

E2ii. The state panel provided clarification on how state staff will work with local leaders in building capacity for a variety of efforts designed to turn around the persistently lowest-achieving schools especially in the Zones of Innovation.

Total	50	45	48	
-------	----	----	----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F1i). According to the application, over the past five years there has been increased support for public education in Hawaii as a percentage of the overall State budget. The increases have continued even though Hawaii is experiencing a challenging fiscal climate. During its 2010 session, the State Legislature restored more than \$22 million to classrooms through an increase in funds allocated using a weighted student formula. As a result, schools will receive \$131 more per student than they did last year, despite the dire fiscal circumstances of the State.

(F1ii). Because of Hawaii's unique educational structure of having one LEA, the application does not discuss equitable funding between high need LEAS and other LEAs, but the state's plan does provide details on the state's use of "horizontal" equity that refers to the way that public education resources are allocated statewide. The state's plan also references Act 51, recently passed by the Hawaii State Legislature that provides for public education funds to be allocated to schools based on individual students needs though a "weighted student formula." As noted earlier, during its 2010 session, the State Legislature restored more than \$22 million to classrooms through an increase in funds allocated using a weighted student formula. As a result, schools will receive \$131 more per student than they did last year, despite the dire fiscal circumstances of the State.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	33	35	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	6	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	5	5	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6	6	

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F2i). The number of charters allowed within the state was recently increased based on the Governor signing into law Act 144 on May 26, 2010 which revised the charter school law to authorize three additional start up charters for every existing charter school that achieves accreditation for three years or longer through the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The new law brings the state well within the definition of "high cap" because up to 23% of public school statewide can be charters. This is not considered even mildly inhibiting to the creation of additional charters.

(F2ii). As of 2006, the Charter School Review Panel (CSRP) is the state's sole authorizer of charter schools, and is authorized to approve, monitor, hold accountable, adopt reporting requirements, and place on probation or revoke charters. Act 144 requires the Panel to establish rigorous criteria, including student achievement as a significant factor, for the reauthorization of charter schools and to review schools every four years to six years. According to the application, the current law requires charters to conduct and submit an annual review that includes an evaluation of student achievement, as well as the instructional program. Included in the state's plan is a summary of charter school applications received since 2006. The only charter school closed was later reversed for court decision. Given the high need population that is served by the state's charters, for example several schools report 97% of their population qualify for free or reduced lunch, it is surprising that only one charter has been revoked.

(F2iii). The state's application includes reference to state policy that requires that all public school students be supported with an equitable amount of public education resources. Charter School laws were amended in 2006, 2007, and 2009 Legislative Sessions in an effort, according to the application, "to better define the equitable amount of public education resources available to public charter schools." The last legislative action obviously did not resolve or bring clarity to the state's charter school funding because the application notes the "State Legislature is currently engaged in discussions with representatives of the charter schools and HDOE, with assistance provided by the private Harold K.L. Castle Foundation, to resolve discrepancies in funding and create transparency."

(F2iv). The state's application includes very detailed information attesting to the state's strong support in providing charters access to quality facilities to educate their students. According to the application the state provides facility support by providing schools access to existing land and facilities in collaboration with several federal government agencies. To increase state support, a recent amendment to a state statute provides facility funding to charter schools through a per-pupil lump sum general fund appropriation. The application references an additional amendment to Act 144 that gives charter schools the first rights to occupy facilities on any DOE property that becomes vacant or underutilized.

(F2v). The state's plan cites compelling evidence of the state's allowing innovative, autonomous public schools. For example, three secondary schools have been created as "New Tech Highs" that enhance students access to technology and anchor all teaching in project-based learning. An especially interesting innovative program described is developing education through the Hawaiian language. Hawaii is the national leader in education through an indigenous language. The state's plan also provides the legal authority that allows schools flexibility to operate innovative and autonomous public schools. Insufficient information was provided in the application to determine if the schools described 100% meet the definition of innovative, autonomous public schools as defined by the US Department of Education.

