

DAVID Y. IGE
GOVERNOR



CATHERINE PAYNE
CHAIRPERSON

STATE OF HAWAII
STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL COMMISSION
(‘AHA KULA HO‘ĀMANA)

1111 Bishop Street, Suite 516, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel: (808) 586-3775 Fax: (808) 586-3776

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: Action on Charter School Application for DreamHouse Ewa Beach

I. DESCRIPTION

Recommendation that the Committee recommend to the full Commission that it deny the charter school application for DreamHouse Ewa Beach.

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: DreamHouse Ewa Beach

Mission: “Our Mission is to empower children to be affirmed in their identities, grounded in and committed to the values of our community, and equipped with skills to be leaders. We believe in children driving change, and doing so in a way that they know who they are, what they stand for, and how they will have a positive impact on our community.”

Vision: “Affirmed in identity, empowered in leadership, our graduates will be the future leaders of our island community.”

Geographical Area: DreamHouse Ewa Beach is proposing that they will be located in Ewa Beach. Specifically, south of Papipi Road, south of Hanakahi Street, along North Road, 'Ewa Beach Road, and Pohakupuna Road.

Program Synopsis: The DreamHouse educational model consists of four components: 1) high academic expectations; 2) 21st century skill building; 3) leadership growth; and 4) identity development in our local community and a global world. These four components are combined to create the DreamHouse Matrix, a guiding pedagogical framework applied to the school's instructional design, student learning, and overall classroom design.

Inquiry-driven instruction with the student at the experiential center of learning will leverage the teacher as a facilitator and supporter in knowledge and skill building through frames of leadership, identity, and community, and will serve as a consistent thread between content and grades. Strategies for assessment take micro and macro approaches at student learning, progress, and data-driven instruction. Assessments will be generated by curriculum and teachers, linked to standards, and will allow for pre-, during-, and post-unit analysis.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1 2017		Year 2 2018		Year 3 2019		Year 4 2020		Year 5 2021		Capacity 2023	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K												
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6	100		100		100		100		100		100	
7			100		100		100		100		100	
8					100		100		100		100	
9							100		100		100	
10									100		100	
11											100	
12											100	
Subtotals	100		200		300		400		500		700	
Totals	100		200		300		400		500		700	

IV. BACKGROUND

The Evaluation Team assigned to the DreamHouse Ewa Beach (DreamHouse) application was comprised of Danny Vasconcellos Jr., Beth Bulgeron, Ben Cronkright, and Jeff Poentis. In conjunction with the application, the Evaluation Team interviewed applicant group members and reviewed the applicant's responses to the Request for Clarification. The applicant group members that attended the interview were Alex Teece, Lissette Roman, Deborah Zvercher and Zachary Dilonno.

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 opted not to write a rebuttal to that response. The Recommendation Report (**Exhibit A**), and Applicant Response (**Exhibit B**) make up the Recommendation Packet.

In addition, the Commission held a public hearing on the application on May 12, 2016. State Senator Will Espero, State Representative Takashi Ohno, State Representative Jarrett Keohokalole, State Representative Matthew LoPresti and twenty-one individuals submitted written testimony in support of DreamHouse. Four applicant group members and one concerned individual provided oral testimony in support of DreamHouse.

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

Final Application Recommendation Report

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for the DreamHouse be denied since it failed to meet the standard in three of the four core areas of the application. The Recommendation Report states that the academic plan, financial plan, and evidence of capacity did not meet the standard for approval.

The report finds that the academic plan does not meet the standard since it does not adequately describe a potential plan for student learning. The Evaluation Team notes that plan uses academic jargon but does not detail how its broad ideas will translate into a viable curriculum. Among the key concerns about the academic plan were:

- The applicant’s responses related curriculum and instructional design are undeveloped;
- Course outcomes are vague and does not provide details on how they will be achieved;
- The applicant’s response related to standards based curriculum demonstrate a lack of preparation in that a rationale for their choice of standards was not provided. Instead, responses to questions relating to standards were cut and pasted from the Common Core Standards Toolkit online resources; and
- The academic plan represents a model borrowed from DOE schools and the only innovative aspects of the academic plan (the DreamHouse matrix) are broadly defined and lack a clear plan for implementation or evaluation.

The report notes that the application meets the standard for the organizational plan and that it reflects a “well-developed and foundationally strong governance structure.” Highlights regarding the organizational plan were:

- The governance philosophy captured the board’s desire to provide resources, thought partnership, strategic support, and its responsibility to provide oversight and be held accountable; and
- The applicant provides a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound plan for identifying, securing, renovating, and a financing a facility.

The report notes that the application does not meet the standard for the financial plan because the budget that was presented was not complete, realistic, or viable. The Evaluation Team found that

the applicant omitted and miscalculated information in the financial materials that were submitted which resulted in a \$1.3 million discrepancy in operational expenses and in the cash that was to be used for operational activities. When given the opportunity to address this issue in the capacity interview, the applicant team was unaware of the issue and was not able to explain why it occurred. Also, in the request for clarification, the applicant did not provide the Evaluation Team with any other documents or details related to the \$1.3 million discrepancy that was noted. Because of this, the Evaluation Team could not rely on the financial reports that were submitted to provide a clear understanding of the applicant's budget.

The report found that the applicant does not meet the standard for evidence of capacity. The academic plan suggests a lack of experience in developing and implementing a viable curricular model and school-wide practices. There were also additional concerns related to the financial capacity in that the Evaluation Team was not able to verify that it had a viable budget.

Applicant Response.

The Applicant Response attempts to clarify key concerns brought forth in the Recommendation Report relating to its instructional strategies not being explained, the course learning outcomes needing clarification, and its budget.

In regard to the academic plan concerns, the response:

- Explains that it has listed instructional strategies such as "active learning" in its application;
- Did not refute that it had cut and pasted from online materials, stating on page four of their response, "synthesized and cited from Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards toolkits is the applicant's rationale of the inclusion of these standards." and
- States that its "academic targets are complex-aligned to support collaboration and inter-school innovation while speaking the same language and being held to the same metrics" as DOE schools.

In regard to the financial plan concerns, the response:

- Suggest that the budget discrepancy noted in the Recommendation Report is the result of misinterpreting the instructions on the cash flow section of the financial workbook template. The applicant understood the instruction to mean that "not every expense was required to be listed from corresponding budget tabs." As a result, some expenses appeared in its budget, but not in its cash flow.

In regard to the capacity concerns, the response:

- Suggests that the applicant has the capacity to open a charter school based on the combined background and experience of the founding board who will be comprised of members of the applicant team.

Evaluation Team Rebuttal.

The Evaluation Team opted against presenting a rebuttal to the Applicant 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.

The report finds that the academic plan does not meet the standard since it does not adequately describe a potential plan for student learning. The Evaluation Team notes that plan uses academic jargon but does not detail how its broad ideas will translate into a viable curriculum. Essentially, there isn't enough information that described how the Applicant will implement the pieces of their plan. While the Applicant's academic model closely resembles the DOE's practices and curriculum with the addition of the DreamHouse matrix, the DreamHouse matrix is only described in broad strokes and lacks detail and a plan for implementation. This evidences that the Academic Plan isn't integrated and cohesive in its design at this point in time.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

The Organization Plan met standard.

The report notes that the application meets the standard for the organizational plan and that it reflects a "well-developed and foundationally strong governance structure." The Applicant has done considerable work on the Organizational Plan and met standard in every section.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

The Financial Plan did not meet the standard.

The report notes that the application does not meet the standard for the financial plan because the budget that was presented was not complete, realistic, or viable. Due to omissions by the Applicant, the Evaluation Team was not able to fully assess and get a clear understanding of the applicant's budget. In the Applicant's rebuttal, they offer the information that should have been presented as a follow up to the capacity interviews regarding their budget in the Request for Clarification. Unfortunately, it cannot be considered at this point.

Staff concurs with the Evaluation Team's findings.

The Evidence of Capacity does not meet standard.

