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: X. Action on Charter School Application for Kilohana Academy

I. DESCRIPTION

Recommendation that the Committee recommend to the full Commission that it deny the charter school application for Kilohana Academy.

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: Kilohana Academy

Mission: "Kilohana Academy has a threefold mission to prepare its students for graduation: to build a strong foundation in self and place through the language and traditions of Hawaii; achieve rigorous academic requirements; and engage with community mentors to fully prepare for careers and college. Kilohana is a creative and cultural Arts and Science Academy. Kilohana engages Kauai students in authentic academic experiences grounded in the values and traditions of Hawaii and our Pacific Island neighbors. Kilohana Academy is founded on the principles of Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha or love of land and reverence for aloha. Kilohana prepares students for local and global employment by exposing them to the values and practices of Kokua, Ikena and Paahana, Service,

Knowledge and Work. Kilohana students' interests, talents and skills become service to others and themselves. These interests will then guide them to college and careers. Kilohana Academy builds and maintains healthy relationships with the local and global community to create networks that encourage students to bring Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha to the world."

Vision: "Our Vision of a Kilohana graduate: Confident, creative, actively engaged, passionate at work, locally and abroad, committed to Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha."

Geographical Area: Kilohana Academy will be located at the Kapaa Boys and Girls Club in Kapaa, Kauai at 4695 Mailihuna Road. For year one, Kilohana Academy will partner with the Boys and Girls Club through a MOU for the use of facilities, utilities, and an adjacent property.

Program Synopsis: Kilohana instructional strategies are built on the foundation of Hawaiian values and tradition, and the belief that all students have strengths and interests that they can further pursue that will provide them with a livelihood and career choices.

6-8 grade Overview includes foundations in the language, culture and values of Hawaii, Polynesia, Pacific Rim, India and Asian countries; focus on diet, exercise and emotional well -being; meeting all Math and LA standards to grade level.

9-10 grade Overview focus on GED prep; American and World History and International Relations; Quarterly place based, and project based curriculum introduce career and community formats: Kealia Farms - Farm to Market to table, Kealia Kai- Coastline resource management. Wailua Smiths Boats-Tourism, property managment, river resource management. Fred Aki-Entertainment industry.

11-12 grade Overview pass GED test, career centered; Engage in career goals as aligned with ILP (ex. pre trade school course work. pre university entrance course work, employment, internship, mentoring programs); increase community engagement. Refine Art.

Kilohana students must declare a career "pathway" by 11th grade. Options are: Natural Resource Management, Entrepreneur, Government. The ILP shall reflect student progress towards career pathway goals. These assessments are compiled towards graduation requirements.

This Hawaiian values curriculum is created based on the work of George Kanahele, Pua Kanahele, Kameelehiwa, and Meyer. Hawaiian values and proverbs guide our beliefs and therefore our behavior. These are reading/writing intensive courses conducted in Olelo Hawaii.

- Na Honua Maoli Ola-Guidelines for developing culturally appropriate environments developed by UH Hilo, Includes Assessments. http://www.olelo.hawaii.edu/pub/NHMO.md1.msw.pdf

- Papaku Makawalu-Culturally appropriate curriculum developed through Edith Kanakaole Foundation, Hawaii Community College, Hilo, shows connections between arts and sciences through a uniquely Hawaiian cultural lens. Includes Assessments. (https://www.edithkanakaolefoundation.org/current-projects/papaku-makawalu/)

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2016		Year 2 2017		Year 3 2018		Year 4 2019		Year 5 2020		Capacity 2021	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K												
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6	15		15		20		20		20		25	
7	15		15		15		20		20		25	
8	15		15		15		15		20		25	
9			15		15		15		15		25	
10					15		15		15		25	
11							15		15		25	
12									15		25	
Subtotals	45		60		80		100		120		175	
Totals	45		60		80		100		120		175	

IV. BACKGROUND

The Evaluation Team assigned to the Kilohana Academy 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 response to the Request for Clarification. The applicant group members that attended the interview were Kaee Ahloo, Kamealoha Hanohano-Smith, and Stuart Rosenthal.

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 submit 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. State Representative Derek Kawakami and 31 individuals submitted written testimony in support of

Kilohana Academy. Four applicant board members and two individuals also provided oral testimony in support.

Further, staff solicited comments from the Department of Education ("DOE")—particularly the Kauai Complex Area Superintendent—on the application. However, the Commission did not receive any comments from the DOE on this application.

Final Application Recommendation Report

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for the Kilohana Academy be denied. The Recommendation Report states that the academic plan, organizational plan, financial plan, and evidence of capacity did not meet the standard for approval and notes that the application "does not provide enough accurate and specific information, does not show thorough preparation, and fails to present a clear, realistic, picture of how the school expects to operate."

The report finds that the academic plan does not meet the standard due to the proposed plan not providing enough detail or explanation of the academic approach, curriculum, and instructional strategies. Among the key concerns regarding the academic plan were:

- All 9th and 10th graders will work toward obtaining a GED instead of a BOE diploma, and students who choose to receive a BOE diploma will have to meet additional requirements;
- High school graduation being presented as an option rather than as the expectation for all students runs contrary to state policy goals and the expectation that the Charter Commission authorize high quality schools;
- The individualized learning plan process does not list any special school-wide or cohort-wide goals for the school to self-assess or measure overall academic progress; and
- The application does not have a comprehensive plan to serve students with special needs.

The report notes that the application does not meet the standard for the organizational plan. Overall, the Evaluation Team found the organizational plan was undeveloped and provided little detail or explanation of the applicant's vision for the school and how the vision would be implemented. The report noted that the key concerns regarding the organizational plan were:

- The plan lacks a comprehensive and effective plan for collecting, measuring, analyzing student academic achievement data; and
- The start-up plan lacks detail and reiterates the start-up activities needed to facilitate the opening of a charter school.

The report notes that the application does not meet the standard for the financial plan because the plan has substantial gaps, and lacks required information in one or more areas. The report noted that key concerns regarding the financial plan were:

- The financial plan does not provide complete, realistic, and viable start-up and three-year operation budgets;
- No reasonable assurances were provided that start-up funding will be available; and
- There is no documented contingency plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated.

The report finds that the applicant does not meet the standard for evidence of capacity because the application is sparse, underdeveloped, and did not provide the Evaluation Team with sufficient information needed to evaluate and assess both the overall vision of the school and the implementation plan. The applicant does not demonstrate academic capacity since the academic plan lacks detail and does not provide a thorough explanation of the academic approach, curriculum, or instructional strategies. Similarly, the organizational and financial plans also lack capacity due to its underdeveloped nature and the lack of specific details which could have furthered the Evaluation Team's understanding as to how the plans would be implemented.

Applicant Response.

The Applicant Response attempts to clarify some key concerns brought forth in the Final Application Recommendation Report. However, the Applicant Response mainly contains new information that cannot be considered at this point in the applications cycle.

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 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 did not meet standard.

Overall, the Evaluation Team found that Kilohana's Academic Plan did not provide enough detail or explanation of the academic approach, curriculum, and instructional strategies to be assessed and as a result did not meet standard. Kilohana's response to the Evaluation Team's Recommendation Report provided additional information that was not previously included in the Application, which cannot be considered at this point in the process. The additional information illustrates the Evaluation Team's assessment of their Application.

Additionally, Kilohana's application does state that they aim to prepare students to meet G.E.D. requirements rather than aim for all students to graduate with a high school diploma, which does not meet the criteria or the standard for a high-quality charter school. Although the Applicant's response states that they will change their focus to graduate all students with a high school diploma, this is new information and further evidence that the Applicant needs more time to fully understand the requirements to meet standard and that the Academic Plan that was submitted does not meet standard.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's Findings.

The Organization Plan did not meet standard.

The Evaluation Team found the organizational plan was undeveloped and provided little detail or explanation of the applicant's vision for the school and how the vision would be implemented. Additionally the Evaluation Team found that the Applicant did not have a comprehensive and effective plan for collecting, measuring, and analyzing student academic achievement data. The use of data is a vital part of the operations of any school. Data driven decision making insures that the organization works in an orderly and focused manner to meet the goals and targets that every school should have. When targets and goals are not achieved, it is the data that will help to explain and drive the improvements necessary to re-assess and to re-double their efforts to meet the targets and goals. This is further evidence that the Academic Plan did not meet standard.

The Evaluation Team also found that the Applicant's start-up plan lacked detail and merely reiterated the start-up activities needed to facilitate the opening of a charter school. The opening of a charter school is one of the most difficult challenges for any new charter school. As evidenced by so many of experiences of our newest charter 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, but also designates the key 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 did not meet standard.

The Evaluation Team again found that the Applicant's Financial Plan lacked the required information in one or more areas, and contained substantial gaps. Due to the lack of a complete, realistic, and viable start-up plan, this called into question the three-year operation budget that was presented. The Applicant's did not provide evidence of start-up funding; nor a contingency plan for how they would meet financial needs if anticipated revenues were not received or lower than expected.

Having a strong Financial Plan is vital to ensuring that the proposed school will be able to do what it outlined in its application. No matter how strong an Academic Plan is written, or an Organizational Plan that is presented, without the proper Financial Plan, the proposed school will not be able to open or sustain its operations. Kilohana's Financial Plan did not meet standard.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's Findings.