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

F2ii. The panel clarified the state's role in authorizing and holding charters accountable for student performance and outcomes.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(F3). This section of the state's application includes documentation on several education reforms that the state has implemented over the last 15 years. Significant among these reforms is the 2004 passage of the Reinventing Education Act that was designed to improve conditions for schools and students and included an \$11.7 million appropriation. In addition, the state has moved to reduce class size in grades K-2 and created the Hawaii Principals Academy to support and train school leaders. These reforms and others help to establish an environment that is reform friendly and nurturing.				
Total	55	48	50	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>The state's application has a well detailed plan to develop and implement a statewide STEM strategy. First, the state's plan includes the development of a rigorous course of study in the STEM subjects. Specific strategies are also focused on increasing the supply and effectiveness of mathematics and science teachers. Of special focus is the preparation of more students especially underrepresented groups such as girls, Native Hawaiian and Micronesian Pacific Islander students for advanced study and careers in STEM. For example, The Women in Technology Project administers funding from the state to encourage girls, women and other underrepresented groups to pursue STEM careers. The state's robust plan takes advantage of its strong track record of STEM to advance its strategy. Some of these achievements include being only one of six states to receive \$500,000 in funding from the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. This funding supported the development of a STEM portal to provide students, parents, and teachers with information on the importance of STEM education and access to STEM programs around the state.</p>				
Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>Hawaii's application provides a comprehensive plan to address each of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA.</p>				
Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	441	451	
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	--

means of school reform. The newly classified Priority schools are located within two identified Zones of School Innovation and will be reformed using the transformational model. These schools are located in remote and rural areas and will work in partnership with the state to design its school reform plan. At least 50% of the plan will conform to strict state guidelines aligned with the ARRA reform areas and the other 50% will be contextualized to the empower local school communities and better meet their unique needs. The department of education will provide a wide range of instructional support strategies and significant additional human resource support and incentives. The state also plans to train a cohort of 36 prospective school administrators to become "turn around specialists." An additional 176 residency based teachers will be trained to work in its most challenging schools.

Hawaii is moving into new territory here. Its plan to work with its persistently low achieving schools is innovative and makes a great deal of sense. One concern, however, is that the design needs to be as clear as possible before it is presented to practitioners. The application frequently says that it "will contract out or with" an unidentified provider to meet its needs and goals. This conveys lack of clarity and specificity about what is actually going to happen. It begins to feel more like a plan for a plan than a clear design.

Total	50	45	45	
-------	----	----	----	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
According to Appenix F-1, the percentage of total state revenues dedicated to education rose 2% between 2008 and 2009. However, the application indicates an increase of 5.3% (p.180). In either case this represents a significant state investment in its schools during an economic recession.				
Hawaii is a national leader in equitably funding its schools. Funds for education come from the general fund and they follow the student in that they are allocated to <u>schools</u> based on individual student needs through a weighted student formula. Therefore, high poverty schools receive greater funding.				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	37	37	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	