The Evaluation Team found that the Applicant did not meet the standard for evidence of capacity. Overall, the Applicant presented an Academic and Financial Plan that was not ready to be implemented and requires further work. While DreamHouse has assembled individuals on their Applicant Team and governing board that have a multitude of qualifications and experiences, it is ultimately the Application that must be assessed and key sections of the Application do not evidence capacity. For this reason, the evidence of capacity does not meet standard.

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

Conclusion.

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

Staff recommends the denial of the DreamHouse Ewa Beach application.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Motion to the Commission:

"Moved to recommend to the Commission to deny the charter school application for DreamHouse Ewa Beach."

Exhibit A

Recommendation Report for DreamHouse Ewa Beach



State Public Charter School Commission 2015-2016 Recommendation Report

Charter Application for
DreamHouse Ewa Beach

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 strength(s) and weakness(es) of the proposal based on evaluation criteria.

Proposal Overview

Proposed School Name
DreamHouse, Ewa Beach

Mission and Vision

Mission: Our Mission is to empower children to be affirmed in their identities, grounded in and committed to the values of our community, and equipped with skills to be leaders. We believe in children driving change, and doing so in a way that they know who they are, what they stand for, and how they will have a positive impact on our community.

Vision: Affirmed in identity, empowered in leadership, our graduates will be the future leaders of our island community.

Geographic Location

‘Ewa Beach. Specifically, south of Papipi Road, south of Hanakahi Street, along North Road, ‘Ewa Beach Road, and Pohakupuna Road.

Anticipated Student Population

The anticipated student population will generally correlate the current demographics of the rising 6th grade class across seven feeder elementary schools in the Campbell Complex. The following data was gathered from Hawai‘i Department of Education (HIDOE) public databases, HIDOE School and System Improvement Reports, and the 2013 U.S. Census:

- Approximately 40% Filipino, 20% Native Hawaiian, 15% White, 7% Samoan, 5% Japanese, 13% additional ethnicities (Hispanic, Black, Chinese, Micronesian);
- Approximately 8% of children qualify for Special Education programming and 5% have been identified with Limited English Proficiency (Ewa Makai and Ilima Intermediate average);
- 41.3% of residents speak a language other than English at home;
- Nearly half of the 6,000 students across the seven feeder elementary schools attended prekindergarten;
- ‘Ewa Beach Quick Statistics: Median Income - \$70,000; Per Capita Income - \$20,557; 16.4% below poverty line (HI: 11.2%);
- ‘Ewa Beach community educational attainment: college graduate (21.6%), some college (38.9%), high school (30.5%), less than high school (8.8%).

Contribution to Public Education System

Of the two Priority Need areas identified by the Commission, our proposed school addresses the first need of providing additional school capacity to an area that has exceeded full enrollment capacity, especially at the secondary levels. STRIVE HI scores improved for the Campbell Complex by an average 18% from 2013-14 to 2014-15, and DreamHouse aims to contribute to this improvement narrative.

Contribution details are as follows:

Adding capacity: The Campbell-Kapolei complex is the second largest in the state with James Campbell High School being the largest high school in the state with over 3,000 students (3,024 in 15-16 SY). The proposed school would eventually serve 700 students, grades 6-12.

Adding an option: Depending on which side of Fort Weaver Road a family lives, they have one middle school option: Ilima Intermediate (Diamond Head) or Ewa Makai ('Ewa). The proposed school would serve families from either side, creating choice.

Local Control: the Hawai'i Board of Education governs each school within the Campbell Complex. The proposed school would have a community board designed to make decisions close to this school and its students.

Pedagogy: our model does not track students into "gifted and talented" or remedial programs and our Response to Intervention (RTI) model is applied to all students, regardless of identified need; we believe an integrated model with highly differentiated classroom supports and heterogeneous groupings will inspire learning and growth across sub-groups and ability levels. This is particularly important given the achievement gaps between non-high needs and various sub-groups. We offer this integrated approach up to partnership, professional learning, and scaling in the larger complex and district.

Vertical Alignment: due to our nimble size and iterative model (+100 students / year), we will a) partner with elementary schools to get ahead of anticipated needs, b) collaborate with fellow middle and high schools to develop professional learning communities and shared best practices, and c) integrate college-career programming into our model as appropriate, offering the University of Hawai'i at West O'ahu an opportunity to impact children far into their pipeline.

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Capacity	
	2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2023	
Brick & Mortar/ Blended vs. Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual	B&M/ Blended	Virtual
K												
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6	100		100		100		100		100		100	
7			100		100		100		100		100	
8					100		100		100		100	
9							100		100		100	
10									100		100	
11											100	
12											100	
Subtotals	100		200		300		400		500		700	
Totals	100		200		300		400		500		700	

Executive Summary

DreamHouse, Ewa Beach

Recommendation

Deny

Summary Analysis

The recommendation of the Evaluation Team is to deny the application for DreamHouse, Ewa Beach as the applicant failed to meet standards in three of the four core areas of the application. The Academic Plan does not meet the standard for approval because it fails to adequately describe a potential plan for student learning. The proposal uses academic jargon but does not detail how broad ideas will translate into a viable curriculum.

The Organizational Plan meets the standard as the applicant has developed a sound governance structure and philosophy, recruited governing board members with key skills that correspond to statutory guidelines, and developed a comprehensive and sound facilities plan.

The Financial Plan does not meet the standard for approval as the application does not provide a complete, realistic, and viable three-year operating budget. The applicant omitted financial information, which resulted in discrepancies in the budget.

The Evaluation Team has concerns regarding the academic and financial capacity of the applicant team. These concerns stem from the issues pertaining to the academic and financial plans.

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

Meets the Standard

Evidence of Capacity

Does Not Meet the Standard

Academic Plan

DreamHouse, Ewa Beach

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

DreamHouse proposes a school with the mission of preparing students of the Ewa Beach community to be affirmed in their identity, grounded and committed to the values of their community, and equipped with the skills to be leaders. DreamHouse proposes to increase capacity of the Campbell-Kapolei complex by eventually serving 700 students in grades 6-12. The pedagogical framework that drives the instructional model is based on the Response to Intervention or “RTI” model for providing remediation and accelerated learning opportunities.

Analysis

The application states that the core driver of the academic model for the school is the DreamHouse Matrix. “The DreamHouse educational model lives at the nexus of high academic expectations, 21st (century) skill building, leadership growth, and identity development in our local community and a global world.”

These four concepts are described in broad terms and the review team attempts to present the analysis of the proposal through the lens of these four concepts, starting with High Academic Expectations within the Curriculum and Instructional Design.

The first section of the Curriculum and Instructional Design section requires the applicant to provide a clear description of course outcomes for each course at each grade level. The response in this section does not meet the criteria in most respects, is undeveloped or significantly incomplete and raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan as well as the applicant’s capacity to carry it out.

For example, in 6th grade social studies, the course outcomes are “Historical understanding, history, political sciences and civics, cultural anthropology, geography, and economics.” This list of standard headers does not provide even a broad overview of any substantive education plan or curriculum. The lack of description does not provide the review team with any idea of what a 6th grader will be taught and expected to learn in the social studies class.

The high school course outcomes use similar broad topic headings and outcomes such as “graduates will leave us affirmed in identity and empowered in leadership.” How this outcome will be achieved is not described or developed in individual course outcomes described in this section.

Next the application asks for the proposed school to discuss the rationale for choosing each set of standards. The response in this section does not meet the criteria in any respect, demonstrates a lack of preparation and raises substantial concerns about the applicant’s ability to carry out the plan and overall understanding of standards-based curriculum, and therefore falls far below the standard.

Instead of providing a rationale for the choices of three sets of standards, the applicant merely cut and pasted from materials online protected by copyright and cited these materials in the application with the notation “*cited from the Common Core Standards Toolkit.” The cut and pasted response does not provide a rationale, instead it merely provides the publisher’s introduction and background for each set

of standards. The lack of response calls into question the applicant's understanding of the foundation of the entire academic plan.

In the area of using data, the proposal provides a clear and comprehensive description for how instructional leaders and teachers will use student data to administer, collect, and analyze the results of diagnostic, formative, benchmark and summative assessments to inform programmatic and instructional planning decision and trigger responses to intervention strategies.