The Evidence of Capacity does not meet standard.

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.

In each of the three areas of the Application, Kilohana did not present plans that met the standards required to demonstrate their collective capacity to implement a high-quality charter school. Generally each of the Applicant's plans needed further development, more information and specificity to demonstrate not only that they have viable Academic, Organizational, and Financial plans, but that they possess the capacity to carry out these plans successfully.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's Findings.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, Staff agrees with the Evaluation Team that applicant has not met standards in all areas. Kilohana's Application is a good start, but needs more work. Although no new information can be considered in the review of their application, clearly the Applicant Team has more to add, as evidence by their response to the Evaluator's Recommendation Report. Kilohana has a good foundation for a future application, but will need to work on developing a more detailed and cohesive plans for their proposed charter school.

Staff recommends the denial of Kilohana Academy's application.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Motion to the Commission:

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

Exhibit A

Recommendation Report for Kilohana Academy

State Public Charter School Commission
2015-2016 Recommendation Report

Charter Application for
Kilohana Academy

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
Kilohana Academy

Mission and Vision
Mission: Kilohana Academy has a threefold mission to prepare its students for graduation: to build a strong foundation in self and place through the language and traditions of Hawaii; achieve rigorous academic requirements; and engage with community mentors to fully prepare for careers and college.
Mission: Kilohana is a creative and cultural Arts and Science Academy. Kilohana engages Kauai students in authentic academic experiences grounded in the values and traditions of Hawaii and our Pacific Island neighbors. Kilohana Academy is founded on the principles of Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha or love of land and reverence for aloha. Kilohana prepares students for local and global employment by exposing them to the values and practices of Kokua, Ikena and Paahana, Service, Knowledge and Work. Kilohana students' interests, talents and skills become service to others and themselves. These interests will then guide them to college and careers. Kilohana Academy builds and maintains healthy relationships with the local and global community to create networks that encourage students to bring Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha to the world.

Vision: Our Vision of a Kilohana graduate: Confident, creative, actively engaged, passionate at work, locally and abroad, committed to Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha.

Geographic Location

Our formal learning site is at the Kapaʻa Boys and Girls Club of Kapaa, Kauai.

4695 Mailihuna Rd. Kapaa 96744.

In Year 1, Kilohana Academy will partner with the Boys and Girls Club through a formal MOU for use of facilities, utilities and an adjacent property. We will have the option to extend the MOU if we decide to continue the school at The Kapaʻa Boys & Girls Club.

Anticipated Student Population
Given the socioeconomic demographic of Kapaa, Kauai, we anticipate that our average student will come from a multicultural home; Native Hawaiian, mixed with Asian, Polynesian, Caucasian, and or Hispanic bloodlines; with a median family income of $53,000.

We anticipate a high number of students enrolling who are Native Hawaiian and considered at risk, based on factors including but not limited to poverty and disadvantaged family life. Students whose parents are incarcerated will be actively recruited.

Contribution to Public Education System
Kilohana Academy provides Kauai Youth with a unique opportunity to actively engage in diverse experiences as a means to build appropriate relationship with place and community, as opposed to a "classroom only" delivery of knowledge.

The "at-risk" youth in our educational complex will greatly benefit from a smaller, more personal school that is focuses on the student strength and affirms their learning style. A smaller school will also insure

that students will have teachers for consecutive years, which will make it easier to serve students that might normally fall through the cracks in a larger school. Truancy and other educational factors appear to indicate a need for this kind of educational choice to exist. There are a number of children in this community who have become alienated, disenfranchised, and in general resist any kind of association with the current public school system.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2016		Year 2 2017		Year 3 2018		Year 4 2019		Year 5 2020		Capacity 20__	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K												
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6	15		15		20		20		20		25	
7	15		15		15		20		20		25	
8	15		15		15		15		20		25	
9			15		15		15		15		25	
10					15		15		15		25	
11							15		15		25	
12									15		25	
Subtotals	45		60		80		100		120		175	
Totals	45		60		80		100		120		175	

Executive Summary

Kilohana Academy

Recommendation

Deny

Summary Analysis

The recommendation of the Evaluation Team is to deny the application for Kilohana Academy as the applicant failed to meet standards in the four core areas of the application. The primary reason for this recommendation is that the application does not provide enough accurate and specific information, does not show thorough preparation, and fails to present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.

The Academic Plan does not meet the standard as the proposed plan does not provide enough detail or explanation of the academic approach, curriculum, and instructional strategies. With so many details omitted, the Evaluation Team is unable to develop a clear and realistic picture of the school's academic operations. Another major concern was the priority of having students achieve a GED mid-high school and only having a track of students that would self-select to continue on to earn their diploma.

The Organizational Plan does not meet the standard as the proposed plan lacks a comprehensive method for collecting and analyzing student achievement data and a comprehensive and sound start-up plan.

The Financial Plan does not meet the standard as the proposed plan lacks a sound, start-up period budget and a comprehensive contingency plan which would allow the school to operate if proposed funding is not provided or enrollment projections are not met.

The applicant's evidence of capacity does not meet the standard for approval as the overall application was sparse, underdeveloped, and does not provide the Evaluation Team with the sufficient information needed to evaluate and assess both the overall vision for the school and the implementation plan.

Summary of Section Ratings

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

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

Academic Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Financial Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Organizational Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Evidence of Capacity

Does Not Meet the Standard

Academic Plan

Kilohana Academy

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

The applicant proposes to develop a school that serves at-risk youth in Kapaa, Kauai in a small, personalized environment. Kilohana is designed to be a creative and cultural Arts and Sciences academy engaging students in authentic academic experiences grounded in the values and traditions of Hawaii. The school will be founded on the principles of Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha or love of land and reverence for aloha. The overarching goal is to serve the children in the community who have become disenfranchised and resistant to engaging with the traditional public school system.

The ninth and tenth grade curriculum has a focus on preparation for the GED (General Education Development), American and World History and International Relations, and place-based, project-based curriculum that introduces career and community formats. In 11th and 12th grades, after students have passed the GED test, the curriculum is more career-centered and students engage in university preparation coursework, employment, internships, and have increased community engagement.

Analysis

The strength of the application lies with the non-profit partner, Kaiaulu Anahola, which currently has an active partnership with the Boys and Girls Club where the proposed school plans to be housed. The on-going programs offered by Kaiaulu Anahola are place, culture, project and strength-based education programs that motivate students to value both traditional knowledge through Hawaiian Language and culture, and western science through project based research.

However, even with strong partnerships and community involvement and commitment, the Academic Plan does not meet the standard because it lacks detail and required information in one or more areas and does not reflect a thorough understanding of key issues. Furthermore, it does not provide enough accurate, specific information. The Academic plan does not show thorough preparation, and fails to present a clear realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.

The biggest concern with the plan is the proposed goal of having all 9th and 10th graders to take the GED and then students *who choose to receive a BOE diploma* will meet additional requirements and must maintain a 3.0 GPA or higher. Additionally, students will also be actively engaged (20 hour per week) in their desired career field. The goal of having students earn a GED is so that that by mid-way through their high school careers, they will have the insurance of at least having a GED. This accomplishment, which may constitute a very positive academic attainment in the community, will also provide students a sense of accomplishment that the applicant team hopes will encourage them to push forward onto higher academic aspirations and accomplishments.

This goal, however, that high school graduation is an option for some students and *not an expectation for all students,* runs contrary to state policy goals and expectations of the Charter Commission to authorize high quality charter schools.

Many of the responses in the Academic Section are underdeveloped and do not describe a plan for building and running a school. For example, the application requires a description of the materials that have been selected and an explanation that largely demonstrates how the materials support the Academic Plan. For grade levels and courses that do not have curriculum materials selected, a reasonable and sound timeline description of how the materials will be developed or selected and a list of individuals that will be involved in the development or selection process should have been provided. The applicant response explains that materials selected are relevant for place-based and project based learning and that Aleks math will be used to support math standards. However, for the remaining materials the response just states, "other curriculum materials are under development." There is no plan for how these materials will be developed or selected, or who will be responsible for the process.

The application also asks for a clear list of academic goals and targets and a description of how the proposed school assesses the progress of individual students, student cohorts and the school as a whole on the identified goals and targets. The proposed school will use the Individualized Learning Plan process to plan and evaluate individual student progress. But the plan fails to list any school-wide or cohort wide goals for the schools to self-assess progress and to measure overall academic progress and standing. The proposal states that the targets include graduation rates, community satisfaction, increase student employment and job satisfaction but does not list any actual targets. Even in the Organizational Performance section, the applicant lists academic targets as "XX% of students will score Proficient or Advanced Performance Levels" (on state assessments). There is no target provided, just XX.

In response to a request to provide a clear description of the instructional strategies that the proposed school will use, and an explanation of how those strategies support the mission, vision, and academic philosophy of the proposed school, the applicant fails to address instructional strategies at all. Instead, the response states that if students are not able to fulfill requirements, they will be given more time. And for students who do not desire to fulfill requirements, they may have to have their individualized learning plans adjusted. This raises the concern that the applicant will not have high expectations for all students.

The application also requires the development of a comprehensive and compelling plan and explanation of how students with special needs will be served. This particular question has eight sub-questions to guide the applicant to provide a complete, thoughtful response. The applicant however, offers only that the SPED teacher will make modifications through the IEP process.

