectives that are aligned to state and national desired student outcomes and look to foster growth and achievement in all students. Furthermore, there is substantial research that shows the effectiveness of the activities and strategies outlined within the applicant's' academic plan.

Organizational Plan

Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii

Rating

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii states that its governing board will have three main roles: to help the school decide its strategy for improvement, to serve as a critical friend, and to ensure accountability. Overall, the governing board is intended to assist the proposed school in their shared mission of providing the best possible education for its students.

Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii plans to operate in a location on the west side of Oahu, either in Kapolei or Ewa Beach. The proposed school intends to be located in a community that is invested in the school, as it will serve as the heart of the community's academic environment.

Analysis

The Organizational Plan meets the standard for approval because it provides specific information that shows clear, realistic plans of operations and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the manageable plans effectively. However, it is recommended that approval be contingent on meeting the requirements of the pre-opening assurances which should include remedying the specific items in the applicant's Organizational Plan that have raised concerns.

The governing board has a diverse skill-set and members were identified with overlapping experience in key areas: Human Resources, Academics, and Finances. Although not a requirement, it should be noted that the applicant presented a four-member team at the capacity interview which included the CEO of ALL Tucson and the proposed school director, who is currently a teacher and department head at ALL Tucson. Though the governing board is currently made up of only individuals associated with and employed by ALL Tucson, the diversity and range of knowledge of the governing board members and the success of ALL Tucson encouraged confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out its proposed plan and reassurance that it has the commitment and knowledge needed to oversee the school.

The Organizational Plan provides a reasonable and sound management plan that detail the start-up period for the proposed school. Although the start-up plan initially did not identify any specific individuals who will be responsible for completing these tasks, in the capacity interview, the applicant identified the proposed school director as the individual responsible for start-up plan activities. Since the members of the applicant team include the upper management of ALL-Tucson, including the CEO, and there is an assurance that direct assistance will be provided by ALL-Tucson to assist with start-up activities.

The governing board bylaws presented in the proposed school's Organizational Plan provide a concise description of the governance philosophy that will guide the proposed school governing board but require some revision. The applicant met the criteria by attempting to provide a comprehensive set of bylaws which explained many of the board's policies and procedures; however, aligning the board structure to the more familiar board structure utilized by ALL-Tucson will require the applicant to make

revisions to its bylaws. As a reminder, the governing board structure and practices must comply with Chapter 302D, Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS"), which is the governing charter school law in Hawaii.

While the applicant has identified a geographic location and provided a reasonable rationale for selecting that location, the Evaluation Team does have a concern with the applicant's timeline for securing a facility. The applicant has identified two, large areas-Kapolei West and Ewa Beach- as potential sites for the school; the applicant also identified the Ho´opili planned development community in Kapolei East as another potential site. Although the application stated negotiations with developers in the identified areas have been initiated, there is concern with the applicant's ability to secure a site in the timeframe allowed for a pre-opening charter school. The Evaluation Team recommends that the pre-opening assurances clearly establish a timeline and strict deadlines for deliverables pertaining to securing a site and facility in order to facilitate the opening of the school for the 2017-2018 school year.

Financial Plan

Accelerated Learning Laboratory- Hawaii

Rating

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

Accelerated Learning Laboratory – Hawaii's will employ a part-time finance manager who will be responsible for maintaining, managing, and interpreting financial data on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis.

To accommodate its targeted student enrollment of 180 students in year 1, Accelerated Learning Academy – Hawaii intends to work with a developer to design and build a facility specifically for the school's needs and growth. In year 1, the school has budgeted annual lease rent of $220,800.

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

	Total Operating Revenues	Total Operating Expenses	Total Operating Gain/(Loss)
Year 1	$1,244,280	$1,145,332	$98,468
Year 2	$1,579,280	$1,200,501	$378,779
Year 3	$1,914,280	$1,223,148	$691,132

Analysis

The Financial Plan meets the standard for approval because it provides specific information that shows clear, realistic plans of operations and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the manageable plans effectively. However, it is recommended that approval be contingent on an assessment of progress during year 0, to appropriately meet the requirements of the pre-opening assurances which should include addressing the sections of the applicant's Financial Plan that have raised concerns.