However, the application should provide a clear description of instructional strategies that the proposed school will use that adequately explain how these strategies will support the mission, vision, and academic philosophy of the proposed school and are well suited to the anticipated student population. The response does not meet the criteria in most respects, is underdeveloped and demonstrates lack of preparation. The response states "content should be standards-aligned and rigorous; standards should be scaffolded and broken down for differentiation and modification if needed..." and further describes some criteria teachers should adhere to. However, the response does not list or describe any teaching methodologies and fails to describe what rigorous content looks like or how teachers will know when they have achieved the undefined level of rigor.

The lack of description of teaching methodologies also applies to how the applicant proposes to teach the 21st Century Learning and Leadership and Character skills that are part of the DreamHouse matrix. The 21st Century Learning skills are described but the strategies to teach those skills are not referenced or developed. The Leadership and Character category is described as being aligned to the Native American Community Academy integrative leadership model. There is no description of what this model is or how it will be used at the school. When the Evaluation Team consulted the Native American Community Academy website, it only describes an integrative leadership model for aspiring school leaders who are at the graduate school level. Overall, the application fails to describe how these broad elements of the matrix will be taught or evaluated within the curriculum.

In the area of School Culture, the applicant should provide a clear, coherent description of the shared beliefs; attitudes, traditions, and behaviors of the proposed school community, and a detailed plan describing how these shared beliefs, attitudes, customs, and behaviors will be developed and implemented and create a school culture that will promote high expectations. This area of the plan requires additional information in one or more areas and does not reflect a thorough understanding of key issues. While the applicant acknowledges the importance of the community values in the school culture, and the importance of building a strong culture is stated in each paragraph of this section, it lacks an overall plan for developing a strong student culture. Strategies to develop such a culture are not described in detail. Overall, the Evaluation Team was not provided with a sense of what the school's culture would feel or look like, and the application fails to articulate aspects of a school culture that would attract students to the proposed school.

Overall, when described in specificity, the academic plan represents a model borrowed almost entirely from Department of Education schools. The standards and the curriculum are in line with DOE instruction and curriculum; the RTI model is consistent with the DOE model but falls short of DOE practices in many areas. Even the academic achievement targets set by the proposed charter school are aligned with the Complex area academic targets. The only aspects of the proposed plan that could be considered innovative or original, the DreamHouse matrix, are only broadly defined and lack a clear plan for implementation or evaluation.

Organizational Plan

DreamHouse, Ewa Beach

Rating

Meets the Standard

Plan Summary

The school governing board has a governance philosophy which provides resources, thought-partnership, and strategic support, while being accountable to the goals, metrics, and success indicators of the proposed school. The philosophy further states that the board is intended to provide strategic counsel in academics, finance, and organizational compliance that is essential to the effective delivery of the school's educational program and student success.

Key components of the applicant's plan include the following:

- Utilizing existing performance measurements, such as the STRIVE HI system and the Commission's Organizational and Financial Frameworks;
- Providing school food service (as explained in the school's Request for Clarification);
- An open admissions process which allows for equal access for prospective students;
- An established non-profit, whose sole mission is to support the school through fundraising;
- A facilities plan which identifies both short and long term options in the Ewa Beach area; and
- A start-up plan which outlines an 18 month timeline that prepares for an August 2017 opening.

Analysis

The Organizational Plan meets the standard for approval as the applicant has adequately met the criteria for the various components of the organizational section. The Evaluation Team has highlighted the following items below to illustrate the adequacy of the Organizational Plan.

The applicant satisfies several key criteria in the governance section of the organizational plan which reflects a well-developed and foundationally-strong governance structure. The governance philosophy provided a clear and concise description of the proposed board's understanding of its statutory and contractual responsibilities as the philosophy captured both the board's desire to provide resources, thought-partnership, and strategic support and its responsibility to provide oversight and be held accountable.

The applicant also adequately explains how the proposed governance structure and composition ensures that the proposed school will be an academic and operational success. This is reflected in the board's committee structure which is based on the performance frameworks in the current Charter Contracts; the DreamHouse governing board will consist of academic performance, finance, and organizational governance committees. These committees are intended to not only provide oversight over each respective area but also report to the board as a whole on outcomes and goals, monitoring activities, and the viability of both the school and the board itself. For example, the specific responsibilities of the Academic Performance Committee are to: review and recommend the school's annual accountability plan for adoption; provide regular updates regarding school progress towards academic outcomes; educate other governing board members about the adopted academic goals and assessment tools and their relation to the school's mission.

The applicant identifies key skills or areas of diverse expertise that are or will be effectively represented on the proposed school governing board. Five key skill areas- academics, financial, fundraising, legal, and human resources management- are identified as needed for the optimal board composition; the applicant stated that, at no time, would the board lack at least one member for each key skill area. Four of these identified skill areas are specifically identified in the state charter school law as ideal skill sets that should be considered in the selection of charter school governing board members. Accordingly, the current applicant governing board includes individuals who have experience in the five skill areas, as corroborated by a review of applicant board members resumes and professional biographies.

In the section on geographic location and facilities, the applicant had also provides a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound plan for identifying, securing, renovating, and financing a facility. Though the site of the proposed school has not been finalized yet, the applicant provides a facilities plan which is focused exclusively on the Ewa Beach area. Specifically, the facilities plan consists of a three tiered approach which assesses the probability of securing the facility (Tier I- probable; Tier II- possible; Tier III- less likely), and then provided both short-term and long-term options. Within Tier I, the applicant has three short-term and three long-term options, all of which, according to the applicant, would allow the school to open with 100 students and expand to meet its future needs. For all Tier I options, the applicant provides the county property information, maps, and pictures of the current facilities at each identified location.

In the start-up plan section, though the applicant has developed a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound management plan for the start-up period, the Evaluation Team has some concerns that many tasks in the start-up plan are facilitated by the proposed school director. The applicant budgets for the school director to be paid as a full time employee during the start-up period which emphasizes the full time commitment that the proposed school director will have during this period; however, the Evaluation Team has concerns with the dependence on a single individual to effectively facilitate the opening of a charter school. These concerns were partly alleviated in the capacity interview and request for clarification as the applicant group identified members other than the proposed school director who would facilitate and assist in start-up tasks. One member of the applicant team was able to make significant time commitments to assist the proposed school director with start-up tasks and the other members of the applicant team said they would provide “as much help as was needed” to open the school.

Financial Plan

DreamHouse, Ewa Beach

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

DreamHouse's School Board and School Board's Finance Committee will provide oversight of all financial aspects of the Financial Management of the school. Under the supervision of the School Board and the Nonprofit's Board, the School Director and Operations Manager will handle all the day-to-day functions.

To accommodate its targeted student enrollment of 100 students in year 1, DreamHouse, as a short term facility, intends to lease facilities in the Ewa Beach area for an annual lease rate of \$60,000. Beginning the Fall of 2020, the school plans find a long-term facility that would support their growth to a capacity of 700 students by 2023-2024.

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

	Total Operating Revenues	Total Operating Expenses	Total Operating Gain/(Loss)
Year 1	\$1,015,253	\$911,500	\$103,753
Year 2	\$1,621,755	\$1,433,100	\$188,655
Year 3	\$2,493,117	\$1,934,578	\$558,539

Analysis

The Financial Plan does not meet the standard for approval since a complete, realistic, and viable three-year operating budget was not provided. Specifically, the applicant omitted certain financial information and miscalculated other information, which raises questions on the budget as a whole.

In the initial review of the proposed budget, the Evaluation Team found differences in the amounts of operational expenses reported in the applicant's year 1 through 3 budgets and the cash intended to be used for operational activities. These discrepancies in the Schedule of Estimated Monthly Cash Flow amounted to almost a \$1.3 million difference between expenses reported on the Profit and Loss Statement for the first three years of the school's operations. These reports allow the Evaluation Team to cross-check the information provided in the operating budget to ensure accuracy and viability.