(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5	5	
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>31 of Hawaii's 287 school are charter schools. This represent 11% of the schools in the state. 26 are start ups and 5 are conversions. Furthermore, the Charter School Review Panel (CSRP) has been authorized to approve 25 new conversion schools. In addition there are 12 openings for start up charters. In effect this means that the cap for charter schools in Hawaii is well over 20%, making it a high cap state.</p> <p>The CSRP is the sole authorizer of charter school in the state. It monitors state charter schools and holds them accountable through annual reporting procedures, which include self evaluation, the identification and adoption of benchmarks, an evaluation of student achievement, a financial audit, and site visits. To date, one charter has been revoked and it was contested in the courts. Charters appear to be very popular with the indigenous Hawaiian population. A goal of the CSRP is to encourage and reward charters for going through a school accreditation process. To date eight charter schools have done so. State policy requires that all public school students be supported with an equitable amount of public education resources. Thus, charter schools are required by state policy to be equitably funded. Most charter schools are leased and the state equitably provides support via a per pupil allocation. Charter schools also have the first rights to occupy facilities on any department of education property that becomes vacant or underutilized. The state environment for charter schools is very favorable.</p> <p>Other innovative, but not necessarily autonomous schools mentioned in the application include three International Baccalaureate High Schools, two new high tech high schools, a variety of schools specializing in studying the Hawaiian language, and several lab schools associated with Hawaiian immersion programs.</p>				
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>A variety of other significant school reform conditions mentioned in the application include: 1) increased transparency and accountability through investments in technology and telecommunication infrastructure to collect and publicly share student achievement data; 2) implementing a weighted students formula to ensure that public school funding follows demonstrated students needs; 3) enhanced community involvement through school community councils; 4) increased support and accountability for principals through the funding of a principal academy and performance based contracts; reductions in class size K-2 to support student achievement; and 5) investment in higher education to fund new faculty and an administrative position to increase the pool of qualified administrators and teachers in Hawaii.</p>				
Total	55	52	52	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) STEM priorities and related activities are well integrated into the application. The application nicely summarizes the state's STEM accomplishments as well as its current and future initiatives. STEM is clearly a priority in Hawaii as it moves towards preparing its students to becoming college and/or career ready. The state realizes that STEM development is fundamentally linked to its economic survival, well being, and future prosperity.				
Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The states application clearly and comprehensively address the four areas of reform specified by the ARRA. Strong stakeholder support and commitment are evident. With a single statewide school district and consensus about where its headed, the chances of achieving its ambitious goals are likely.				
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2) The state's presentation confirmed and validated Tier 1 assessments. The Hawaii team was honest and transparent in their responses to the review panel's questions.				
Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	463	463	
--------------------	-----	-----	-----	--

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The Department of Education, State Superintendent of Education, and Complex Area Superintendents have a range of legal authorities to directly intervene in persistently low achieving schools, including those that have improvement or corrective action status.				
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>The applicant has a viable plan for identifying persistently low achieving schools. They have established and gained US Department of Education approval for defining their lowest achieving schools, a process which includes review of academic performance of students, analysis of growth slope, and inspection of school status under ESEA. The applicant plans to update and review the priority school list annually, and has the expectations that the number of schools falling in the bottom 5% based on identification criteria will likely increase as the reform agenda is implemented.</p> <p>The applicant has identified six schools as persistently low achieving. The turnaround model of intervention is planned for these schools. The applicant recognizes the importance of contracting with a lead turnaround partner to guide and develop protocols for intervention. The goal of building state capacity by training school administrators and state leadership in the skills and understanding of directing schools turnaround is a laudable one, particularly given the applicant's view that the number of low performing school will likely increase as the reform agenda moves forward. Building capacity contributes to the state's ability to turnaround low performing schools beyond the life of the grant.</p> <p>The human, financial, and technological resources directed toward the turnaround effort appear to be adequate for the applicant's turnaround goals. With respect to human resources, for example, state teams, external consultants, and Complex Area Superintendents will be deployed to address the specific needs of Zones of School Innovation schools. Initiatives discussed to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers and principals will be implemented, and distance learning will be incorporated so location will not serve as a barrier to students' exposure to highly qualified effective teachers. Many of the newly developed reform data gathering and analysis, and evaluation processes will be initiated at the priority schools. This step is a bold and forward thinking in that the value of initiatives will be tested in the most challenging locations—before they are transferred to locations where their success would be more readily anticipated.</p>				
Total	50	50	50	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>State funding for support of public education has increased over the past five years. The increase from FY 2008 to FY 2009 was 5.3%.</p> <p>Policies lead to equitable funding between high need and other LEAs and within LEAs between high poverty and other schools.</p> <p>The applicant's unique position of being the sole LEA has resulted in policies where funding follows students. A weighted student formula exists, which addresses state law that funds be allocated based on students' needs. These policies and practices eliminate the possibility that the education of wealthier students would be funded above that of students in high need schools or high poverty schools.</p>				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	38	38	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6	6	
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The state appears to have a very positive attitude toward increasing the number of charter schools in the state. Currently, 11% of the state's public schools are charter schools. The Charter School Review Panel (CSRP) is the sole authorizer of charter schools. Based on recent changes in legislation, 23 percent of public school statewide can be charter schools. While a cap for charter schools exists in the state, the percentage of allowable charter schools places the state within the "high cap" range.</p> <p>The state clearly supports charter schools and has passed laws and statues to ensure the stability and accountability of these schools. CSRP receives annual self evaluations from charter schools, as required by law. These evaluations include measures and evaluations of administrative and instructional programs, as well as evaluation of student achievement. CSRP has the authority to revoke charters, make decisions about awarding charters, and providing interventions to schools based on issues that might arise from the schools' self evaluation. It appears as if charter schools reflect the state population, and over half of these schools serve high need students. To-date, CSRP revoked the charter of one school, although this revocation was later reversed based on a technicality. Rules have been passed so that the technicality will no longer be an issue.</p> <p>Inclusive funding policies that ensure charter schools are funded just as the state's traditional schools are funded exist in the state, as an additional indication of the how charter schools are valued in the state.</p>				