Overall, the application does not provide enough detail or explanation of the academic approach, curriculum or instructional strategies to get a clear picture of how the school expects to operate. With so many details omitted, the proposal does not provide a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.

Organizational Plan

Kilohana Academy

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

Kilohana Academy proposes a governance structure that includes committees that will not have the authority to take administrative action but assist the school governing board in the areas of finance and audit, facilities, and academic program. A School Leadership Team, a voluntary committee made up of school administrators, teachers, students, and parents, is considered to be an essential component of the site-based management structure.

Kilohana Academy will be associated with Kaiaulu Anahola, a community-based outreach and research organization that intends to be a non-profit entity. The proposed school's location for its initial years would be at the Kapa'a Boys and Girls Club on the island of Kauai.

Analysis

The Organizational Plan does not meet standard for approval as it does not reflect a thorough understanding of key issues, which resulted in a plan that does not present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate. Specifically, the application as a whole was sparse and underdeveloped as it provides little detail or explanation of the applicant's vision for the school and how the applicant will implement that vision.

The applicant provides a confusing plan for measuring academic performance that was not aligned with the academic plan; specifically, the Organizational Plan lacks a comprehensive and effective plan for collecting, measuring, and analyzing student academic achievement data. The applicant lists the academic indicators that would be considered, which are primarily the data and results of the state assessment system (Strive HI). However, these indicators do not align with the proposed school's academic plan; for example, college entrance exam scores are one of the measures that will be used to determine the proposed school's academic success despite the academic plan's focus on having students prepare for and receive a GED. While the academic plan seems to allow students to progress academically at a pace that fit the students and not focus on state academic requirements and measures, the proposed academic assessment system utilizes the data based on the state requirements and measures. The Evaluation Team was unsure how the academic performance assessment data would be analyzed and utilized to improve student performance as the plan provided by the applicant is sparse and does not provide any detail or explanation.

The Organizational Plan also lacks a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound management plan for the start-up period. The start-up plan provided lacks detail and basically reiterates the start-up activities needed to facilitate the opening of a charter school. For example, the start-up plan provided is made up of four phases, of which Phase I included tasks from the Application Process. Each Phase of the start-up plan lists tasks that need to be completed, such as building a relationship with the community through sponsoring engagement events, develop process to identify curriculum materials, and hiring staff. There is no timeline of when tasks would begin and when they should be completed, though the applicant does recognize that there is approximately a year to complete these tasks. The start-up plan does not

provide any detail or explanation of specifics of each task. Due to the lack of a comprehensive and sound management plan in the application, the Evaluation Team must consider the applicant's Organizational Plan inadequate.

Financial Plan

Kilohana Academy

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

Kilohana Academy's governing board will provide oversight of all financial aspects of the Financial Management of the school. Under the supervision of the school's Co-Directors and governing board Treasurer, the business manager will handle all the day-to-day functions.

To accommodate its targeted student enrollment of 45 students in year 1, Kilohana Academy has secured a memorandum of understanding for a facility through a partnership with Kapaa Boys & Girls Club in Kapaa, Hawaii for an annual lease rate of $40,000.

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	$555,000	$495,500	$59,500
Year 2	$685,000	$653,420	$31,580
Year 3	$855,000	$745,402	$109,598

Analysis

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

The Financial Plan does not provide a complete, realistic, and viable start-up and three-year operation budgets. The school's start up plan fails to provide a comprehensive plan as to spending during the start-up period. In addition, the applicant does not provide any reasonable assurances that the start-up period funding would be available. When the evaluation team inquired about funding from the non-profit, the applicant responded that they were in the process of writing grants and that they were hopeful of getting them.

The Financial Plan does not provide a sound contingency plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated. The applicant does not provide a documented contingency plan. When the evaluation team inquired at the capacity interview, the applicant responded with a variety of solutions ranging from the Co-Director "working for free", possibility of not paying rent to Kapaa Boys & Girls Club and reducing staffing needs.

With a projected student enrollment of only 45 students in year 1, a lack of a contingency plan and reliance on private grant funding raises the concerns of the Evaluation Team regarding school viability and the financial plan as a whole.

Evidence of Capacity

Kilohana Academy	Rating
	Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

The applicant team for Kilohana Academy currently functions as the proposed school's interim governing board and is made up of five individuals from Kauai, specifically the Anahola and Kapa´a areas. The proposed school co-directors are members of the interim governing board; one of the proposed directors has experience in non-profit management and administration as the project director for Kaiaulu Anahola, the non-profit organization that will be associated with the proposed school, and the other co-director currently teaches in a Kauai charter school.

The applicant team plans to have a seven member school governing board in place by August 2016. In addition to Kaiaulu Anahola, the proposed school will have ties with various community groups, such as the Kapa´a Boys and Girls Club (which will provide facilities), ´Aha Moku (a local cultural practitioners' group), and Kealia Farms (which will provide farming and agricultural opportunities for the school).

Analysis

The applicant's evidence of capacity does not meet the standard for approval as the overall application is sparse, underdeveloped, and does not provide the Evaluation Team with the sufficient information needed to evaluate and assess both the overall vision for the school and the implementation plan.

The applicant does not demonstrate academic capacity as the academic plan provided lacks detail or a thorough explanation of the academic approach, curriculum, or instructional strategies.

Both the Organizational and Financial Plans are negatively affected by the underdevelopment of the application as a whole and the lack of specific detail which could further the Evaluation Team's understanding of how these plans would be implemented. Both sections share similar concerns regarding the absence of detail and evidence of preparation as noted in the lack of a detailed start-up plan and contingency plan. The application simply does not provide the Evaluation Team with enough information.

The Evaluation Team was impressed with the applicant's strong ties and commitment to the Anahola community and the work that its associated non-profit, Kaiaulu Anahola , is already doing in the community. The sincerity and commitment of the applicant team to the disadvantaged youth of Anahola was evident in the team's capacity interview, which made an impression on the Evaluation Team. The ability to describe and expound on the support services provided by Kaiaulu Anahola clearly demonstrates the applicant's capacity as a non-profit and community organization.

However, the applicant's strength in that area only emphasizes the lack of capacity in the academic, organizational, and financial areas. The Evaluation Team can only conclude that the sparse and underdeveloped application itself is an indication of the lack of academic and administrative capacity that raises the question of whether the applicant will be able to open and operate a high quality charter school.

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 Kilohana 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:** This section merely lists the courses the applicant intends to provide and does not provide course outcomes or an in-depth description of standards or assessments. The only mention of an "outcome" is that students must meet assessments. The applicant does not provide any of these assessments or any rubrics that will be used for assessments. There is no mention of the instructional design or method of instruction. The applicant has set passing the GED test as a target for students in grades 11-12 and preparation for the GED as a focus in grades 9-10. The academic overview does not provide a concise overview of instructional methods or assessment strategies.		
Criterion II.B.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant merely provides a list of the Common Core standards for Language Arts and Mathematics; while not providing any standards for any other courses. The applicant does not provide any rationale or show any work done to tie the standards to any courses offered. There is no description or mention of how each set of standards contribute to the success of student learning. There is no mention or explanation of how these standards align with the academic plan.		

Criterion II.B.3
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not provide a description of the material selected or an explanation that demonstrate how the materials support the academic plan. The applicant simply states that materials are relevant, current, and different.
Criterion II.B.4
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not provide a list of academic goals and targets and does not describe how the school would assess individual student progress.
Criterion II.B.5
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not provide a clear and comprehensive description of how instructional leaders and teachers will use student data, the roles and responsibilities of the instructional leadership team, and the formalized process and supports that will enable students to reflect on student progress.
Criterion II.B.6
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not describe or provide any interventions and modifications if students do not meet identified goals and targets. The applicant only says that students will be given more time and that students that do not want to fulfill requirements will be allowed to change the requirements to meet personal goals. This section is especially critical as the applicant intends to target at-risk students who require interventions and modifications in order to achieve any academic support.
Criterion II.B.7
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant proposes a program that focuses on passing the GED rather than getting a high school diploma.
Criterion II.B.8 (sub-criteria a through j)
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:**

This section is for applicants who intend to provide virtual or blended learning programs, but it does not appear that the applicant intends to provide either virtual or blended learning. However, the lack of detail or explanation in the application makes this uncertain. It appears that the applicant intends to deliver a program that is dependent on technology for the academic program but it is not a virtual or blended learning program.

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 applicant dos not provide a plan for serving educationally disadvantaged students; even a plan for at-risk students which are the target population, is not provided.		
Criterion II.C.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not provide a plan or explanation for any of the sub-groups listed in this section. The applicant's response in this section was one line- "The SPED insures modifications are met through the IEP process."		
Criterion II.C.3		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not provide any description of how the academic plan accommodates the academic needs of students performing at grade level and does not provide any description of supports and instructional strategies.		
Criterion II.C.4		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not provide a description of how the curriculum would be adjusted to accommodate students who perform above grade level.		

Section II.D: School Culture		
☐ **Meets the Standard**	☒ **Does Not Meet the Standard**	☐ **Falls Far Below the Standard**
Criterion II.D.1		
Strengths:		

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant uses two terms- Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha- to describe school rules/culture. However, there is no explanation or description of how they fit into the school culture.