During the capacity interview, the applicant team was given the opportunity to address this issue. At that time, the applicant team was unaware of this issue and was not able to explain why the discrepancies in the Schedule of Estimated Monthly Cash Flow occurred. The proposed school director stated that he prepared the budget and financial reports and was not aware of the discrepancies. The applicant was then asked in the Request for Clarification to account for these discrepancies. The applicant's response stated that the issue had been caused by the applicant's omission of additional lines of expense in the Schedule of Estimated Monthly Cash Flow that resulted in a failure to account for all the expenses listed in the budget. However, the applicant in the response did not provide any details on the costs and items that were associated with the omitted expense lines; providing this information

would allow the Evaluation Team to cross-check and verify the operating budget. As a result, the Evaluation Team still cannot rely on the financial reports to provide a clear understanding of the applicant's operating budget and remains unable to determine whether the budget is realistic and viable.

Evidence of Capacity

DreamHouse, Ewa Beach

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

The applicant team is comprised of eight members, who have experience in the key areas of academics, organization, and financial management. The proposed school director has had experience as a teacher in the area that the proposed school intends to serve in and is currently in a school leadership program. The applicant team has also looked to develop partnerships with community organizations, local financial institutions, and educational associations.

Analysis

The evidence of capacity section does not meet the standard for approval.

The proposed school leader, who will take on the role as the academic lead, has limited experience in a school setting and does not appear to have any school administration experience. The academic plan suggests a lack of experience developing and implementing a viable curricular model and school wide practices. This experience and expertise should be one of the core drivers of the development and launch of a new and successful school.

Additional concerns about financial capacity are also raised as the applicant submitted financial reports that omitted expense information. As a result, a discrepancy of almost \$1.3 million in these financial reports, which raises concerns regarding the viability of the applicant's operating budget. In the Request for Clarification, it was stated that the proposed school director prepared the operating budget and was the main developer of the reports that make up the Financial Plan and workbook. This raises the concerns of the Evaluation Team since the proposed school director will be responsible for the on-site management of the school's finances. Though the applicant team includes members with financial management experience, the issues with the discrepancies in the financial reports raise concerns regarding the level of support provided by these members to the proposed school director.

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 DreamHouse Ewa Beach

Evaluation Criteria Overview

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

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

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

Note on Evidence of Capacity

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

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

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

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

Evaluation Report

I. School Overview

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

II. Academic Plan

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

Section II.A: Academic Plan Overview, Academic Philosophy, and Student Population

This section is not separately rated by the evaluators. However, a strong Academic Plan will demonstrate consistent alignment with the Academic Plan Overview, Academic Philosophy, and Student Population.

Section II.B: Curriculum and Instructional Design

☐ Meets the Standard

☒ Does Not Meet the Standard

☐ Falls Far Below the Standard

Criterion II.B.1

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

The applicant's response within this section does not meet the criteria. The limited description of course outcomes does not provide substantial evidence of learner outcomes at all grade levels. Vague headings such as "graduates will leave us affirmed in identify and empowered in leadership" provide incomplete details and development in regard to individual course and learner outcomes.

Criterion II.B.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

This section is incomplete. The information provided fails to "map out each standard that will be addressed within each course". Instead of providing a rationale for the choices of three sets of standards, the applicant merely cut and pasted from materials online protected by copyright and cited these materials in the application with the notation "*cited from the Common Core Standards Toolkit." The cut and pasted response does not provide a rationale, instead it merely provides the publisher's introduction and background for each set of standards. The lack of response calls into question the applicant's understanding of the foundation of the entire academic plan.

Criterion II.B.3
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.B.4
Strengths: The description provided outlines a clear and comprehensive approach to assessment with a research-based approach to formative and summative measures that look to monitor student progress efficiently. This is highlighted within the “comprehensive data portfolio and dashboard”. In addition, the applicants also demonstrate a strong understanding in regard to reducing achievement gaps amongst identified sub-group populations of students. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.B.5
Strengths: The proposal provides a clear and comprehensive description for how instructional leaders and teachers will use student data to administer, collect, and analyze the results of diagnostic, formative, benchmark and summative assessments to inform programmatic and instructional planning decision and trigger responses to intervention strategies. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.B.6
Strengths: None Weaknesses: The applicant provides a limited description of a limited list of instructional strategies that the proposed school will use; the response is underdeveloped. Although the description hints at some elements of research-proven strategies due to the limited explanation and description it is difficult to determine.
Criterion II.B.7
Strengths: Graduation requirements are comprehensive and aligned with BOE outlined requirements. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.B.8 (sub-criteria a through j)
Not applicable as the applicant does not intend to provide 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:**

A comprehensive approach toward serving educationally disadvantaged students as well as those students with special needs. This approach is highlighted by promising practices dedicated to proper identification of special needs students, ELL students, and at-risk students with an RTI model supported by a multi-tiered support system available for all students schoolwide.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion II.C.2**Strengths:**

The strategies and methods listed demonstrate strong potential.

Weaknesses:

This section of the applicant's plan remains incomplete. The applicants list "highly differentiated instructional strategies", however and explanation and description of these strategies are missing.

Criterion II.C.3**Strengths:**

The RTI approach that is explained within this section provides a structure for systems of support that is comprehensive in regard to the identification and placement of students.

Weaknesses:

Again, the missing information includes a detailed description/explanation of instructional strategies and/or methods. In other words, explanations for the interventions remain vague.

Criterion II.C.4**Strengths:**

The RTI approach that is explained within this section provides a structure for systems of support that is comprehensive in regard to the identification and placement of students.

Weaknesses:

Again, the missing information includes a detailed description/explanation of instructional strategies and/or methods. In other words, explanations for the interventions remain vague.

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:

Demonstrates a lack or limited understanding of the beliefs, values, and traditions of the potential school

community. It is evident that there has been limited engagement with the community in learning how the current set of beliefs, values, and traditions align with the proposed set of school beliefs, values, and traditions.
Criterion II.D.2
Strengths: The DreamHouse matrix demonstrates a set of promising principles that have a strong correlation to high quality schools. Weaknesses: The explanation of “building culture” insinuates that the current culture within the potential school community needs a “new” culture. This is a weakness in that it is an approach that fails to recognize the promising components of the existing culture within the community.
Criterion II.D.3
Strengths: A demonstrated strength through an outlined commitment to engaging Universities and other external partners aligned with the promotion of college and career readiness. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.D.4
Strengths: Thorough and aligned explanation Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.D.5
Strengths: Thorough and aligned explanation Weaknesses: None

Section II.E: Professional Culture and Staffing		
☒ Meets the Standard	☐ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion II.E.1.a		
Strengths: The applicants provide a plan that demonstrates a supportive culture for the growth and development for incoming teachers Weaknesses: None		
Criterion II.E.1.b		
Strengths:		

None Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.1.c
Strengths: Demonstrates alignment with the vision and mission of the school Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.2.a
Strengths: The growth and development plan for teachers during the start-up and initial year of operation demonstrates a cultivated network of support Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.2.b
Strengths: None Weaknesses: While the applicant provides a well-designed list of PD activities for incoming teachers, the applicant does not provide a description/explanation of the PD activities and why these activities were chosen to assist incoming teachers acclimate to the school's academic program.
Criterion II.E.2.c
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.2.d
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.3.a
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None

Criterion II.E.3.b
Strengths: The applicant intends to start the proposed school with “lean” founding team that will grow as the school expands its grades served. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.3.c
Not applicable as the applicant does not provide an online learning program.
Criterion II.E.4.a
Strengths: Outlined strategies toward recruitment of staff demonstrates strong potential. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.b
Not applicable as the applicant does not provide an online learning program.
Criterion II.E.4.c
Strengths: The applicant intends to follow the DOE’s background check and fingerprinting protocols. Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.d
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.e
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None
Criterion II.E.4.f
Not applicable as the applicant does not intend to deviate from the collective bargaining agreements.
Criterion II.E.4.g
Not applicable as the applicant has not developed a personnel manual.

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:

None

Criterion II.F.2**Strengths:**

None

Weaknesses:

None

Section II.G: Supplemental Programs

☐ Meets the Standard	☐ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
---	---	---

Criterion II.G.1

Not applicable as the applicant does not intend to offer summer programs.

Criterion II.G.2

Not applicable as the applicant does not intend to offer extra-curricular activities or programs.