State funding for charter schools is provided through a per pupil lump sum from a general fund, which accommodates the fact that most of the charter schools lease facilities. Charter schools are also given the first right to occupy under used or vacant facilities on department of education properties.

The state has innovation-friendly policies that allow schools to request waivers from school board generated policies, procedures, and rules. Although there is no explicit statement that waivers require schools to have accountability for increased school achievement, schools requesting waivers are expected to incorporate school changes that will lead to school improvements. Schools in the state have taken advantage of this prerogative to incorporate innovative initiatives within their buildings and communities. Innovative school practices include schools where the delivery of education is through the Hawaiian language, as a means for engaging students; students have access to technology as they engage totally in projects-based learning; and schools where the calendar and schedules were change in order to increase instructional time.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>The applicant presents multiple examples of how laws, regulations, and policies have rendered the state a place where education reform and innovation will likely thrive. In addition to reform and innovation-friendly laws mentioned above, the applicant discusses the <i>Reinventing Education Act</i> which resulted in the development of School Community Council, provided funding for the Hawaii Principals Academy, and reduced class sizes to support student achievement, among other initiatives that support flexibility within schools.</p>				
Total	55	53	53	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant discusses STEM throughout the application, which indicates the extent to which the STEM priority is integral to the reform agenda proposed. STEM is an element of standards-based instruction and assessment, improving the education of students in low performing schools, and ensuring that all students have effective teachers. STEM courses will be made available to all students through the Common Core Curriculum. Increasing the numbers of students from underrepresented groups and girls who take advantage of advanced study in STEM is accomplished through initiatives such as the STEM Centers where students learn about STEM-related careers and the Women in Technology Project that encourages girls and women to pursue STEM-related careers. Legislation has been enacted to ensure that STEM related education and efforts have a sense of permanency in the state. The state has partnered with the university and STEM related organizations and agencies as further evidence of important role STEM plays in the state's reform efforts.

Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>Hawaii has presented a comprehensive and coherent agenda to reform education in the state that thoroughly addresses all four education reform areas. As stated several times above, the state's unique position of being the sole LEA advantages the state in terms of implementing a systemic approach to reform. The state has presented a credible set of initiatives for delivering education to students in low performing schools, which will subsequently decrease the achievement gap that plagues not only this state but all states in the nation. They have presented plans to ensure that all students benefit from effective teachers and leaders. Hawaii has done an excellent job of recognizing issues that are particular to the state and which have interfered with the achievement of an excellent education for all students. Innovations and legislation have addressed many of these issues, but others remain—and these have been identified, along with feasible solutions in the state's application.</p>				
Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	472	478	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--

of reconstitution (found in Appendix E5). These statutes seem to underscore the State's determination to codify the authority required for school reform.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	35	38	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	33	

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(E)(2)(i) The Applicant has attached a copy of the letter from the USDOE (Appendix E5) accepting the HIDOE's definition of Persistently Low Achieving Schools (PLAS). By this definition, for 2009-10, Hawaii has 115 Title I schools whose ESEA status is "In Need of Improvement," "Corrective Action," "Planning for Restructuring," or "Restructuring." The six schools whose overall performance and growth place them at the bottom 5% of this list are "Tier I schools," or "Priority Schools." The remaining 109 schools are designated as "Tier III-schools".