The applicant's Financial Plan provides reasonable assurance that the proposed school will have sound systems, policies, and processes for financial planning, accounting, purchasing, and payroll. The proposed school will utilize the services of staff currently employed by ALL-Tucson for business services which already use generally accepted accounting principles. The applicant states that this outside accounting will ensure that internal finances are consistently examined for accuracy and compliance. Standard business practices, such as utilizing a uniform chart of accounts and generally accepted accounting principles, are already standard operating procedures for ALL-Tucson that will be carried over to ALL-Hawaii operations.

The application provides a realistic and viable three-year operating budget. The applicant's budget forecasts operating gains that provide a comfortable cushion for the school in its first three years. From a modest operating gain of approximately $100,000 at the end of Year 1, the applicant projects net assets of almost $1.2 million by the end of year 3. The applicant has developed a budget that clearly

stays within the per-pupil funding that would be received if enrollment projections are met and is not dependent on outside funding sources.

The Evaluation Team does have a concern regarding the Year 0 budget. Due to an unexplained procedural glitch, a Year 0 budget was not provided. In the capacity interview and in the request for clarification, the applicant stated that ALL-Tucson will "absorb all the costs associated with the assembly of the intellectual, physical and human resources required for ALL-Hawaii to open its doors", without providing any of those costs. The Evaluation Team recommends that the approval of ALL-Hawaii's charter application be contingent on the submission of a reasonable, sound Year 0 budget, which should include a description of revenues and expenses.

Evidence of Capacity

Accelerated Learning Laboratory- Hawaii

Rating

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

The members of the applicant team are associated and employed by ALL-Tucson, a high-performing charter school in Arizona. Members include the CEO of ALL-Tucson and the developer of ALL-Tucson's automated data analysis and management system- MARC (Management and Analysis Report Compiler). The proposed school director is also employed by ALL-Tucson as a teacher and is currently the head of the English department.

Analysis

The evidence of capacity section meets the standard for approval because the applicant has demonstrated the necessary expertise and competency to execute its plans. The applicant team is currently running ALL-Tucson and they seek to share their successful model with Hawaii.

ALL-Tucson serves a population that is 40% economically disadvantaged. The school was recognized by the Washington Post in 2011 as one of the nation's top performing schools and was recognized by the Post in 2013 as #6 on their American's Most Challenging High Schools list and ranked #24 on the list in 2014. Graduates of ALL-Tucson go on to attend colleges and universities nationwide, including Brown, Georgetown, University of California, MIT, NYU and Stanford. By eighth grade, 93% of students were proficient in math, 82% proficient in reading and 93% were proficient in science based on Arizona's 2014 state assessment. These proficiency levels far outpace the achievement of Hawaii's highest performing middle school.

The Organizational Plan provides evidence of the applicant's capacity in understanding the compliance requirements that need to be addressed to successfully operate a high quality charter school. Members of the applicant team include some of the upper management of ALL-Tucson, who already oversee a high quality and successful charter school. Based on the success of ALL-Tucson, the Evaluation Team is confident that the applicant has the collective qualifications and capacity to implement the school's Organizational Plan successfully.

Evidence of the financial capacity of the applicant is demonstrated by the commitment of the applicant to utilize the business services and expertise of the financial staff working at ALL-Tucson. Specifically, the proposed school will utilize the services of the finance manager currently employed by ALL-Tucson; in addition, the finance manager is also a member of the applicant governing board. The finance manager's current duties include maintaining the business ledgers for ALL-Tucson and its associated pre-school program, maintaining the Accounts Payable and Account Receivable, and providing reconciliation of bank accounts, to name a few. The applicant is aware of and has developed procedures to meet the financial reporting requirements for Hawaii charter schools as required by statute.

Evaluator Biographies

Beth Bulgeron

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

Ben Cronkright

Mr. Cronkright is currently a consultant with McREL International and formerly the Commission's Federal Programs Manager. He has wide-ranging experience in education having been a teacher in Tennessee and Michigan, and later serving as an assistant principal, and a principal in public schools in Michigan. He has experience in school improvement planning and design and instructional leadership. He earned a MA in Educational Leadership and a BA in Secondary Education from Saginaw Valley State University.