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 applicant provides a clear governing philosophy that ties into the school's mission and vision. The governing philosophy recognizes the autonomy to determine the educational program but acknowledges that academic goals and success must be shown to demonstrate accountability.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.2

Strengths:

The applicant provides numerous organizational charts that clearly show lines of authority and the governance structure.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.3

Strengths:

The applicant intends to have members with the key skills identified in the Hawaii charter school law (financial management, fundraising, legal, and human resource management, as well as academics) on the governing board at all times. In addition, the applicant will target board members from the community the applicant intends to serve.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion III.A.4

Not applicable as the applicant does not have a virtual or blended learning program.

Criterion III.A.5

Strengths:

The applicant team states that current members have experience in the key skill areas identified in the Hawaii charter school law.

Weaknesses:

None
Criterion III.A.6
Strengths: The governing board intends to have three committees which emulate the performance frameworks in the Charter Contract. Weaknesses: None
Criterion III.A.7
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None
Criterion III.A.8
Strengths: The applicant uses the State of Colorado's Charter School Board Governance and Training Guide as a resource and has developed processes for recruitment and orientation of new board members based on the Colorado model. The orientation process takes approximately six months and is divided into four stages. Weaknesses: None
Criterion III.A.9
Not applicable as the applicant does not intend to have advisory groups or councils.

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 recognizes that the leadership team must be qualified in collecting and analyzing student academic data in order to train and support the governing board on interpreting the data. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.B.2		
Strengths: The applicant provides six stages of corrective action which can apply to academic, organizational, and financial issues. The corrective actions start by establishing clear understanding and communication, allow for improvement and acknowledgement of improvement efforts, and finally allows for additional contingencies and possible personnel separation. Weaknesses:		

None
Criterion III.B.3
Not applicable as the applicant has not yet developed school-specific measures.

Section III.C: Ongoing Operations		
☒ Meets the Standard	☐ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion III.C.1		
Not applicable as the applicant does not intend to provide school transportation.		
Criterion III.C.2		
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.C.3		
The applicant originally stated in the application that food service would not be provided; however, at the capacity interview, the applicant then stated that food service was a possibility. At the current time, it cannot be determined whether the applicant has a sound plan for food service.		

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 provides a sound plan for student recruitment and marketing that includes direct engagement with the community the applicant intends to serve (neighborhood canvassing, open houses, and presentations to community organizations). Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.D.2		
The applicant does not intend to have enrollment preferences.		
Criterion III.D.3		
Strengths: The applicant provides a clear and concise admissions policy that meets state requirements and the Charter Contract. Weaknesses: None		

Section III.E: Parent Involvement and Community Outreach		
☒ Meets the Standard	☐ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion III.E.1		
Strengths: The applicant provides a clear description of the philosophy on parent and community involvement. The applicant initially engaged the community in 2013 by joining community organizations to gain a better understanding of the educational needs of the Ewa Beach community. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.E.2		
Strengths: The applicant's parent engagement plan is based on a research-based framework, developed by an educator from John Hopkins University, which involves six stages of involvement- parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with the community. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.E.3		
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.E.4		
Strengths: None 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: The applicant is supported by a non-profit organization that is already in good standing with state and federal law and regulations. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.F.2		

Strengths: None
Weaknesses: None

Section III.G: Geographic Location and Facilities		
☒ Meets the Standard	☐ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion III.G.1		
Strengths: None		
Weaknesses: None		
Criterion III.G.2		
Strengths: The applicant provides a comprehensive, reasonable, and sound facilities plan and timeline. The plan includes short-term and long-term options; the intent of this approach is to acknowledge the needs of the proposed school as it starts out and has more limited resources as well as taking into consideration the long term needs, specifically achieving the full enrollment projections that the applicant envisions which will require larger facilities.		
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: The applicant provides a comprehensive and sound start-up plan which includes a realistic timeline and milestones that can be used to track progress and achievement. The start-up plan is divided into academic, organizational, and financial sections, which are then broken into sub-sections which cover different areas of the different plans.		
Weaknesses: The applicant does depend on the proposed school director to complete many of the start-up tasks with an unspecified level of support from other individuals on the applicant team. As written, the start-up plan does rely heavily on one individual.		
Criterion III.H.2		
Strengths: Same as above		
Weaknesses: Same as above		

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:

Applicant was thorough in describing the separation of duties of the fiscal responsibilities. Applicant has also identified a potential CPA for preparation of the annual independent audit.

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion IV.A.2

Strengths:

The applicant has explained a 4 part process in describing the separation of duties of fiscal responsibilities on page 88 and 89

Weaknesses:

None

Criterion IV.A.3

Strengths:

Applicant provided an adequate description of the policies and procedures to choosing Vendors and Contractors.

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:

An evaluation of the Operating budget identified a discrepancy on the cash flow statement that amounted to a \$1.3 million dollar difference between expenses reported on profit and loss statement for years 1 – 3 and cash used for operating expenses. This discrepancy was raised during the Capacity Interviews, but the Applicant team was unable to respond to the question. This issue was followed up as a question in the request for clarification. The applicant response to the question during the request for clarification was a statement that they did not add additional line items to the Estimated Monthly Cash Flow report to ensure that the totals balanced at the time of submission of the application, but upon doing so later, the totals did balance. There was no additional explanation

so the evaluation team is unable to access the validity of the estimated monthly cash flow.

At the capacity interview, the issue of the \$150,000.00 term loan was raised. The applicant was not aware that financing agreements were not allowed without prior approval from the Attorney General. Upon learning this, the applicant stated that they will remove the funding and debt service payments from their operating budget. Although the applicant provided a revised budget, this is considered new information and has not been reviewed.

Criterion IV.B.2

Strengths:

None

Weaknesses:

None

V. Applicant Capacity

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

Section V.A: Academic Plan Capacity

☐ Meets the Standard	☒ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion V.A.1		
Strengths: None Weaknesses: Other than the proposed school director, the applicant team does not identify the members of the academic team that will be involved in the implementation of the academic plan. While there are members with experience and expertise in education and school administration, the level of involvement of these members is not explained. Based on the information provided, the responsibility for implementing the academic plan rest with the proposed school director.		
Criterion V.A.2		
Strengths: Six members of the applicant team have worked or live in the Ewa Beach area where the proposed school would be located. Weaknesses: None		
Criterion V.A.3		
Strengths: None Weaknesses: None		
Criterion V.A.4		
Strengths: None Weaknesses: The proposed school director, though currently in a school leadership program, has limited experience as a school teacher and very limited experience as a school administrator. At the capacity interview, the proposed school director stated that he wrote most of the charter application, including the academic plan. As such, the flaws in the academic plan show a lack of experience in developing curriculum and applying that curriculum to a school's instructional model.		

Criterion V.A.5
Strengths: None
Weaknesses: None

Section V.B: Organizational Plan Capacity		
☒ Meets the Standard	☐ Does Not Meet the Standard	☐ Falls Far Below the Standard
Criterion V.B.1		
Strengths: Seven of the eight members of the applicant team have experience sitting on the board of non-profit organizations related to education and monitoring operational performance. Members of also have legal experience and experience with facility acquisition.		
Weaknesses: None		
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: None		
Weaknesses: The applicant submitted a financial plan that included a budget with financial reports that did not align. Though the applicant lists a member of the applicant team that has over 20 years of financial experience at a local bank, at the capacity interview, the applicant stated that the proposed school director developed the financial plan on his own. Based on the inconsistencies in the financial reports in the budget, it is uncertain what level of support is being provided by the member with the financial experience.		
Criterion V.C.2		
Strengths: None		
Weaknesses: The applicant identifies several organizations and agencies as partners but does not explain or describe how these		

organizations support or intend to support the proposed charter school.

Exhibit B
Applicant Response for DreamHouse Ewa Beach

DreamHouse Recommendation Report Response

*Dr. Deborah Zuercher, Meilan Akaka, Alex Teece, Zach Dilonno,
Jane Henzerling, Ed Kaukani, Lissette Roman, Jacob Karasik*

July 8, 2016

Dear Yvonne, Evaluation Team, and Hawai‘i Commissioners,

Thank you for the feedback in this report. We believe that any opportunity to look critically at our model, our experience within the community, and the work we hope to continue with the families and children of Ewa Beach is an opportunity to grow.