(E)(2)(ii) Discussed previously, the HIDOE has established a designation of and plan to address the needs of their PLAS. The Zones of School Innovation (ZSIs) will include five of the six Priority Schools and their eight neighboring schools (all of which are Tier III schools), bringing the total number of schools in the two ZSIs to 13. These five Priority Schools are considered rural or remote, are designated "hard-to-staff" and are located within two of the HIDOE's total 15 Complex Areas; one on the island of Oahu, and one on Hawaii Island.

(A listing of Priority and ZSI schools is found in Appendix E7.) One school, Naalehu Elementary School, will utilize the designated "transformation" school intervention model in the upcoming 2010-11 school year. Beginning in the 2012-13, the HIDOE will employ federal school intervention models in up to six additional Priority Schools at the discretion of the Superintendent.

In this sub-criterion, the State reveals extensive plans for the schools in its Zones of School Innovation, including contracting with a lead turnaround partner; conducting assessments; leading school teams in strategic and implementation planning; a long list of supports and inclusion in major parts of the HIDOE Reform Action Plan, as well as, ongoing monitoring and evaluation. The detailed specific actions and activities are commendable and demonstrates depth of thinking and planning on behalf of the state. However, much of the success of the Priority Schools will rest on the effective and efficient management and coordination of the large number of programs and services that the HIDOE plans to provide to the schools, teachers, principals, students, parents and communities in the ZSIs. There was no discussion acknowledging the critical need for effective coordination of these services.

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The team addressed the issue of effective coordination of programs and services in the Zones of School Innovation resulting in an increase in the score for this sub-criterion.

Total	50	45	48	
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9	9	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4	4	

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(1)(i) As a percentage of the State budget, Hawaii's financial support for elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased 5.3% from FY2008 to FY2009. An expenditure chart is provided in Appendix F1.

(F)(1)(ii) The State reports that in addition to Hawaii's funding of public education from State General Funds (not through local revenues as in most states), in 2004, Act 51, the "Reinventing Education Act", was passed by the State Legislature (found in Appendix D9). There is discussion of the need for a weighted formula and a committee of weights was established. There were no specific details regarding percentages or flat dollar amounts as part of the weighted formula.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	29	29	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	4	4	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	4	4	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5	5	

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(F)(2)(i) Currently, the State has 287 public schools, 31 of which, or 11%, are public charter schools. Twenty-six schools are "start up" charter schools and five schools are conversions. In addition, in May 2010, the charter law was revised to specify that the 25 openings for conversion charter schools will remain, in addition to 12 openings for start-up charters, increasing the number of charter schools permitted to 67, or up to 23% of public schools statewide.

(F)(2)(ii) According to the HIDOE, the Charter School Review Panel (CSRP) is the State's sole authorizer of charter schools, and is authorized to approve, monitor, hold accountable, adopt reporting requirements, and place on probation or revoke charters. This year the CSRP must establish rigorous criteria, including student achievement as a significant factor, for the reauthorization of charter schools and to review schools every four years or six years. Charters must submit an annual school self-evaluation and submit to an external financial audit. (Found in Appendix F6) New rules on reauthorization and supporting charters as they seek accreditation will improve accountability strengthen the charter school program in the state.