Criterion II.D.2

Strengths:

The applicant intends to have multiple group sessions where everyone gathers together as well as weekly meetings with individuals to discuss the individual learning plans.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.D.3

Strengths:

The applicant will provide career pathways that are intended to foster workplace readiness.

Weaknesses:

The applicant has a focus on preparing for and taking the GED.

Criterion II.D.4

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant provided a short class schedule that does not include any description or explanation.

Criterion II.D.5

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant uses the same response used for Criterion II.D.1 and uses the same two terms- Aloha Aina and Kapu Aloha- to describe school rules/culture. However, there is no explanation of how this fit into student discipline.

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:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant states that there will be multiple gatherings for staff but does not provide a sound plan that describes the creation and implementation of a professional culture.

Criterion II.E.1.b

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant acknowledges that there may be a high proportion of economically disadvantaged students but does not provide a clear description of how the proposed school will address the anticipated academic challenges.

Criterion II.E.1.c

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant provided a short class schedule that does not include any description or explanation.

Criterion II.E.2.a

Strengths:

The applicant intends to implement a teacher/leadership portfolio program that incorporates feedback from stakeholders and students, as well as having a peer review process.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant states that its professional development programs will be data driven, there is no explanation of what data will be collected, how it will be analyzed to assess teacher and student performance, and how this data analysis will inform decisions and assist teacher development.

Criterion II.E.2.b

Strengths:

The applicant intends to have quarterly team building experiences.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explain how teachers will be prepared and what will be covered during the induction period.

Criterion II.E.2.c

Strengths:

The applicant intends to have multiple opportunities for professional development, including daily and weekly meetings, quarterly retreats, day long staff meetings, and outside opportunities.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not state whether professional development sessions conflict with the requirements of collective bargaining agreements.

Criterion II.E.2.d

Strengths:

The applicant identified the co-directors as the individuals responsible for professional development needs.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide a plan for identifying on-going professional development needs.

Criterion II.E.3.a

Strengths:

The staffing plan aligns with the proposed budget.

Weaknesses:

The staffing plan is contingent on the co-directors teaching in Years 1 and 2; the applicant will need to ensure that both co-directors meet state licensure requirements and federal highly qualified requirements.

Criterion II.E.3.b

Strengths:

The applicant has set a ratio of 1 teacher to 15 students.

Weaknesses:

The applicant is proposing to have elective classes taught by community scholars; this may raise collective bargaining issues. The applicant will need to discuss this program with the teachers union before it can be implemented.

Criterion II.E.3.c

Strengths:

The staffing plan includes an IT position to assist with the school's technology needs.

Weaknesses:

There appears to be some confusion as the applicant states that a component of the school will be both virtual and blended. Further clarification on this will be needed.

Criterion II.E.4.a

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a description of the school's recruitment and hiring strategy; the applicant simply states that HQ teachers will be hired.

Criterion II.E.4.b

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a clear description of the school's recruitment and hiring strategy; the applicant simply states that a Math/IT person will be hired.

Criterion II.E.4.c

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a clear description of the procedures that will be used for hiring and dismissing personnel and for criminal background checks.

Criterion II.E.4.d

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a plan for developing and implementing a school leadership and teacher evaluation system; instead the applicant simply states that a school leadership and teacher evaluation system will be implemented.

Criterion II.E.4.e

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide an effective plan that explains how the school intends to promote or incentivize performance; the applicant's response is "Incentives will be given through non-profit partner."

Criterion II.E.4.f

Not applicable

Criterion II.E.4.g

Strengths:

The applicant provided a comprehensive employee manual.

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:

The applicant intends to follow the DOE calendar.

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not explain how the calendar aligns with the Academic Plan.

Criterion II.F.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a weekly schedule or any information associated with the weekly schedule. The applicant also does not provide a satisfactory explanation of how the schedules are optimal for student learning.

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 describes a sound summer and inter-session program that is intended to supplement the academic program and provide culture-based and place-based learning projects. **Weaknesses:** The applicant did not explain how the summer and inter-session program will be funded.
Criterion II.G.2
Strengths: The applicant intends to provide sports and other programs through partnerships with the Boys and Girls Club and the Kauai sports federation. **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not describe how these activities ties into 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:

The governing board bylaws present a clear and concise description of the governing philosophy.

Weaknesses:

The applicant mentions that the school will comply with the requirements of State Sunshine Laws; however, the governing statute for charter schools exempts charter school governing boards from State Sunshine Law.

Criterion III.A.2

Strengths:

The organizational chart delineates roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority within the school.

Weaknesses:

The organizational chart does not show the additional groups that will assist in managing and supporting the school, such as the School Leadership Team and a parent group that are described in the next section of the application. This creates inconsistency and some confusion as to how these groups will fit into the governance structure.

Criterion III.A.3

Strengths:

The applicant will form a parent group that is intended to organize parent volunteers and share ideas for the school.

Weaknesses:

This section describes the additional groups that will assist in managing and supporting the school, such as the School Leadership Team and a parent group; this section does not describe how the governing board will oversee and work with these groups. This creates inconsistencies that raise questions regarding the governance structure of the school.

Criterion III.A.4

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

This section is sparse and does not provide a clear description of the role the governing board will play in the online learning program nor does it provide a description the knowledge of online learning that the governing

board possess or will endeavor to possess.

Criterion III.A.5

Strengths:

The interim governing board has strong ties to the area that the school intends to serve. Interim members have experience as cultural advisors, community liaisons, and non-profit administrators.

Weaknesses:

While the applicant states that it is aware that they will need members whose skill sets meet the considerations of Section 302D-12, HRS, the applicant does not describe the plan or actions that it will take to recruit those members.

Criterion III.A.6

Strengths:

The applicant describes how its governing board will be structured and how meeting will be conducted and made available to the public.

Weaknesses:

The applicant includes a reference to Section 302B-1, HRS, which is the repealed charter school law.

Criterion III.A.7

Strengths:

The applicant does not anticipate having any governing board members with actual or perceived conflicts of interest.

Weaknesses:

Though the applicant has drafted a Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest policy, the policy does not refer to or acknowledge the State Ethics Code which includes the Conflict of Interest provisions that the governing board would be held to.

Criterion III.A.8

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

While the applicant intends to have training and orientation for its governing board members, the applicant does not describe who will provide the training and what resources the applicant has in securing viable governing board training. The rest of this section repeats information previously provided throughout the governance section of the application.

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 follow state and federal accountability requirements and will participate in the State's assessment programs.

Weaknesses:

The applicant lists the academic indicators that would be considered, which are primarily the data and results of the state assessment system (Strive HI). However, these indicators do not align with the proposed school's academic plan; for example, college entrance exam scores are one of the measures that will be used to determine the proposed school's academic success despite the academic plan's focus on having students prepare for and receive a GED.

Criterion III.B.2

Strengths:

The business manager is identified as the person who is responsible for financial information and data.

Weaknesses:

The plan for financial oversight lists the activities that need to be done to provide financial oversight, but it fails to describe or describe how financial oversight will be implemented and actually done.

Criterion III.B.3

Strengths:

The applicant intends to follow an Organizational Performance Framework that is aligned to the Commission's Organizational Framework.

Weaknesses:

The plan for organizational performance and oversight lists the activities that need to be done to meet the requirements of organizational performance, but it fails to describe or describe the processes and procedures that associated with organizational performance and how the applicant will implement these processes and procedures.

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:

The applicant did not provide a sound plan for the safety and security for students, facility, and property. The applicant stated that virtual security features would be purchased but does not provide any explanation or detail on this.

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: The applicant anticipates serving a high number of students that come from families in poverty, are considered academically low achieving and/or at-risk. **Weaknesses:** The recruitment and marketing plan provided in the application is not detailed and does not describe the specific outreach actions that will be taken.		
Criterion III.D.2		
Not applicable		
Criterion III.D.3		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The admission policy submitted is based on an old admission policy of a currently operating charter school and would not be approved by the Commission. Specifically, the applicant's admission policy contains language pertaining to special education students that is problematic. The admission policy also contains enrollment preferences despite the applicant saying that they would not seek enrollment preferences.		

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 will work with a community-based outreach organization, Kaiaulu Anahola, which already has actively engaged the community. The applicant will adopt that organization's community involvement plan to involve parents and the community with the school. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion III.E.2		
Strengths: The applicant will develop a community involvement handbook that will be based on Kaiaulu Anahola's community involvement plan. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion III.E.3		
Strengths:		

The applicant will work with various organizations, such as the Kapa'a Boys and Girls Club, Kealia Farms, and the County of Kauai to inform and engage parents and community with the school's development.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.E.4

Strengths:

The applicant will work with various organizations, such as Kaiaulu Anahola, the Kapa'a Boys and Girls Club, Kealia Farms, the Pacific American Foundation, and the County of Kauai.

Weaknesses:

None

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

Criterion III.F.1

Strengths:

Kaiaulu Anahola intends to be the associated non-profit for the school. One of the proposed school directors is the project director for that organization. The organization intends to be a fully incorporated 501(c)3 by Fall 2017. The organization is also associated with the Pacific American Foundation, which serves as the program fiscal sponsor.

Weaknesses:

None

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 intends to be located at the Kapa'a Boys and Girls Club in its first two years of operation. The clubhouse director of the Boys and Girls Club is on the applicant governing board.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.G.2

Strengths:

The applicant provided a draft memorandum of agreement with the Kapa'a Boys and Girls Club for the use of the facility for the first 2 years of operation.