The words of Dr. Michael Chun, retired Headmaster of Kamehameha Schools, capture the work and vision of DreamHouse. In his support letter, he shares, “The voices, concerns and dreams of community members, families and children have informed the vision of DreamHouse and the instructional model being proposed. This vision is centered on identity and leadership, affirming and empowering children to be leaders committed to their local community and island home... Before young people can see what they can be, they need to know who they are first. DreamHouse integrates this approach and is why I am strongly supportive of the educational model its leaders are proposing.”

The following provides clarification on the three areas deemed broad or undefined, which were (a) the curriculum and instructional design, (b) special populations and at-risk students, and (c) a part of our budget (the three areas that did not meet standard in the evaluation report).

Report Feedback Headlines	DreamHouse Team Response
Instructional strategies in our model were not explained.	Highlights the 48 instructional strategies listed within our application.
Course learning outcomes needed more clarification.	References to the standards-driven and student-mastery focused academic plan detailed in application.
Component of budget did not link to other tabs.	Clarification of budget template and detailed explanation of difference.

To guide this report, all quotes from the Evaluator’s Recommendation Report (“Report”) will be in **orange font** and cited by page number and section from the Report. Thank you for the opportunity to explain and clarify these components of our application and work.

Instructional Strategies

Response to Evaluators' comments on criteria: II.B.6, II.C.3

The evaluators state that there is a “**limited list of instructional strategies**” (II.B.6, p. 18) and that “**explanations of instructional strategies... remain vague.**” (II.C.3, p. 19)

In the section below, the applicant team references instructional strategies detailed throughout the application:

- Section II.B.6 (p. 19-20 of application) lists instructional strategies with examples:
 1. Active Learning – “students create small structures with cardboard to learn about angles, shapes, and other geometric components.”
 2. Engaging Community – “Kumu Hula joins ELA class to share history and significance of Halau; students journal, share, and reflect together.”
 3. Stations – “one station students are creating their own poetry with literary devices; one station students are sharing their poetry and offering / receiving feedback.”
 4. Teacher as Facilitator – teacher stepping back from direct instruction and “students serve as support; questions directed to other students; assessment and mastery is peer-driven” – *this is research-backed by the University of Hawai‘i Center for Research, Education, Diversity, and Excellence.*
 5. Pairing – “due to the high amount of student interaction and engagement, strategic grouping and pairing is a viable modification for students who need additional support in the classroom.”
 6. Direct Support – “have a special education teacher present for part or most of the class period, and finally that this child is supported with identified and self-identified optimal strategies.”
- The day-in-the-life of a student (Attachment E) spotlights more than a dozen research-based instructional strategies tailored to classroom environments across four content areas:
 1. Whole class sharing (Advisory)
 2. Do Now, partner sharing, mini lesson, Socratic seminar, small groups, take-home work (ELA)
 3. Lab, quiz (Science)
 4. Group homework moderation, mini-presentations, in-class research (Math)
 5. Venn Diagram, gallery walk, stations (Hawaiian Studies)
 6. Affinity groups, journaling, whole group presentations (Dream Block)
- The day-in-the-life of a teacher (Attachment F) describes instructional strategies from the lens of an ELA teacher:

1. Delivering protocol and supporting small group work (Block A)
 2. Incorporating real-time feedback from instructional coach (Block B)
 3. Homework and one-on-one discussions (Block C)
 4. Differentiation and RTI model modifications (Block D)
- The Response To Intervention (RTI) model that supports all students describes instructional strategies for various learners (p. 22-33 of application):
 - Small group, one-to-one reading, extended time, standards and curriculum differentiation, opportunities for students to teach and lead peers, scaffolding of standards, and responsiveness to IEPs and 504 accommodations as necessary.
 - Attachment D has a 15-page unit plan that offers an ELA example of a unit standards map with more than 20 descriptions of instructional strategies listed including, but not limited to:
 1. See Think Wonder – “Students complete follow-up reflection using See-Think-Wonder format to offer observations, analysis, and questions looking forward.”
 2. Daily Journal – “End of day, each day, allows for students to free write and express themselves; prompts may come from student-generated questions and/or text.”
 3. Group Discussions (Harkness) – “Using the Harkness Method (student-driven discussion with minimal teacher direction or intervention), students will discuss the power and purpose of personal stories, share pieces of their own, discuss their definitions of the four values of the week, all while engaging collaboratively and analyzing story (supported by teacher).”
 4. Individual Speeches – “Students will have the opportunity to read their analysis, their situational comparison, or a journal entry; working on presenting claims, sequencing, using appropriate eye contact, adequate volume, and clear pronunciation.”
 5. Values Walk – “Students will each design a poster with their discovered values and those that resonate with them and will post them around the room; students visit others’ posters, commenting and offering alignment, and ultimately collaborate visually and within class around each other’s values.”
 6. Reflection & Peer Feedback – “All students will not only reflect on their own five-week journey, but they will also offer feedback to each of their peers (part of the listening to presentations and offering gallery walk feedback).”

Course Outcomes

Response to Evaluators' comments on criteria: II.B.2

- The evaluators state, “The information provided fails to map out each standard that will be addressed within each course” (II.B.2, p. 17).
 - Attachment D of the application (p. 1-3) provides a map of what standards will be used for each course at each grade.
- The evaluators state, “Instead of providing rationale for the choices of three sets of standards, the applicant merely cut and pasted from materials online and cited these materials... The cut and pasted response does not provide a rationale, instead it merely provides the publisher’s introduction and background for each set of standards.”
 - Rationale for these standards is stated in Attachment D (p. 3): “Per Academic Plan, we are focused on college and career success through a Common Core-, BOE-, and competitive college entrance requirements-aligned academic program. Thus, our standards are rigorous, state-, and university-aligned.”
 - The application explains the inclusion of standards for ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, Hawaiian Studies, Fine Arts, World Language, HCPS III Physical Education (9-12), CTE, and Health.
 - Synthesized and cited from Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards toolkits is the applicant’s rationale of the inclusion of these standards.
- The evaluators state, “The lack of response calls into question the applicant’s understanding of the foundation of the entire academic plan.”
 - Guiding the mastery of standards and intended student outcomes are curriculums from the University of Hawai‘i’s Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG) as well as the Connected Math Program (p. 12 of the application); a member of our applicant team is a UH Mānoa College of Education professor who has helped build CRDG curriculums and serves as an international curriculum and scholar consultant on adapting Common Core State Standards for cultural relevance, while multiple team members have experience implementing CRDG-driven units and lessons.
 - Learner outcomes are anchored in mastery of standards, which drives instruction, and ultimately supports data-driven strategies to improve school performance. The application explains a data-driven approach and adopts a metric of at least “80% mastery” of standards in each course (p. 7-8 of application).

Special Populations & At-Risk Students

Response to Evaluators' comments on criteria: II.C.1, II.C.2, II.C.3

- Section II.C in the application asks for “an outline of the overall plan” to serve disadvantaged children with special needs in our community.
 - Evaluators state that the model to support special populations and at-risk students is a “**comprehensive approach**” with “**promising practices**” and “**strategies and methods [that] demonstrate strong potential.**” (II.C.1, p. 19) Furthermore, strengths of the model identify a “**structure for systems of support that is comprehensive.**” (II.C.3, p. 19)
- Evaluators state that “**an explanation and description of (instructional) strategies**” was not apparent in the Response To Intervention (RTI) model in Criterion II.C.2 and II.C.3.
 - The “highly differentiated instructional strategies” in the Tier I model refer to the instructional strategies and classroom environments detailed on pages 2 and 3 of this response (above). Tier II and Tier III interventions list out small group learning, support from special education teacher, and support from individual learning modules (iReady, ST Math). One-to-one support, engaging local partners, and additional learning modules (Do the Math NOW, Phonics BOOST) are referred to as specific RTI strategies. (p. 27 of application).
 - The application highlights the following: block scheduling and personal special education teacher support in the classroom, extended time, standards and curriculum differentiation, opportunities for students to teach and lead peers, scaffolding of standards, and responsiveness to IEPs and 504 accommodations as indicated. (p. 30-32 of application)
- “**Highly differentiated instructional strategies**” (II.C.2, p. 19) is mentioned under weaknesses and “**strategies and methods listed demonstrate strong potential**” under strengths. (II.C.2, p. 19)
 - The applicant explains and describes over 25 instructional strategies in both Section II.B.6 (p. 19-20 of application) and in Attachment D’s unit plan incorporated within the standards map.

