

Alaka'i Heritage Revisions Addendum

Meeting the Need Areas of Concern:

- The written application describes recruitment efforts largely focused on parents/families that are Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and states that 98% of the 600+ letters of intent are from Native Hawai'ian/Pacific Islander families. However, when asked during the capacity interview about meeting the needs identified in the SPCSA Needs Assessment, the applicant articulated an intent to locate in and serve a community with 1- and 2-star schools and potentially utilize preferential enrollment to prioritize serving the immediate community. The applicant has yet to conduct outreach in the proposed community or communicate with the 600+ families that have submitted letters of intent to enroll regarding the changing priorities and enrollment approach.
 - **Please see revisions made on pages 20 and 21 of the application.**
- While the applicant outlines some concrete methods for conducting community outreach, there has been limited engagement with the target community in the development of the plan. Moreover, it was noted during the capacity interview that while the families and students who have completed Intent to Enroll forms are committed to the school, they are not aware of the shift in sentiment to meet the needs as outlined within the Needs Assessment.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **20 and 21,**
 - **25-26,**
 - **191-199**
- The applicant was unable to clearly articulated how the proposed model would address the needs of the local community, particularly in the area of serving students who are English Learners, expected to make up approximately 25% of the student body based on the surrounding school data provided by the applicant.
 - **Please see revisions made on pages 16-18 of the application.**
- During the capacity interview, the applicant acknowledged that there may need to be some changes to the staffing and model to meet the needs of the newly identified target community. While some ideas were provided, no clear plan was outlined.
 - **Please see revisions made on pages 147-151.**
- The application states that parents will be able to choose to attend the Board meetings of the school and provide comment. This represents a narrow approach to parent feedback that is likely to limit engagement and input from parents.
 - **Please see revisions made on pages 22-24 of the application.**

Academic Plan Areas of Concern:

- Applicant does not clearly describe how the school will accelerate the academic growth of all subgroups and for students who are struggling academically. In several places, vague generalized approaches are listed within the application.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **16-18**
 - **35-36**
 - **40**

- The applicant’s plan for serving English Learners is not fully developed, particularly when considering that in surrounding schools, approximately one in four students is an English learner. This would translate to about 90 students at Alaka’i Heritage Academy in the first year of the school. In particular, the plan relies on using a classroom teacher who would be provided with a stipend to coordinate EL services on top of regular classroom duties. While the committee to form spoke about aiming to hire teachers with a TESOL endorsement, they did not provide convincing evidence that the staffing model would be sufficient given the expected size of the population. In addition, the applicant states that staff will be trained in working with students with EL students but does not provide a detailed plan for professional development to teachers and staff to ensure they can support and accelerate the learning of English Learners.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **90-91**
- The school model is oriented around arts integration and aims to incorporate Hawaiian culture and the cultures of the student body. The applicant lists various instructional strategies that will allow the school to implement their educational plan, but it is not clear in the written application (nor is a successful implementation model cited on the footnotes) as to how these strategies will be simultaneously used together. During the capacity interview members of the committee to form provided examples of classroom activities, however it is still unclear how the curriculum, arts integration model and multicultural approach will consistently and systematically be integrated to create a cohesive learning experience.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **35-36**
- While the applicant states that the school will “integrate relevant cultural components, reflective of the school’s student body” and provides an example, the applicant does not articulate how this would be accomplished at a school-wide level. This is a fairly significant component of the proposed model.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **53-54**
- One of the applicant’s two overarching goals is “Demonstration of at least one (1) year of growth in Reading and Math annually with the ultimate goal of meeting and exceeding proficiency in the core curriculum.” This goal raises significant questions about how the school will support students across the performance spectrum. In particular, a single year’s growth is insufficient for students that are below grade level. When asked about this during the capacity interview, the applicant stated they wanted to maximize growth for students and support students through tier 2 and tier 3 instruction. However, the applicant did not define what success should look like for those students entering behind academically.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **6**
 - **67-68**
- The MAP goals as stated indicate that the applicant does not fully grasp the proposed interim assessments. MAP does not report whether a student is “proficient” or “advanced” as stated within the proposal.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **67-68**