(F)(2)(iii) Although the Applicant states that, "State policy requires that all public school students be supported with an equitable amount of public education resources", it appears that equitable funding for charter schools has been elusive. Charter schools funding laws were amended by the legislature in 2006, 2007 and 2009, to "better define the equitable amount of public education resources available to public charter schools". The most recent amendment appears to equalize, per-pupil funding, beginning in the 2009-10 fiscal year, "...the non-facility per-pupil funding request for charter school students shall not be less than the per-pupil amount to the [HIDOE] in the most recently approved executive budget recommendation for the department..."; this statute also states that charters are eligible for federal funding as regular public schools are. The State Legislature is currently engaged in discussions with representatives of the charter schools and HIDOE and a task force has been created to complete this work and to provide a report to the Legislature, policy makers, and the Governor (Statute is found in Appendix F8). Even though "state policy" may "require" all students to be supported equitably with public education resources, it apparently did not occur as state charter schools funding laws had to be amended three times. Evidence supporting equitable school funding for charter schools should be provided.

(F)(2)(iv) According to the State, as most charter schools lease their facilities, the most effective way to provide facility support is via a per pupil allocation, and a statute to that effect was enacted last year. However, providing a per-pupil lump sum. "...based on a Debt Service Formula calculation that provides facility funding based on a percentage of the debt service attributable to HIDOE", is not clear. Do the charters know what they pay to lease space? Why do they lease space when regular public schools do not? Each year it appears the HIDOE and the legislature have to get together to devise "fairness schemes". Perhaps who the majority of charter schools serve has some bearing on the inching along in equity in both funding and facilities.

(F)(2)(v) The applicant states that all schools in the State have the ability to request waivers and exceptions, which are designed to enhance flexibility in order to facilitate school improvement. The practice of issuing generic waivers or exceptions is a creative way to reduce 'red tape' in the HIDOE bureaucracy. However, a requested waiver is not the

same as a granted waiver. There is no discussion regarding the operation of autonomous public schools as defined in the application.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5	
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
(F)(3) The State has enacted a number of laws that appear to have a positive effect on schools, students, families and staff. The most encompassing is Act 51 which established or reformed: the weighted school formula, a principals' academy, required local school community councils, and funded reduced class sizes in grades K-2.				
Total	55	43	43	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
The Applicant has discussed STEM ideas, initiatives and programs fairly often throughout this RTTT proposal, beginning with an address by the Governor, in 2006. The proposed STEM initiative shows that the State has realized the importance of STEM courses and careers for the state for some time. They have consistently funded STEM courses with state, federal and private funds. The STEM plan comprehensive, covering all of the required areas stated in this Competitive Preference Priority. Rural and remote areas need special attention in providing STEM course and teacher access for their schools.				
Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
Overall, the State has submitted a strong proposal and is to be commended for its emphasis on school improvement and student achievement in recent years. Some areas of the plan have been very thoroughly thought through, and the depth of ideas and strategies is impressive. It appears that the State has come to understand there are no 'throw away' people in this economy; everyone counts. Therefore, the slow, but eventual focus on the State's Native Hawaiian population will pay off in the end.				
As noted previously, the majority of the high quality plan for developing and supporting great teachers and leaders as presented here represent many, many changes in thoughts, beliefs, actions and culture from all aspects of Hawaiian society, particularly the education community. While the Race to the Top initiative requires high-quality plans with ambitious yet achievable annual targets, notice must be taken of the change literature and research so that everyone can be accounted for, as they are being held accountable.				
Likewise, in addition to new offices and personnel (for example, the newly proposed Office of Strategic Reform and its new director, the Special Executive Assistant for School Reform) having to "hit the ground running", the current staff of the entire HIDOE will need to change how they do business, which takes time; even if they support all of the changes required to successfully implement this RTTT proposal.				

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The team from Hawaii prepared a focused, informative presentation on their RTTT reform plan. Each member was knowledgeable in their areas of expertise as well as generally. It appeared that the team really believes in the vision and goals of their plan and the road map they have designed to move the state forward to fully educate all the state's students to high standards, from Pre-K through college.