The applicant team is comprised of the former Campbell High School Special Education Department Head, multiple teachers with Special Education degrees and teaching experience within the community, and a parent whose child has ADHD (as was mentioned in testimony), and administrators who have designed and implemented Response To Intervention Models at a school-wide level.

Budget

Response to Evaluators' comments on criteria: IV.B.1

The evaluation points out two components of the budget where clarification is needed: (1) “a discrepancy on the cash flow statement” and (2) a “\$150,000 term loan”, per Section IV.B: Operating Budget (p. 30-31).

(1) In the cash flow section of the Financial Workbook Template, beginning on Line 7.1, the Instructions/Notes read: “*Optional lines to use to provide a more detailed accounting of the projected cash payments related to school operations.*” The applicant team interpreted “optional” as meaning not every expense was required to be listed from corresponding budget tabs. The team included personnel expenses and kept all other expenses on the budget tabs.

Below is an exact account of each line item from the budget that was detailed on the budget tabs and not the cash flow. There exists no new information below, rather an isolation of the line items that remained in the budget and not on the cash flow.

LINE	BUDGET TAB EXPENSES	YEAR 1	YEAR 2	YEAR 3
112	Travel and other expenses	3,000	3,000	3,000
113	Supplies & Materials	500	500	500
173	Fundraising	12,000	12,000	12,000
182	Recruitment/Advertising	1,000	1,000	1,000
183	Travel and other expenses	1,000	1,000	1,000
185	Other: Dues, Licenses, Permits	2,000	3,000	3,000
214	Supplies and Materials	5,000	5,000	5,000
215	Travel and other expenses	3,000	3,000	3,000
234	Contracted Services (reserve)	10,000	10,000	1,000
243	Supplies and Materials	1,000	1,000	1,000
244	Travel and other expenses (non-stipend)	750	4,500	4,500
254	Supplies and Materials	5,000	5,000	5,000
268	Instructional Software	5,000	5,000	5,000
350	Food Services Program costs	90,000	180,000	270,000
410	Salaries-Operation, Maintenance of Plant	6,000	6,000	6,000
415	Utilities	12,000	18,000	18,000
440	Rental/Lease of Buildings & Grounds	60,000	60,000	60,000
445	Rental/Lease of Equipment	500	500	500
450	Other: Portables	20,000	68,000	96,000
460	Other: Security System	500	500	500
620	Civic Activities	4,000	4,000	4,000
	TOTAL	242,250	391,000	500,000

These totals for years one, two, and three are the exact amounts asked for in the Request For Clarification.

(2) With regard to the \$150,000 term loan and associated debt service:

- The applicant team's established non-profit will carry and service debt, not the school.
- The applicant team's confirmed that the non-profit would carry and service debt during the April 4th Capacity Interview and again in the Request For Clarification.
- The applicant team's application states: *"Our nonprofit is independent of the proposed school and is in existence to support the school through fundraising (fundraising sources detailed in Financial Plan); the proposed school has no fiduciary responsibility or contractual obligation to the nonprofit."* (p. 83 of application)
- The applicant's Start-up Project Management Plan lists the *"Non-profit Board"* as the main collaborator for structuring credit facilities and servicing debt (attachment BB, p. 24-25).

The applicant team included non-profit financing activity to provide a transparent, holistic view of finances, fundraising, and debt.

The applicant team appreciates the feedback regarding the presentation and interpretation of the budget, as well as the reminders to exclude non-profit activity within future school budget models; this feedback is noted, understood, and will help the school present finances as clearly as possible moving forward.

Associated Capacity Concerns

Response to Evaluators' comments on criteria: Evidence of Capacity, V.A.1, V.A.4, V.C.1, V.C.2

The applicant's founding board will be comprised of members of the applicant team; the local knowledge, roots in the local community, and organizational and financial backgrounds of the applicant team are outlined below. Each has committed to supporting the planning (detailed in Attachment BB, Start-Up Plan), founding (board), and operation (governing board) of this school.

Academic Capacity

- Professor, Fulbright Scholar, UH Mānoa College of Education Leadership Award Recipient, international program administrator at the College of Education at University of Hawai'i, and teacher coach in the Leeward District;
- Charter school founder and director, Johns Hopkins Education Policy Fellow, and former Executive Director for Teach For America;
- Recent graduate from Harvard University's School Leadership Program and former Campbell Complex educator, Ilima Intermediate school leadership team member, and planning committee member for the design of Ewa Makai Middle School;
- Local parent and community leader with over 25 years of local leadership experience who also went to Ilima Intermediate and Campbell High School
- Former Campbell High School special education department head, former Punahou summer program (PUEO) administrator and Instructional Coach, and new teacher coach on the Leeward Coast;
- Former charter school leadership fellow and math department head, Leeward Coast teacher, and teacher leadership fellow in Hawai'i;
- Former Special Education teacher in the Campbell Complex and UH Mānoa College of Education graduate.

Source: board member resumes, board member information forms, application narrative.

Organizational Capacity

The Recommendation Report states the applicant team has a “clear governance philosophy” and includes the following:

- “The applicant adequately explains how the governance structure and composition ensures that the proposed school ensures that the proposed school will be an academic and operational success” and “A governance philosophy which provides resources, thought-partnership, and strategic support.” (Organizational Plan Summary, p. 8)
- “Key skills or areas of diverse expertise that are or will be effectively represented on the proposed school governing board” and “The applicant identifies key skills or areas of diverse expertise that are or will be effectively represented on the proposed school governing board” including “academics.” (Organizational Plan Summary, p. 9)

- “Acknowledges that academic goals and success must be shown to demonstrate accountability.” (III.A.1, p. 24)
- “The applicant provides a sound plan for student recruitment and marketing that includes direct engagement with the community the applicant intends to serve.” (III.D.1, p. 26)
- “The applicant provides a clear description of the philosophy on parent and community involvement. The applicant initially engaged the community in 2013 by joining community organizations to gain a better understanding of the educational needs of the Ewa Beach community” and “the applicant’s parent engagement plan is based on a research-based framework.” (III.E.1, III.E.2, p. 27)

Each of the eight criteria for assessment meet the standard in the organizational plan, demonstrating a sound governance model with board members who have key skills, diverse experience, and deep knowledge of the community. This board is responsible for the implementation of the academic plan, performance management of the school, and the success of each student.

Financial Capacity

Section IV.A of the Recommendation Report (p. 30) highlights the financial oversight and management as being thorough “in describing the separation of duties and fiscal responsibilities.”

The applicant team has the following:

- 20+ years of experience at First Hawaiian Bank
- \$98 million in commercial credit underwriting with Bank of Hawai‘i
- Combined local fundraising experience of over \$15,000,000
- Non-profit board and finance committee responsibilities
- MBA in finance and corporate experience
- Budget design and control for a school, non-profit, and foundation

Each member of the board and non-profit team has and will continue to support, partner with, and monitor all finances of the school.

Source: board member resumes, board member information forms, application narrative.