Jeff Poentis

Mr. Poentis is the Commission's Financial Performance Specialist. He has extensive accounting experience and is a Certified Public Accountant with over 18 years of experience in both the private and public sectors. He holds a Bachelor of Business Administration from the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Danny Vasconcellos, Jr.

Mr. Vasconcellos is the Commission's Organizational Performance Manager. He previously worked at the State Office of the Auditor as an Analyst where he worked on or lead projects (such as the audit of Hawaii's charter schools and a study of the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board) where he analyzed agency effectiveness and efficiency and identified internal control weaknesses. He also served as a researcher for the Hawaii State Legislature's House Finance Committee and has extensive knowledge of Hawaii's legislative process and funding. He holds a Master of Public Administration from the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Appendix A

2015-2016 Evaluation Report for Accelerated Learning Laboratory-Hawaii

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: The applicant provides an extensive description of standards for Math, Science, and English/Language Arts that cover multiple grade levels and shows cohesion within the academic program. The Math and language Arts standards are aligned to meet or exceed the Common Core standards. The Science standards are aligned to meet or exceed the Next Generation Science Grade Level standards. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.B.2		
Strengths: The applicant provides an extensive description of how students can demonstrate understanding and mastery of the standards applied to different courses for each grade level. The descriptions include specific student achievements that demonstrate mastery and how this ties back to the standards. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.B.3		
Strengths: ALL uses proprietary materials that include summative evaluations and formative teaching tools. ALL's system of Expert Trials and Challenge Trials are intended to require students to achieve mastery and understanding and then		

apply concepts that require the students to recall the mastery and understanding.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.B.4

Strengths:

The applicant will utilize a proprietary automated data analysis and management system (MARC) that serves as a repository for raw data (this system is utilized at ALL-Tucson). The system makes student data readily available to be used to set academic goals and targets.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.B.5

Strengths:

The applicant will utilize the MARC system to establish a data-driven assessment system that would assist teachers in setting student growth goals. The system can also be used to track progress and growth and make adjustments to student goals based on success or difficulties.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.B.6

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.B.7

Not applicable

Criterion II.B.8 (sub-criteria a through j)

Not applicable

Section II.C: Special Populations and At-Risk Students		
☒ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**

Criterion II.C.1

Strengths:

The applicant's academic program provides an already developed plan to serve special needs students that incorporates the requirements of the IEP /504 processes and provides additional supports and structures intended to foster the success of special needs students. The plan includes provisions for ELL students and economically disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.C.2
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.C.3
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.C.4
Strengths: The academic plan allows for students to receive instruction based on their academic functional level, increasing the opportunity for individualized attention and individualized learning plans. **Weaknesses:** None

Section II.D: School Culture		
☒ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion II.D.1		
Strengths: The applicant provides a clear description of how the culture of respect promoted by the school ties into the curriculum and instructional practices. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.D.2		
Strengths: The applicant states that the curriculum itself is vital to creating a supportive school culture that removes fear of failure and judgement. The school culture also looks to establish the respect of peers and the learning environment. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.D.3		
Strengths: The applicant will promote learning through a variety of activities, such as participation in the Science Olympiad and through field work and culturally educational events.		

Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.D.4
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.D.5
Strengths: The applicant, in addition to adopting the state's requirements for student conduct and discipline, provides an extensive description of a student conduct and discipline policy that aligns with the school mission and culture. **Weaknesses:** None

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: ALL teachers are able to utilize the MARC system to get data on their performance (via student performance data) to highlight strengths and weaknesses. The ALL curriculum is also clearly laid out which allows teachers to focus on lesson implementation and student evaluation. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.E.1.b		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.E.1.c		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.E.2.a		
Strengths: None		

Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.2.b
Strengths: The applicant provides a three-year induction program that follows the framework of the Hawaii DOE which includes a mentorship program, a beginning teacher growth plan, and data collection. **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.2.c
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.2.d
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.3.a
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.3.b
Strengths: The applicant is proposing a staffing structure which sets an adult to student ratio of 1:20; the student to teacher ratio is roughly 30:1. **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.3.c
Not applicable
Criterion II.E.4.a
Strengths: The hiring process for teachers includes interviews with governing board members and the school director which will emphasize the school's culture, goals, and curriculum. **Weaknesses:**

None
Criterion II.E.4.b
Not applicable
Criterion II.E.4.c
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.4.d
Strengths: The applicant has developed an evaluation system for teachers and administrators (ALLMEE- ALL's Measure of Educator Effectiveness) that incorporates the MARC system for data-driven decisions and assessments. **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.4.e
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion II.E.4.f
Not applicable
Criterion II.E.4.g
Not applicable

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: The applicant intends the follow the Hawaii DOE calendar. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion II.F.2		
Strengths: The applicant provided a clear description of the schedule, including a daily and weekly breakdown. **Weaknesses:**		

None

Section II.G: Supplemental Programs		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion II.G.1		
Not applicable		
Criterion II.G.2		
Not applicable		

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:

While comprehensive, the applicant's bylaws need revision as the structure used in ALL-Tucson, which serves as the model for ALL-Hawaii, needs some revision in order to meet the requirements for Hawaii charter governing boards.

Criterion III.A.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The organizational chart needs to be revised to reflect that the governing board is the direct oversight of the school and does not report to the CEO.

Criterion III.A.3

Strengths:

The applicant governing board, which will transition into the school governing board, is made up of the upper management of ALL-Tucson, as such, the members have the experience and expertise to develop and open a successful charter school. The board also acknowledges that it is responsible to students and parents and the State.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.4

Not applicable

Criterion III.A.5

Not applicable

Criterion III.A.6

Strengths:

The members of the applicant governing board were recruited specifically for their abilities that demonstrate the

experience and expertise needed to open and operate a successful charter school. The members include the CEO of ALL-Tucson, the developer of the MARC system, and staff of ALL-Tucson.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.7

Strengths:

ALL-Tucson intends to recognize ALL-Hawaii as a sister school.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.8

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.9

Not applicable

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:

The applicant intends to use the MARC system to collect and evaluate student data. The applicant intends to follow standard business practices, such as keeping a uniform chart of accounts.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.B.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.B.3

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Section III.C: Ongoing Operations		
☒ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion III.C.1		
Not applicable		
Criterion III.C.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion III.C.3		
Not applicable		

Section III.D: Student Recruitment, Admission and Enrollment		
☒ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion III.D.1		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion III.D.2		
Not applicable		
Criterion III.D.3		
Strengths: None **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: The applicant intends to allow parents to take a hands-on approach to their child's education by observing classes, dropping by classrooms after school, and join parent's groups. **Weaknesses:**		

None
Criterion III.E.2
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion III.E.3
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None
Criterion III.E.4
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant has only contacted a local businessman for community engagement.

Section III.F: Nonprofit Involvement		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☐ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion III.F.1		
Not applicable		
Criterion III.F.2		
Not applicable		

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: The applicant recognizes that the area they intend to serve is an area that needs more educational options. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion III.G.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:**		

The applicant's plan is on a very aggressive timeline and raises concerns with the deliverables in obtaining and constructing a facility.

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:** The applicant's start-up plan does not provide a timeline or deliverables for obtaining a facility.		
Criterion III.H.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		

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: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion IV.A.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion IV.A.3		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		

Section IV.B: Operating Budget		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion IV.B.1		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** Applicant did not provide a Year 0 operating budget or a Year 0 Estimated Monthly Cash Flow report.		
Criterion IV.B.2		
Strengths: Very knowledgeable as to the types of Federal Funds available. Used a conservative approach to budgeting by not including other sources of funding (i.e. grants and donations) in operating budget. **Weaknesses:**		

Did not provide a contingency plan.