Weaknesses:

None

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 provided a start-up plan that is not comprehensive and detailed and essentially reiterates the activities listed in the criteria. The start-up plan does not contain any specific deadlines or deliverables.		
Criterion III.H.2		
Strengths: The applicant lists the co-directors and the proposed business manager as the team that will lead the development of the school during the pre-opening phase. **Weaknesses:** This section mentions a start-up plan that is divided into seven categories; however, it appears the applicant intends to develop this plan during the start-up period. The explanation of this plan again reiterates activities that need to be completed rather than describing the activities and providing a timeline of completion.		

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: The financial plan was well written, thorough and complete. All facets of the financial process was thoroughly explained and well thought out. **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:** None		
Criterion IV.B.2		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:**		

The applicant did not provide a contingency plan should enrollment projections or outside revenues streams are not met.

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 academic team has experience with charter schools and with the community the school intends to serve. **Weaknesses:** The academic team does not appear to have experience and sufficient capacity with school administration, curriculum, instruction and assessment, performance management; the evidence of this lack of capacity is the inadequate academic plan that was provided.		
Criterion V.A.2		
Strengths: The proposed co-directors have clear and long-standing ties and knowledge of the community and the area that they intend to serve. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion V.A.3		
Strengths: The applicant is supported by other organizations, such as the Kapa'a Boys and Girls Club and the Pacific American Foundation. **Weaknesses:** None		
Criterion V.A.4		
Strengths: None **Weaknesses:** The applicant does not describe the recruiting and selection process for selecting the school co-directors. The application does not provide evidence that the co-directors will be able to implement a successful academic plan.		
Criterion V.A.5		
Strengths: None		

Weaknesses:

The application does not provide an adequate academic plan so there is no evidence that the individuals identified as the management team can develop or implement a successful academic plan.

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 application does not provide an adequate organizational plan as the application submitted basically reiterated the criteria and requirements but did not provide any detail or explanation which is what the criteria requires; as such, it must be concluded that the applicant does not have the capacity to develop or implement an effective organizational plan.

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:

The applicant's proposed Business Manager has years of experience at another Charter School in Hawaii and knows what is expected to run a financially sound charter school. He also has many years of experience in different roles in accounting.

Weaknesses:

The applicant's omission of a contingency plan and response during the capacity interview clearly exemplified that there is no clear contingency plan should enrollment projections not be met.

Criterion V.C.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

Exhibit B

Applicant Response for Kilohana Academy

Kilohana Academy PCS (KA) Leadership Team/Board members, in cooperation with volunteers, representatives of community-based organizations and public/private partnerships, met regularly, and thus ensures that their ongoing dedication, utilizing specific skill sets, lead to preparing the foundation for a new public charter school. These narrative responses described below address the Charter Commission Report Recommendations for more information to understanding of (KA)s Academic Plan.

Native Hawaiian children learn, connect, and retain knowledge more effectively when the material is culturally meaningful and relevant to their own lives and experiences (Kaiwi & Kahumoku, 2006; Kanaʻiaupuni et al., 2011; Kawakami & Aton, 2001). Kanaʻiaupuni and Kawaiʻaeʻa (2008) defined culture most simply as shared ways of being, knowing, and doing, in this case Hawaiian indigenous culture. KA has a threefold mission to prepare its students for graduation: 1) to build a strong foundation in self and place through the languages and traditions of Hawaii; 2) to achieve rigorous academic requirements; and 3) to engage with community members to fully prepare for careers and college.

The curriculum will be organized from several major culture-based frameworks that were developed by Native Hawaiian scholars, educators and elders. They are 1) Papaku Makawalu (University of Hawaii, Hawaii Community College/Edith Kanakaole Foundation); 2) Na Honua Maoli Ola, University of Hawaii, Hilo, Ka Haka Ula Ke`elikolani College, Native Hawaiian Education Council, Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Kamehameha Schools, and the Hawaii State Department of Education. Ho'opena A'o was added because of Board of Ed Policy 4000.

A standards-based system of experts form the physical, intellectual and spiritual foundations from which life cycles emerge as the Hawaiian worldview. The pedagogy of categorizing and organizing and combining the natural world into three houses of knowledge is called Papakū Makawalu and are foundations for understanding all existence and our place in it: Papakū Makawalu is a methodical presentation of a holistic preview of the Hawaiian universe.

1. Papahulilani is the space from above the head, spaces of the atmosphere and experts who are spiritually, physically, and intellectually attuned to the space above and its relationship to earth. (heavens)
2. Papahulihonua is inclusive of earth and ocean evolution by natural causes and experts who are spiritually, physically, and intellectually attuned to this earth and its relationship to the space above and the life forms on it. (lands)
3. Papahānaumoku moves from the embryonic state of all life forces to death. The birthing cycle of all flora and fauna inclusive of man; the process of investigating, questioning, analyzing and reflecting upon all things that give birth, regenerate and procreate. It is spiritually, physically and intellectually attuned to things born and the habitat that provides their nourishment, shelter, and growth. (http://www.edithkanakaolefoundation.org/current-projects/papaku-makawalu/)

Nä Honua Mauli Ola, Hawaiian Cultural Pathways for Healthy and Responsive Learning Environments, These cultural guidelines foster a student-oriented, culturally-relevant environment, grounded in the indigenous philosophy, language, and teachings of Hawaiian elders. There are nine cultural pathways designed for student success in school and lifetimes.

ʻIke Pilina Relationship Pathway: We envision generations that have respectful, responsible and strong relationships in service to akua, ʻäina and each other. Nurturing respectful and responsible relationships that connect us to akua, ʻäina and each other through the sharing of history, genealogy, language and culture.

ʻIke ʻÖlelo Language Pathway: We envision generations of literate and eloquent Hawaiian language speakers. Using Hawaiian language to ground personal connections to Hawaiian culture, history, values and spirituality and to perpetuate indigenous ways of knowing and sharing.

ʻIke Mauli Lähui Cultural Identity Pathway: We envision generations who walk into the future with confidence in their cultural identity and a commitment of service to akua, ʻäina, and each other. Perpetuating Native Hawaiian cultural identity through practices that strengthen

knowledge of language, culture and genealogical connections to akua, ʻäina and kanaka.

ʻIke Ola Pono Wellness Pathway: We envision generations who lead vibrant, healthy and happy lives as contributors to family and community. Caring for the wellbeing of the spirit, na'au and body through culturally respectful ways that strengthen one's mauli and build responsibility for healthy lifestyles.

ʻIke Pikoʻu Personal Connection Pathway: We envision generations whose actions reflect personal identity that is küpono. Promoting personal growth, development and self-worth to support a greater sense of belonging, compassion and service toward one's self, family and community.

ʻIke Naʻauao Intellectual Pathway: We envision generations fostering the cycle of joyous learning through curiosity, inquiry, experience and mentorship. Fostering lifelong learning, curiosity and inquiry to nurture the innate desire to share knowledge and wisdom with others

ʻIke Hoʻokö Applied Achievement Pathway: We envision generations who demonstrate academic, social and cultural excellence that supports families, communities and future generations. Helping generations attain academic, social and cultural excellence through a supportive environment of high expectations.

ʻIke Honua Sense of Place Pathway: We envision generations who accept kuleana for our honua. Demonstrating a strong sense of place, including a commitment to preserve the delicate balance of life and protect it for generations to come

ʻIke Kuana ʻIke Worldview Pathway: We envision generations who flourish and inspire local and global communities through a culturally Hawaiian perspective that honors all things—past, present and future. Providing a solid grounding in the Hawaiian worldview that promotes contributions to local and global communities.

(nhec.org)

English Language Arts and Mathematics outcomes are drawn from Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Science outcomes are guided by the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS. Social Studies outcomes are aligned to the College, Career, and Civic Life Framework for Social Studies (3C), and Fine Arts outcomes align with the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS). Ongoing assessments, data analyses, computer software applications will monitor student growth and improvement throughout the school year.

These global perspectives are integrated with Aloha Aina (love of our lands), and Kapu Aloha (a discipline of compassion on all to express aloha).

KA proposes to develop a school that serves at-risk youth in Kapaa, Kauai in a small, personalized environment. KA is designed to be a creative cultural Arts and Sciences academy engaging students in authentic academic experiences grounded in the values and traditions of Hawaii.

Section II.B: Curriculum and Instructional Design
Criterion II.B.1

- This section contains a sample curriculum overview including courses for grade 6 only.

MIDDLE SCHOOL CULTURE-BASED SCIENCE AND ARTS INTEGRATION
In the FINE ARTS (NCAS), Middle School (grade 6 sample), students will:

- Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural, historical context (pre-contact, contact, statehood, nation building).
- Generate and conceptualize artistic ideas and work (context, place, lineage, storytelling, relationships).
- Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work. (artist in school)
- Convey meaning through the presentation of artistic work (exhibit presentations).
- Apply criteria to evaluate artistic work. (evaluation rubric)

GRADE 6 – ENGLISH.

- Integrate knowledge and ideas from literature, informational text, and interviews.