Founding School Director Capacity

The proposed founding school director has spent years living and working in Hawai‘i, including years of teaching and leading within Ewa Beach. His experiences include:

Academic

- Elected to Ilima School Leadership Team during first year of teaching, led and developed a team of eight adults in designing and implementing cross-discipline instructional units and learning initiatives (2009)

- Asked by Ed Oshiro (principal, Ewa Makai) to be part of the vision and planning team for Ewa Makai Middle School (2010)
- Developed yearlong action research and defended thesis centered on identity development of children in Ewa Beach (2010)
- Graduated with a 4.0 GPA from University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s Graduate College of Education (2010)
- Served as summer school director for six-person leadership team and 36 new teachers (2012)
- Served as principal intern at an inner city school in Boston (2015-16)
- Graduated from Harvard University’s School Leadership Program (2016)

Organizational

- Co-founder of DreamHouse, Inc. non-profit including responsibilities of organizational governance, bylaw design, budgeting, and legal compliance
- Elected to Aloha United Way Society of Young Leaders Executive Board
- Serve as board chair for local education organization Learning First
- Serve on SEEQS charter school development committee of governing board
- Served on foundation giving board for Harvard’s Graduated School of Education diversity fund

Financial

- MBA in finance and corporate accounting; undergraduate degree in Business Administration
- Bank of Hawaii commercial credit training program and \$98 million of underwriting
- Investment banking experience, investment and wealth management experience
- Multiple years of fundraising and financial projection experience with Teach For America, SEEQS, DreamHouse, Aloha United Way’s Society For Young Leaders, Harvard’s Diversity Council

The applicant team is committed to supporting Alex and holding him accountable for the performance and success of this school. He exhibits qualities and skills earned in Ewa Beach, in Hawai‘i, and beyond that will help found, lead, and grow DreamHouse. The diversity of his experience covers the unique range of capacities required to launch and operate this school.

Essential Partners in Planning

Attachment HH offers details of support from facilities partners; Attachment BB (Start-Up Plan) offers details of proposed relationship with local banks (p. 24); application page 90-93 details projected support from local foundations and philanthropy; the applicant team will continue to deepen work and develop relationships with funding partners through start-up and launch.

Response to Additional Recommendation Report Items

Evaluator: “The response in this section does not meet the criteria in any respect, demonstrates a lack of preparation and raises substantial concerns about the applicant’s ability to carry out the plan and overall understanding of standards-based curriculum, and therefore falls far below the standard.” (p. 6)

Applicant Team: Of the five criteria assessed from the Academic Plan, three were rated “Meets the Standard” and two were rated “Does Not Meet the Standard”. There were no criteria in the Academic Plan rated “Far Below the Standard.” (p. 17-23) The applicant team is unclear why the Academic Plan Summary states falls far below if none of the individual criteria within the Evaluation Report are rated this way.



Evaluator: On page 7 of the Recommendation Report, it is noted that our application “lacks an overall plan for developing a strong student culture.”

Applicant Team: The school culture and professional culture have been rated as “Meets the Standard.” (p. 19-20) The applicant team is unclear how the Academic Plan Summary states that student culture lacks an overall plan when the individual criteria within the Evaluation Report state that both student culture (II.D) and professional culture (II.E) meet the standard.



Evaluator: Criterion II.D.2 (p. 20) states “The explanation of “building culture” insinuates that the current culture within the potential school community needs a “new” culture. This is a weakness in that it is an approach that fails to recognize the promising components of the existing culture within the community.”

Applicant Team: “Building the Culture - Hiring, governance policies, school policies, classroom environment expectations, professional development, expectations and accountability, and other core components of our school will be developed through our DreamHouse Matrix. Alignment to our vision of affirmation and empowerment, as well as key components of this matrix, ensures that our staff, board, and families are aligned.” (p. 34 of application) The applicant team is unclear what part of this response leads to the Evaluator’s comments above.



Evaluator: Criterion II.D. School Culture (p. 19) states “Demonstrates a lack or limited understanding of the beliefs, values, and traditions of the potential school community. It is evident that there has been limited engagement with the community.”

Applicant Team: Section III.E Parent Involvement and Community Outreach (p. 27) met the standard, and states: “The applicant provides a clear description of the philosophy on parent and community involvement. The applicant initially engaged the community in 2013 by joining

community organizations to gain a better understanding of the educational needs of the Ewa Beach community.” The applicant’s founding team has a parent who was born and raised in Ewa Beach and attended Ilima and Campbell; another parent who lived in Ewa Beach and whose children went to Ewa Beach public schools; three former teachers from Ewa Beach public schools; and a teacher coach who has worked with dozens of teachers in Ewa Beach public schools over the past 10 years.

Dr. Michael J. Chun, Retired Headmaster, Kamehameha Schools – “DreamHouse is the result of discussion and conversation within the Ewa Beach community over a period of several years involving the applicant group and respective partners. The voices, concerns and dreams of community members, families and children have informed the vision of DreamHouse and the instructional model being proposed. This vision is centered on identity and leadership, affirming and empowering children to be leaders committed to their local community and island home. The model brings children’s culture and heritage into the classroom, providing a foundation for leadership development and for helping children to raise their aspirations, realize their dreams and embrace the values of their ancestors. This model is especially important for the children of Ewa Beach who grow up south of Papipi Road, in the Hau Bush area, and in pre-development neighborhoods that experience higher levels of poverty and challenge; these are the children of DreamHouse and the school is centered around their needs, opportunities, and futures. As one whose career focused on culture-based education, I fully understand the role it plays in raising aspirations amongst those who are most in need. Before young people can see what they can be, they need to know who they are first. DreamHouse integrates this approach and is why I am strongly supportive of the educational model its leaders are proposing.”



Evaluator: In Section IV.B: Operating Budget (p. 31), the report states: “At the capacity interview, the issue of the \$150,000.00 term loan was raised. The applicant was not aware that financing agreements were not allowed without prior approval from the Attorney General.”

Applicant Team: Through non-profit documents, the application (p. 83), and the capacity interview, the applicant team communicated that debt and debt service will be a non-profit (and not a school) activity. The applicant’s non-profit was established in 2014 to service and carry debt and to avoid any school financing agreements that would conflict with requirements of the Attorney General.



Evaluator: On page 7 of the Recommendation Report, the last paragraph states that the school feels like a DOE school in instruction and curriculum, RTI model, and academic achievement targets: “Overall, when described in specificity, the academic plan represents a model borrowed almost entirely from Department of Education schools... Even the academic achievement targets set by the proposed charter school are aligned with the Complex area academic targets. The only aspects of the proposed plan that could be considered innovative or original, the DreamHouse matrix.”

Applicant Team: The academic targets are complex-aligned to support collaboration and inter-school innovation, while speaking the same language and being held to the same metrics. Section I.A.6 of the application asks applicants to describe contributions to Priority Needs (i.e. overcrowding in Ewa Beach), “serving student demographics that the existing system has had challenges serving” (i.e. children from Hau Bush, south of Papipi Road, and other higher-poverty areas which the school has been designed to serve), and “forming partnerships or feeder-school relationships with existing public schools” (i.e. working with our elementary, middle, and high school colleagues). The School Overview (p. 1-4 of application) details each of these intentions and alignment.

Externally, the school would be the only charter in the community, have the only local board, have no geographic restrictions, would be the first public school in Ewa Beach to encompass grades 6-12, and would grow and evolve one year at a time.

Internally, the driving component of the school – the DreamHouse Matrix (identity, leadership, high expectations, 21st century skills) – aligns school culture, hiring and professional development, student behavior support, academic culture, and individual development around empowering leaders to drive change in the community and islands.

The school vision is grounded in local leadership through seven years of development and education, identity affirmation, cross-curricular time blocks built into the daily schedule, and the flexibility to innovate and evolve year by year as the school grows.

Closing Thoughts

Thank you again for the opportunity to respond to the Recommendation Report provided by the Evaluation Team. Feedback and questions will continue to improve our school model and the work that we are doing with and for children and families of Ewa Beach.

This entire application began as a conversation with Ewa Beach community members years ago, built upon the foundation and experiences of our application team within the community. It has evolved through listening, discourse, research, and building what we fully believe to be an innovative and new option for families in Ewa Beach. We honor and respect the work of current educators, while also acknowledging the very real needs of additional capacity, a school of choice across geographic exception lines, smaller cohort and class sizes, and local leadership through a board of parents, community members, and leaders.

Identity and leadership are not just pillars driving our academic plan; they are the two most common and most important themes that have come from our community partnership work over the past three years. They are concepts that ground us in the history and culture of our community, while acknowledging the ever-changing world around us and the ever-growing need for local leadership within our islands.

The potential of our children here in Ewa Beach is palpable. In addition to the committed and unwavering work of our district colleagues, we believe a new educational model, structured around identity and leadership, built one year at a time from 6th grade through high school graduation, will help support the development of the children of our community.

We thank you for your time and consideration in making this decision.