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 ALL academic plan is based on the curriculum, instructional methods, and empirical research already utilized and conducted at the ALL-Tucson charter school. The academic plan allows students to receive instruction at their functional level and incorporates measures and assessments that support student success. There is evidence that the curriculum and instructional design of the ALL academic plan is successful as ALL-Tucson has received national recognition for student performance. The upper management of ALL-Tucson function as the applicant academic team and have shown evidence of capacity with the success of ALL-Tucson. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion V.A.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion V.A.3		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion V.A.4		
Strengths: The proposed school director is a teacher who serves as the head of the English department at ALL-Tucson so she is familiar with the ALL curriculum and instructional methods. **Weaknesses:** None		
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:

The key members of the applicant include upper management of ALL-Tucson who have already demonstrated that they have the experience and expertise in developing and opening a successful charter school. The team includes members with key skill areas referenced in the Hawaii charter school law.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion V.B.2

Strengths:

The CEO of ALL-Tucson is an applicant board member who developed the ALL curriculum and will be assisting and leading in the development of ALL Hawaii.

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:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant's finance team in Arizona does not appear to have a very strong background in accounting nor has the formal training other than work experience, see Attachment U, page 26. The response to questions regarding Estimated Monthly Cash Flow in the Capacity Interview and Request for Clarification questions were very unclear.

Criterion V.C.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Exhibit B

Applicant Response for Accelerated Learning Laboratory – Hawaii

ALL-Hawaii's Response

to

Final Application Recommendation Report

Overview:

ALL-Hawaii is honored to have been recommended for approval by the Evaluation Team. Additionally, ALL-Hawaii would like to thank you for considering our application and commend you for creating the most rigorous and exhaustive charter application document that we have seen. Although not all charter applicants will welcome the demanding thought and planning process this document requires, it is our opinion that it is better for applicants to consider the substantial challenges of running a school while in the planning process, rather than suffering unanticipated travails and perhaps failure while running a school full of students. Few people are likely to understand that designing Hawaii's charter application process, such that transparency, accountability, and autonomy are preserved, is far more laborious and demanding than the actual application process. Your efforts are likely to greatly increase charter success rate. Your designers deserve much praise.

We believe that we have the capacity to meet the aggressive timeline required to open our school in Kapolei, where additional schools are needed. This response synthesizes our statements from the application, interview, and clarification, in order to demonstrate how we will address the weaknesses that the evaluation team pointed out.

Facilities Acquisition

As discussed in the application, interview, and response for clarification, ALL-Hawaii is currently negotiating with developers for a facility within an incoming residential neighborhood. However, as our team has experience with such negotiations in the past, we're aware that these things take time, especially given that developers have their own timelines for planned communities. As we mentioned in our capacity interview, our contingency plan is to lease a preexisting facility in Kapolei, until such time that a permanent site can be secured. Both aspects of facilities acquisition are well underway. We're confident that we'll meet a reasonable timetable for securing a site and open the school on schedule.

Finally, we agree that securing a site is a reasonable pre-opening assurance, and we do not object to the inclusion of a reasonable timeline within our pre-opening assurances.

Year 0 Budget & Start-Up Plans

The Evaluation Team has stated that our budget for Years 1-3 demonstrates an understanding and capacity for sound, responsible fiscal management. With that in mind, we'll use that budget, along with our interview and clarification statements, to clarify our plans for the Year 0 Budget.

First, we will not incur debt as a state entity. As such, we are relying upon operational funds that we've already acquired as well as any grant funds that we gain .While we have applied and will continue to apply for grants, we are not dependent upon grant funds, as we have acquired sufficient operational funds.

Second, we have acknowledged, during both the interview and the clarification, that there are numerous expenses prior to disbursement of per-pupil funds at the beginning of Year 1. Just a few such expenses include facility leasing/acquisition costs, curriculum, relocation of the School Director, staff training, advertising, staff recruitment and hiring, modifications to any leased facility, and furnishing the school with necessary security, equipment, etc. As previously mentioned, the cost of the facility is properly accounted for in the budget, but the Year 0 costs are dependent upon our negotiations. Ideally, we will not have to spend much, if any, of our operational funds to secure a facility; however, our Year 1 budget reflects that we are aware of the associated costs of utilities, operating costs, and leases that may be incurred if we have to lease for Year 1. With that in mind, we've already anticipated that lease costs may have to be absorbed during Year 0—via the operational funds that we've acquired—and we're quite confident that we'll be fiscally sound, responsible, and stable in the process.