- Cite evidence to determine key ideas and details in both literature and informational text.
- Analyze elements of craft and structure in both literature and informational text.
- Conduct research to build and present knowledge.
- Discuss a range of grade 6 topics and texts with their peers with comprehension.
- Present knowledge and ideas with multimedia components.
- Use knowledge of language and its conventions when writing, speaking, reading or listening.

GRADE 6 – MATH

In Mathematic (CCSS-MA) content, grade 6 students will:

- Understand ratio concepts and use ratio reasoning to solve problems.
- Apply previous understandings of multiplication and division to divide fractions by fractions.
- Multiply and divide multi-digit numbers and find common factors and multiples.
- Apply and extend previous understandings of numbers to the system of rational numbers.
- Apply and extend previous understandings of arithmetic to algebraic expressions.
- Solve real-world and mathematical problems involving area, surface area, and volume.
- Summarize and describe distributions.

MIDDLE SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES ELECTIVES

In Civics (C3), Middle School (grades 6) students will:

- Explain how experts view compelling and supporting questions.
- Determine sources that will provide multiple perspectives in response to questions.
- Explain the roles of civic and political institutions.
- Analyze principle of civic virtues and democratic principles.
- Assess processes, rules and laws.
- Evaluate possible causes and effects.
- Analyze procedures for making decisions and taking action.

In Economics (C3), Middle School (grades 6) students will:

- Determine sources that will provide multiple perspectives in response to questions.
- Explain economic decision-making.
- Analyze dynamics of exchange markets.
- Explain and evaluate dynamics of the national economy.
- Explain dynamics of a global economy.
- Evaluate possible causes and effects.
- Analyze procedures for making decisions and taking action.

In Geography (C3), Middle School (grade 6) students will:

- Construct and use geographic representations, or spatial views of the world
- Evaluate human-environment interactions of place, region and culture.
- Explain global interconnections.
- Evaluate information provided by multiple sources.
- Construct and adapt arguments using claims and counterclaims.
- Critique arguments for credibility.
- Analyze procedures for making decisions and taking action.

In History of the Pacific (C3), Middle School (grade 6) students will:

- Analyze historical change, continuity and context.
- Analyze diverse historical perspectives.
- Evaluate possible causes and effects.
- Evaluate information provided by multiple sources.
- Critique arguments for credibility.
- Analyze procedures for making decisions and taking action.

2. A clear description of the rigorous academic standards that will be

English LA and Math Common Core standards are listed for grade levels 6-12, in **Criterion II.B.2.** - The outcomes are all students will meet the standards for course requirements as measured by the. An in-depth description of standards, assessments and course requirements for all other courses are *currently under development by the education team.* A sample of the

instructional methods with assessment strategies is presented in **Attachment D Map**- a core framework design for the arts/science/social studies curriculum currently in use by Kaiaulu to be adapted for Kilohana Academy.

- The Board of Directors and the authors of this document where misinformed regarding the GED testing opportunity for graduation and have since removed it from our copy of the application.

C**riterion** II.B.2

- Kilohana follows the Common Core standards for Language Arts and Mathematics; as provided by the DOE; and Hawaii Content and Performance Standards II for all other courses, listed by ACCN code in section **II.B.1** as applicable on the standards toolkit site.
- These standards were chosen because they are in alignment with the DOE standards for academic success and that is core to the academic plan. At Kilohana we believe we can meet these requirements and achieve our unique community goals.
- An in-depth description of standards, assessments and course requirements for all other courses are *currently under development by the education team.*

Criterion II.B.3

- English LA materials will be chosen by the HQ teacher when hired.
- Math materials include ALEKS online math curriculum; hands on project based math curriculum will be relevant to school projects.
- Kilohana is a place based, project based learning experience and therefore materials are relevant and current and different in each learning environment.
  Examples of materials that are relevant and current, can be found at:
  - **Academic Overview II. A. 1**. Kealia Farms - Farm to Market to table, Kealia Kai- Coastline resource management. Wailua Smiths Boats- Tourism, property management, river resource management. Fred Aki- Entertainment industry
  - **Attachment D Map**- Kaiaulu is tasked by the County of Kauai in conjunction with a NOAA grant to create a traditional coastline management plan. This requires great observation and research. The final product being informational public meetings, Public Service Announcements, and a Hard Copy Color Hawaiian Moon Calendars available for distribution.

Criterion II.B.4

- Kilohana Academy Academic goals can be found in its mission summarized here: Kilohana Academy has a threefold mission to prepare its students for graduation: to build a strong foundation in self and place through the language and traditions of Hawaii; achieve rigorous academic requirements; and engage with community mentors to fully prepare for careers and college.
- Kilohana teaching/mentoring team together with students and cohorts parents and community, assess individual student, group and school progress.
- Student graduation rates, college and trade school entrance and completion rates, student and community satisfaction, student employment and job satisfaction all measure progress towards goals.
- *Other assessment to indicate school progress are under development.*

Criterion II.B.5

- Instructional leaders and teachers meet weekly to review student data, with students, to reflect on strategies and student progress. This is a formalized and critical component to enable teachers to reflect on student progress and adjust their instruction accordingly.
- In using the ILP process, weekly collaboration and communication between student, teachers, mentors, and lead teacher occur to plan, implement and evaluate each goal in the ILP. Careful review of goals and assessment of progress occur in these collaborations.

Criterion II.B.6

- During the ILP process students are assessed for ability, skills and interests. These are outlined and combined with student's academic, career and personal goals.
- In the ILP an academic plan is created and visited weekly. Student achievement of standards and assignments are documented and inventoried towards overall academic and career goals. Students are rewarded for meeting standards and ILP goals.

- All students want to succeed and desire to fulfill their ILPs. **Students not able to fulfill requirements will be given more time. Students still struggling will receive additional services and ass**essments. Parent and Teacher meeting will be scheduled. will communicate this in the ILP, which then may be adjusted to serve the students personal goals.
- Research shows that at-risk students thrive when given respect and acknowledgment of their ability to guide their future.
- Other interventions and modifications can be recommended or to be developed by SPED teacher.

Criterion II.B.7

- Graduate candidates are requested to:
  - achieve a BOE Diploma and to meet all BOE's graduation requirements, referenced Policy 4540,
  - maintain a GPA of 3.0 or better.
  - be actively engaged in their desired career field. (20 hours a week)
  - present Noeau, or artistic interest.
  - engage in community service. (4+) hours a week

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

- Kilohana will not have any virtual or blended learning programs.

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

Criterion II.C.1

- Kilohana anticipates a high number of students enrolling who are Native Hawaiian and considered at-risk, based on factors of poverty and disadvantaged family life. The curriculum is designed to serve this unique population
- Kilohana Academy's Philosophy stem comes from traditional values and Kapu Aloha. Some students are from special populations and are at risk. Their needs are considered, as are strengths, interests and goals and these are incorporated into the ILP or IEP.
- In using the ILP process, weekly collaboration and communication between student, teachers, mentors, and lead teacher occur to plan, implement and evaluate each goal in the ILP/IEP. Careful review of goals and assessment of progress occur in these collaborations.
- Kilohana will employ an HQ SPED teacher to guide the curriculum and the weekly collaboration team appropriately, regarding students who qualify under IEP and 504.

Criterion II.C.2

- Given the socioeconomic demographic of Kapaa, Kauai, we anticipate that our average student will come from a multicultural home; Native Hawaiian, mixed with Asian, Polynesian, Caucasian, and or Hispanic bloodlines; with a median family income of $53,000.
- The SPED Teacher insures modifications are met through the IEP.
- All other students are in an ILP.

Criterion II.C.3

- Students who are performing at grade level may have their ILP adjusted to a provide differentiated instruction.
- Kilohana is a place based, project based learning curriculum that lends itself to students who learn better in this type of environment. Students not able to fulfill requirements will be given more time and support. Students still struggling will communicate their reflections in the ILP; which will initiate accommodations to help referrals for services including diagnostic assessments.

Criterion II.C.4

Strengths:

- Students who are performing above grade level may have their ILP adjusted to a more challenging level or areas including early college.

Section II.D: School Culture

Criterion II.D.1- Aloha Aina, Kapu Aloha are the school culture.

- From **Section II. A:** Instructional methods: Hawaiian Values Curriculum Aloha Aina, Kapu Aloha
    - Kanahele, Kanahele, Kameelehiwa, Meyer
- Kilohana Academy is a place-based project-based learning environment. All learning experiences on campus, at learning sites, at mentoring job sites, are subject to school rules, Aloha Aina, Kapu Aloha. Aloha Aina, Kapu Aloha is a practice, it is a discipline. Everyone and everything are treated with respect and appreciation. All students and teachers demonstrate their understanding of this value, at all times.
- Na Hopena A'o (or HA), is a new initiative approved by the Board of Education Policy 4000. HA is the breadth of life-long learning outcomes for all of us, as students of Hawai'i, to believe, understand, model and become. What makes Hawai'i – a place unlike anywhere else – are the unique values and qualities of the indigenous language and culture. 'O Hawai'i ke kahua o ka ho'ona'auao. Hawai'i is the foundation of our learning. Thus the following learning outcomes, Nā Hopena A'o, are rooted in Hawai'i, and we become a reflection of this special place.

There are six learning outcomes that include application and creation of knowledge, develop important skills and dispositions.