Total		0	0	
Grand Total	500	449	455	

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>Hawaii has presented a clear process by which low performing schools will be identified- including based on the analysis of academic performance. The schools are identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. As a result, the response was scored in the high range.</p> <p>Hawaii has presented a highly detailed plan for improving student achievement in high priority schools through the LEA implementation of one of the four school intervention models - transformation. This detailed plan fully describes the full extent of preparation, implementation and professional development that will be implemented in the schools. The plan details a high level of responsibility to be placed on the educational leaders and professionals in the schools – in collaboration with the support of the state dept of education. Further, the plan details a high level of ongoing and monitoring and evaluation on participating schools. As a result, the response was given the maximum awarded credits.</p>				
Total	50	50	50	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)				
<p>Hawaii's state budget reflects that education spending increased by 5.3% between FY 2008 and FY 2009. As a result, the response maximum credit was allocated.</p> <p>The state legislature provides for funding for education allocated to schools based on individual student needs through a "weighted student formula" as opposed to funding through local property taxes. The weighted student formula appears to serve the ultimate goal of ensuring school level funding equity by basing allocations on student needs as opposed to community wealth or historical patterns. Further, this weighted student formula creates a transparent process to identify funds and levels of funding for schools, and gives principals control over how best to expend resources. As a result, the response received maximum credit.</p>				
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	30	30	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	4	4	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	5	5	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5	5	

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The legislature passed a package of bills that expanded the number of charter schools in the state. Based on recent changes in the legislation, 23% of the schools in the state could become charter. This results in Hawaii having a high cap in that over 10% of the schools in the state will be charter schools. The response received maximum points..

The State has clear laws and regulations regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, reauthorize and close charter schools, with measurable student performance being central to the review. The response was awarded full credit.

The application provides that the legislature has passed a law that indicates that charters are equitably funded at the same amount as pupils receive through standard public schools – however, the application also indicates that the state has engaged in discussion with a foundation to resolve funding discrepancies in funding and to create transparency among charter schools. Therefore, it is unclear whether or not true equitable funding exists and if the legislated laws are truly being implemented, particularly as it relates to charter schools. There is insufficient evidence in the application to indicate if per pupil funding to charter schools is at least 90% of that which is provided to traditional public school students. The response was scored in the medium range.

The state legislature has passed a law which provides facility funding to charter schools through a per pupil lump sum fund. It is unclear if the the per pupil lump sum formula provides for facilities equity between public schools and charters. The statutory requirements for charter schools are the same as standard public schools. Further, charter schools are given the first rights to occupy facilities on any dept of ed property that becomes vacant. It does not appear from the evidence provided in the application that there exists actual fairness or equity in implementation for access to facilities between charters and standard public schools. The response was scored in the medium range.

The application described various innovative ways that local schools have requested and received waivers by the board of ed to enact various reforms in their schools. It is unclear whether or not this practice has resulted in significant innovations in local schools or meets the innovative definition as described by RTTT. It appears that the state has created innovative measures that are not necessarily autonomous. The response was scored in the medium range.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

5

4

4

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The applicant describes other significant reform conditions; including initiatives that have increased transparency and accountability, implementing a weighted student funding formula, supporting principals and teachers, and incentivizing professional development. The application did not include significant measures of success with these programs or their link to student achievement thus far. The response was scored in the high range.

Total

55

44

44

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state addressed the STEM priority where relevant throughout the application. Its plans for offering rigorous courses of study in STEM are competent. The plans are reasonably calculated to increase the

numbers of members and meet the needs of underrepresented groups and women. As a result, this response received full credit.

Total	15	15	15	
-------	----	----	----	--

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state has demonstrated a commitment to improving educational outcomes for high needs students by strengthening early learning outcomes. Additionally, the application presents a strong partnership between the state dept of education and the University of Hawaii and other businesses to raise high school standards and to align high school requirements with the expectations of employers and colleges. Further, the state has exhibited a strong commitment to flexible funding on the local school level.

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The State team presentation confirmed the high level of commitment on the part of the State to create greater educational opportunities for all children - particularly historically disadvantaged students. The candor and willingness to tackle the very difficult issues regarding educational achievement gaps exhibits dedication to mending these gaps. There appeared to be a shared commitment to coordinating efforts between the State Teachers Association and the State Department of Education. This collaborative relationship is commendable.

Total		0	0	
-------	--	---	---	--

Grand Total	500	463	465	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--