One of the biggest benefits to our program is that the curriculum and the program upon which it functions (MARC) are already developed by our applicant board group, and have been donated to be used by ALL-Hawaii. This alone saves the school millions of dollars, as curriculum is one of the largest costs that new schools often have to incur. This allows us to focus our funds on other costs (mentioned above) that must be carried to make Year 0 successful.

Finally, we'd like to again emphasize that our plan for Year 0 allows ALL Hawaii to stand on its own two feet prior to opening its doors, and without acquiring any debt. Given that all of the board members are donating proprietary materials, training time, and a pool of privately gathered operational funds, we're well aware that financial stability is vital to our school's success—if the school fails to open, our hard work, time, and hard-earned pool of operational funds will go to waste. We've collectively gathered sufficient funds, and personally developed the curriculum, materials, and training methods. We hope that this (along with our financial experience as a board and the capacity that is clearly demonstrated by our Year 1-3 budget) will permit the Commission to agree with the Evaluation Team's conclusion: ALL-Hawaii has the means and capacity to successfully carry through with Year 0.

Governing By-laws

The evaluation team states that we show an understanding of reasonable by-laws and board management, but request that the bylaws be revised to meet the state requirements of Hawaii.

ALL-Hawaii shall revise its organization chart reflecting that the governing board provides direct oversight of the school and that the CEO reports to the Board, consistent with the language provided in our clarification:

> "The CEO shall be a governing Board member, but he shall not serve as Chairperson. Like all board members, the CEO must abstain from voting on any motion that constitutes or "appears" to constitute a conflict of interest. The CEO shall advise the Governing Board concerning topics related to the preservation of ALL's mission and vision. The CEO shall provide ongoing reports to the Board, including but not limited to the following: performance outcomes concerning student progress; educator, school, and system efficiency across demographic distinctions within each content area; educator in-service training effectiveness and educator compliance with defined protocols concerning pedagogy, curriculum design, and systems management. The CEO shall be responsible for reporting to the Board results of statistical analysis of data compiled by MARC, interpreting those reports, and forming data driven conclusions. The CEO shall direct or provide in-service training for key staff, ensure quality control, and provide general insight (at the school level) of the implementation and continuance of compliance protocols concerning pedagogy, curriculum, educator effectiveness, MARC, and the systems engineering of the educational design. The CEO shall represent the Board in negotiations and carry out the Board's directives concerning the procurement of contracts and agreements concerning ALL's physical plant and major amenities required to operate the school. In short, the CEO shall serve as the Governing Board's public face."

In short, our clarification included an explanation as to how the board is the direct oversight of the school, rather than a sole CEO, and we have no objection to clearly revising our organizational chart and bylaws to reflect these concerns.

Conclusion

This year's request for proposals clearly identifies a need for schools in areas where the public schools are near or at capacity. The Evaluation Team points out that we offer a rigorous, successful program that allows for the needs of each student to be constantly monitored and met, and it is already aligned with Common Core and best practices. Best of all, our unique program will be provided to Kapolei students, where the schools are at or over capacity, and the only other options in the area are highly expensive private schools.

We'd again like to repeat what we stated in our interview: ALL-Hawaii chose Hawaii and Kapolei because we strongly feel that it is the perfect community for our curriculum and mission. The vision of Hawaii's Department of Education—where quality of life, quality of education, and respect for community and tradition are fused with ambitious and necessary change—will allow ALL-Hawaii to contribute to education in an ideal setting. Hawaii's educational goals already align with the mission and vision of our Applicant Group, and we're eager to begin working within Hawaii. Our earnest desire to contribute and become a part of Hawaii's educational community has been demonstrated not just in our application, but throughout every stage of the application cycle.

We're confident that we have the capacity, expertise, and leadership necessary to meet this ambitious timetable and plan. We hope that this response permits the commission to share the confidence that the Evaluation team has already stated in their recommendation. Our applicant group is excited at the prospect of moving forward as a pre-opening charter school.