- Strengthened Sense of Belonging. Every student stands firm in his/her space with a strong foundation of relationships. A sense of Belonging is demonstrated through an understanding of lineage and place and a connection to past, present, and future: *He pili wehena 'ole,* A relationship that cannot be undone.*
- Strengthened Sense of Responsibility. Every student willingly carries his or her responsibility and is inspired to care about the quality of his/her work. A sense of Excellence is demonstrated for self, family, community and the larger society. A sense of Responsibility is demonstrated by a commitment and concern for others. *Ma ka hana ka 'ike, ma ka 'imi ka loa'a * In working one learns, through initiative one acquires.*
- Strengthened Sense of Excellence. Every student believes s/he can succeed in school and life by a love of learning and the pursuit of skills, knowledge and behaviors to reach his or her potential. *'A'ohe 'ulu e loa'a i ka pōkole o ka lou,* (*There is no success without preparation)*
- Strengthened Sense of Aloha. Every student shows care and respect for his/her self, families, and communities. A sense of Aloha is demonstrated through empathy and appreciation for the symbiotic relationship between all. *Strengthened Sense of po'okela iho nō. Aloha E 'ōpū ali'i *(Have the heart of a chief)*
- Strengthened Sense of Total Well-being. Every student learns about and practices a healthy lifestyle. A sense of Total Well-being is demonstrated by making choices that improve the mind, body, heart and spirit. *Ua ola loko i ke aloha * (Love is imperative to one's mental and physical welfare).*
- Strengthened Sense of Hawai'i. Every student is enriched by the unique of this prized place. A Sense of Hawaii is demonstrated thorough an appreciation for its rich history, diversity and indigenous language and culture. *'O Hawai'i ku'u 'āina kilohana ** (*Hawai'i is my prized place).*

Hopena A'o is aligned to Na Honua Maoli Ola pathways and cross sections with Papaku Makawalu can help the teacher to plan lessons as a foundational framework.

Criterion II.D.2 - The applicant intends to have multiple group sessions where everyone gathers together as well as weekly meetings with individuals to discuss the individual learning plans.
Criterion II.D.3 - Examples of the plan to intentionally expose students to post-secondary educational and career opportunities at all grade levels can be found at:

- **Academic Overview II. A. 1**. Kealia Farms - Farm to Market to table, Kealia Kai- Coastline resource management. Wailua Smiths Boats- Tourism, property management, river resource management. Fred Aki- Entertainment industry
- **Attachment D Map**- Kaiaulu is tasked by the County of Kauai in conjunction with a NOAA grant to create a traditional coastline management plan. This requires great observation and research. The final product being informational public meetings,

Public Service Announcements, and a Hard Copy Color Hawaiian Moon Calendars available for distribution.

Criterion II.D.4 - The applicant provided a short class schedule and this will be the same every day for the first year.

Criterion II.D.5 - Aloha Aina, Kapu Aloha are the school culture and guides to the pono answer.

- From **Section II. A:** Instructional methods: Hawaiian Values Curriculum Aloha Aina, Kapu Aloha
  - Kanahele, Kanahele, Kameelehiwa, Meyer
- Kilohana Academy is a place-based project-based learning environment. All learning experiences on campus, at learning sites, at mentoring job sites, are subject to school rules, Aloha Aina, Kapu Aloha. Everyone and everything is treated with respect and appreciation. All students and teachers demonstrate their understanding of this value, at all times.
- Academic probation may be enforced for consistent infraction of the ILP.
- Kilohana Academy follows all Chapter 19 rules.

Section II.E: Professional Culture and Staffing

Criterion II.E.1.a

- The Administration, staff, and mentoring community of Kilohana Academy are residents and longtime visitors of Hawaii. They have the same vision of sharing the culture and values of Hawaii and the knowledge and experiences they have had. Everyone is dedicated to Kapu Aloha and Aloha Aina at Kilohana.
- Weekly, quarterly and yearly gatherings of staff and community stakeholders promote the foundational mission as it provides a foundation for innovation.
- Student graduation rates, college and trade school entrance and completion rates, student and community satisfaction, student employment and job satisfaction all measure progress towards goals.

Criterion II.E.1.b

- Use known teaching methods that are successful in working with students who have academic challenges,
- Work with non-profit to identify resources in the community to help students with academic challenges (Kumon through partnership at The Boys & Girls Club),
- Work with administration to get teachers training in teaching methodologies & other support trainings, teachers need to be affective in class,
- Work with parents to create appropriate study environment & ask parents to also receive training in how to work with their children who may be academically challenged,

Criterion II.E.1.c

- A description of a teacher's typical school day is provided as **Attachment F**.

Criterion II.E.2.a

- Kilohana will use the standard BOE evaluation criteria that meets both HGEA and HSTA collective bargaining contract agreements. A portfolio is not meant to replace the standard evaluation as part of the collective bargaining unit, but meant to as a supplement to current evaluation methods. It is a qualitative measurement that is meant for teachers to provide examples of their work, expand on teaching philosophies, assessments they use in class, provide evidence of professional growth, and meant to be a learning experience for the entire school community.

Criterion II.E.2.b

- The applicant intends to have quarterly team building experiences.
- Training be conducted during the induction period in Kilohana Philosophy and Mission, ILP curriculum and assessment strategies.

Criterion II.E.2.c

- The applicant intends to have multiple opportunities for professional development, including daily and weekly. Kilohana will follow the requirements of collective bargaining agreements.

Criterion II.E.2.d

- The applicant identified the co-directors as the individuals responsible for professional development needs. Professional Development will be done in consultation with teachers and administration and the on-going needs of the student, the learning community, and staff. Kilohana will also conduct surveys with teachers and the learning community (local board, committees) to assist with making decisions about on-going professional development needs.

Criterion II.E.3.a - The staffing plan aligns with the proposed budget and Kilohana will ensure that directors and staff meet federally highly qualified requirements in the areas they teach.
Criterion II.E.3.b - The applicant has set a ratio of 1 teacher to 15 students. All the mentors and community scholars will be volunteers.
Criterion II.E.3.c - T Section II.E.3.a – Both Co Directors are Highly Qualified Hawaii State Licensed teachers. Also, the staffing plan includes an IT position to assist with the school's technology needs. There is no virtual or blended learning environment.
Criterion II.E.4.a - Kilohana Academy will recruit teachers through advertisements on Craigslist, Facebook and in The Local Newspapers. We will also partner with the University of Hawaii to solicit recent graduates. For our first school year, Kilohana has commitments from two teachers plus the two Co-Directors. All compensation and benefits will be in line with the current Collective Bargaining contract with HSTA.

Criterion II.E.4.b - Kilohana Academy will recruit teachers through advertisements on Craigslist, Facebook and in The Local Newspapers. We will also partner with the University of Hawaii to solicit recent graduates. For our first school year, Kilohana has commitments from two teachers plus the two Co-Directors. All compensation and benefits will be in line with the current Collective Bargaining contract with HSTA.

Criterion II.E.4.c - All employees will need to pass a criminal background check and be finger printed. All hiring will be done through a two tier interview process with the Co-Directors and other teachers. Any discipline/dismissal of an employee will be done as stated in the current Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Criterion II.E.4.d - Kilohana will use the standard evaluation in place and that follows the collective bargaining unit. A portfolio system will be used as a supplement to the standard evaluation, but will be done in consultation with HSTA and other applicable unions.

Criterion II.E.4.f = Not applicable

Section III.B Performance Management

Criterion III.B.2 STU - The business manager is identified as the person responsible for the financial information and data. Financial oversight is performed by the Business Manager. The Business Manager reports to one of the Co-Directors who will review his or her work. In addition, the Governing Board Financial Committee will oversee and review the monthly financial reports, checks processed and payroll for both accuracy and inconsistancies. The Business Manager will review the financials on a monthly basis with the Governing Board.

In addition, there will be a yearly audit performed by an outside CPA that is versed in the accounting and rules for Charter Schools in Hawaii.

Criterion III.B.3 - In the Governance section of our narrative on page 32 we discuss the different committees that will be formed to create reports, make suggestions, which also includes reviewing school performance in all areas, academic, organizational, and financial. Initially when the school opens, we will have a School Leadership Team (SLT) and it is this team that will set up the process and procedures for the Organizational Performance Framework. The process and procedures will address all the areas outlined in the application which starts on page 42 and goes to page 45 in the narrative. The SLT will schedule meetings to develop process and procedures by which to capture all the necessary data to evaluate organizational performance. The process will include, but is not

limited to the following: a) identifying the data that needs to collected, b) researching the types of measurements needed to obtain the appropriate data for a report, c) create a report of recommendations for the school administration and BOD to adopt as a process, and d) if necessary work with the school to implement the plan so information about the Organizational Performance Plan can be collected in a timely manner.