- The applicant's plan is not concrete as to how there will be a norming of social/cultural expectations for students and does not discuss how students that join mid-year will learn about and become accustomed to the school culture.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **109**
- During the capacity interview, when asked about supporting at-risk students, the committee to form described the use of "double dose" for math and reading to support student growth and remediation. However, this is inconsistent with the schedule provided in the application and a plan for adapting the schedule was not provided.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **117-122**

Operations Plan Areas of Concern:

- The applicant's plan for serving English Learners is not fully developed, particularly when considering that in surrounding schools, approximately one in four students is an English learner. This would translate to about 90 students at Alaka'i Heritage Academy in the first year of the school. In particular, the plan relies on using a classroom teacher who would be provided with a stipend to coordinate EL services on top of regular classroom duties. While the committee to form spoke about aiming to hire teachers with a TESOL endorsement, they did not provide convincing evidence that the staffing model would be sufficient given the expected size of the population. In addition, the applicant states that staff will be trained in working with EL students but does not provide a detailed plan for professional development to ensure they can support and accelerate the learning of English Learners.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **90-91**
 - **97**
 - **101-103**
 - **145**
 - **147-151**
- The plan for the incubation year, including funding to support activities is not clear or sufficiently detailed. For the limited number of planning year milestones that are listed, only some are specific and measurable.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **169-170**
 - **229-230**
- The applicant intends to apply for the (Charter School Program) CSP grant, however, contingency plans are not fully developed. It is not clear how the applicant would cover pre-opening expenses if the applicant is not awarded a CSP grant.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **188-189**
 - **Please also see revised budget (Financial Plan Workbook) or the revised Attachment 16 on the following pages:**
 - **240-270**

- Details regarding the relationship and expectations that the committee to form has with Academica NV are not present. In particular, there is currently no formal agreement in place to outline the responsibilities for Academica NV in the incubation year. Coupled with the fact that the incubation year plan is not sufficiently detailed, this leaves substantial questions as to how the proposed school would come to fruition.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **169-170**
 - **173-175**
 - **Please also see *Attachment 24B* on the following pages:**
 - **275-278**
- Among the applicant team, including the proposed principal, there is limited experience with the Arts Integration educational methodology. The proposed principal plans to participate in training on the arts integration approach, however this creates risk with regard to successful implementation of the model.
 - **Please see revisions on the following pages:**
 - **46-48**
- The proposed board does not have significant expertise in a few key areas including financial, accounting, and legal.
 - **Please see *Attachment 8* on the following pages:**
 - **200-228**
- Proposed leadership team structure does not demonstrate effective assignment of management roles and distribution of responsibilities – it's not clear who will be in charge of instructional leadership, curriculum, personnel, budgeting, financial management, management of state categorical revenue streams, special education and ELL programming, legal compliance, state reporting, external relations, etc. During the capacity interview the committee to form repeatedly made clear that the principal is ultimately responsible for all facets of the school's operations, but it is still unclear who will manage key day-to-day responsibilities.
 - **Please see revisions made on the following pages:**
 - **145-146**
 - **173-175**

Financial Plan Areas of Concern:

- The applicant does not list any expenses or revenues for the pre-opening year in the proposed budget. While the committee to form stated their intent to apply for a competitive charter school program grant or work with Academica Nevada to secure a loan, the funding for pre-opening activities is not clear. While representatives from Academica Nevada spoke generally about providing support during pre-opening period, these supports were not spelled out within the application and there is no evidence that the proposed board and Academica Nevada have agreed to the concrete responsibilities and outcomes that Academica Nevada will deliver during the pre-opening year.
 - **Please see revised budget (Financial Plan Workbook) or the revised *Attachment 16* on the following pages:**
 - **240-270**

- The proposed budget does not reflect any costs associated with providing services to EL students. Given that the school is expecting approximately one in four students to be English Learners this does not appear to be reasonable.
 - **Please also see revised budget (Financial Plan Workbook) or the revised Attachment 16 on the following pages:**
 - **240-270**