Section III.H: Start-up Period - A detailed plan for the school which aligns with the Application Period and Start up Period (Year 0) with tasks, timelines, outputs, outcomes, and responsible individuals for each area. This plan is divided into four (4) Phases:

Key: IBOD = Interim Board of Directors, SCD1 = Proposed Academic Co-Director SCD2 = Proposed Community Affairs/Fundraising Co-Director, BM = Finances/Business Manager, FS = Fiscal Sponsors (The Pacific American Foundation), BOD = Board of Directors (November 2016), CV = Community Volunteers

Interim Governing Board: Kaee Ah Loo (Secretary & Academic Plan), Kamealoha Smith (Vice President & Organizational Plan), Hauoli Smith-Gurtler (President & Governing Board), Stu Rosenthal (Treasurer & Financial Plan), & Aunty Lovey Harper (Kupuna in residence, Chief cultural Advisor):

Key Step	**Tasks**	**Completion Timeline**	**Output**	**Outcomes (Impact)**	**Person Responsible**
Phase 1, Step 1: Building the Founda-tion	a. Build Team, b. Develop Mission, c. Create Work Plan d. Identify foundational partners to build capacity of school – facilities & fiscal partner to build non-profit e. Identify target community & begin community outreach with parents, community, agencies & partners, f. Complete Application Process	October 2015-August 2016	a. Interim Board in place b. Mission/Vision Statement Complete, c. Work Plan Created & Implemented d. Partners Identified – PAF as fiscal sponsor, Kapa'a Boys & Girls Club as facilities partner. e. Target Community identified & described in Academic Plan and Executive Summary, -Three (3) Community Meetings held to introduce proposed school, and	1. We identified a gap group of students currently not being serviced in our community. This helped to build the foundational academic plan for the school. 2. We secured an MOU with Boys & Girls Club for facilities & the Pacific American Foundation as our fiscal sponsor to host our grants during the start-up period. 2. We secured a commitment	a., b., & c., = IBOD d. = SD2 e. = SDI for Academic Plan & IBOD for Community Meetings f. = IBOD

			gather input from community, agencies, and partners, f. Completed application.	agencies and parents to attend application and enrollment meetings upon securing an authorized charter.	
Phase 2: Budget & School Design	a. Revise application, b. Build relationship with community, c. Build relationship with existing partners, d. Student, Teacher Recruitment Strategies, e. Identify Curriculum Materials, f. Begin to fundraise for capacity building,	March 2016-August 2017 (on-going until school opens)	a. Application revisions are on-going until August 2016, b. & c. Building relationships with community & existing partners is on-going through personal meetings, d. Recruitment Strategies are currently being discussed at meetings, e. Curriculum is identified as reflected in the Academic Plan, f. Fundraising strategies identified,	1. We turned in all application revisions & are working on last written response as of July 1, 2016, 2. We continue to secure partners to assist with academic plan and curriculum, 3. We are currently assessing recruitment strategies, -Curriculum is set but currently making revisions for Charter School, 4. Fundraising efforts for capacity building are currently under way through grant writing & creating revenue generating centers.	a. IBOD b. SCD2 c. SCD2 d. IBOD e. SCD1 with input from IBOD, f. SCD2 with input from IBOD

Phase 3 Authorization	a. Community Engagement, b. Present at Community Meetings, c. Develop Board, d. Professional Development for Board & Volunteers, e. Fundraise to build capacity – school supplies, equipment, facilities, professional development, & other costs during Year 0,	August 2017-July 2018 (school opening)	a. Implement community meetings to market school, b. Implement Community meetings and other strategies to recruit students & staff, c. Recruit up to seven members for local school board, d. Implement professional development training for board & volunteer committees, e. Implement fundraising strategies to raise funds for building capacity for Year 0.	1. We have a marketing & student recruitment plan in place that is appropriate for the community we serve, 2. We recruit members & put 7 members in place by November 2016. Members will help to forward the mission of the school as outlined in the governance section of our narrative, 3. We provide appropriate training that will help forward the mission of the school & is in line with other state & federal requirements, 4. We leverage resources we currently have to engage funders that can contribute to building capacity.	a. IBOD & SCD2 b. IBOD & SCD1 c. IBOD & SCD2 d. SCD1 with input from IBOD, e. SCD2 with input from BM & IBOD
Phase 4 Year 0: Finances	a. Fiscal Policies & Procedures, b. Develop Budget for FY 2017-2018 c. Accounting System &	a. & b. – August 2016 – December 2016, c. & d. – August	a. Fiscal Policies & Procedures manual and training complete, b. Budget for	1. The BM & SD1 will make presentations to BOD for input & approval as	a. through d., BM, SD1 with BOD providing input & approval as

	Financial Systems, d. Payroll Systems,	2016 – May 2017	FY 2017-18 complete, c. & d., Accounting & Payroll Systems training is complete,	necessary for a. through d. 2. All systems & procedures will be implemented on or before May 2017	necessary. FS will be contracted to provide training & assist with developing manual.
Phase 4 Year 0: Recruitment	a. Website & other Marketing Materials, b. Community Events, c. Open House & Orientation for Students/Parents,	a. through c. September 2016-July 2017 (school opening on August 1, 2017)	a. Website will be designed & put online by September 2016, marketing materials will be ready as well, b. Community Events will begin October 2016 at selected community events, c. Open House will start in December 2016 and go through March 2017, Orientation for Students/Parents will begin in April 2017	1. Student acceptance letters will go out by end of May 2017, a final orientation will occur prior to the opening of school for 45 students in FY 2017-18, students who did not get accepted will notified and placed on waitlist.	a. through c., SD1 with input & help from BOD & CV.
Phase 4 Year 0: Staffing, HR, Professional Development, & Academic Curriculum	a. Recruit Co-directors, b. Recruit School Staff, c. Finalize handbook & personnel procedures, d. Interview & Hire Staff, e. Mandatory Background Checks (after conditional offer), f. Professional Staff Development	a. through g. January 2017 – July 2017 (school opening on August 1, 2017)	a. & b. – Recruitment starts on January 2017 and is complete by March 2017, c. – Procedures & Manual are complete by May 2017, d. Staff is hired by April 2017, e. Background check is	1. All staff will be in place by May 2017 and they will be required to go through professional development in all aspects of school capacity.	a. through g. will be led by SCD1 with assistance from CV and BM.

	g. Curriculum Map & Project Plans		complete by May 2017, f. Professional Development Starts in May 2017 and is complete by July 2017, g. Curriculum Map & Project Plans starts in May 2017 & is complete by July 2017		

Phase 4, Year 0: Operations, Academics, Technology,	a. Obtain student records, permissions from parents, and make contact with other schools, b. Research & secure intervention resources, c. Research & secure standardized assessments, d. Research & Secure Technology Infrastructure, e. Research & Secure Food Service Options, f. Research & report out to parent's transportation options, g. Secure Student IEP's, h. Research & create Safety Plan, i. Secure ESIS system & train j. Create & handout student handbook	a. through i. will all start in January 2017 and will go through July 2017	a. Student records, permissions, & contact with other school will be done by July 2017, b. through f., All Research & Resources will be done by July 2017, g. Student IEP's will start being collected in May 2017 & secured by July 2017, h. Safety plan draft will start in March 2017 and be implemented by July 2017, i. ESIS (or updated version of this plan) will be secured by May 2017 and everyone will be trained by July 2017, j. Handbook will be created by May 2017 and handed out at orientation in July 2017.	1. We will be fully engaged in interacting with the Department of Education & other agencies as necessary to get school Operations, Academics, and Technology Infrastructure ready to go by July 2017, 2. All trainings will be done for staff, administration, and others as outlined in this plan, 3. All parent necessary initial mandatory communications with parents will be done by July 2017.	a. through i. will involve SCD1, BM, with assistance from CV, SCD2, and when necessary will also include BOD.

Section IV.B.1 – Operating Budget – The Contingency Plan was discussed during the Evaluation Interview process. When asked by the evaluators, I responded that if our Enrollment was below the expected 45 students, the Co-Directors had agreed to take a pay cut based on the shortfall. Example, if we only have 43 students, the directors would reduce their salaries by the "per pupil State funding", so if the per pupil is $7,000 in this case each Co-Director would take a $7,000 pay cut, totaling $14,000 which would be the revenue shortfall.

Section V. A: Academic Plan Capacity

Criterion V.A.1., Criterion V.A.2, Criterion V.A.3, Criterion V.A.4, & Criterion V.A.5, - KAEE, Reiterate strengths of Academic Plan

- Our nonprofit sponsor Kaiaulu, intends to assist the team with training in performance management, curriculum planning, instruction and assessment.
-

Criterion V.B: Organizational Plan Capacity

Criterion V.B.1 After responding to all the comments in the other sections the interim board believes we are able to open up a high quality charter school that exceeds the standards of the charter school commission. Equally important it is a school that meets the needs of the student population and community we intend to serve on Kauai. Examples of our organizational capacity include having a facility, an interim board and plan to transition to a local school board, a sound financial plan, a curriculum founded in the Hawaiian values Kapu Aloha and Aloha Aina, a successful community-based non-profit and fiscal sponsor with years of experience building capacity, writing grants, and pulling resources together to enhance professional development, curriculum development, and academic achievement. Also included as part of our capacity building process is a detailed start up plan. Based on a combination of these factors, Kilohana Academy feels we are more than capable of opening up our charter school on time and will be ready to go before Day 1, 2017.

Criterion V.C: Financial Management Capacity

Criterion V.C.1- The Contingency Plan was discussed during the Evaluation Interview process. When asked by the evaluators, I responded that if our Enrollment was below the expected 45 students, the Co-Directors had agreed to take a pay cut based on the shortfall. Example, if we only have 43 students, the directors would reduce their salaries by the "per pupil State funding", so if the per pupil is $7,000 in this case each Co-Director would take a $7,000 pay cut, totaling $14,000 which would be the revenue shortfall.