

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (i) Hawaii provides evidence of increased expenditures for public education between FY08 and FY09. (ii) Because there is only one LEA in this case, it is not possible for the application to address equitable funding among LEAs. The application does provide ample evidence, however, of an equitable funding formula between high-poverty schools and other schools.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	17
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (i) The State does have a restrictive charter school law that limits conversion charters to 25 and also places a limitation of the number of start-up charters. The State indicates a desire to improve the charter law. (ii) The existing statute does address procedures for monitoring and evaluating charters. The application also provides descriptions of the process for approving charters but neglects to indicate any emphasis upon student achievement as a significant factor in determining charter renewal. The application is silent in presenting evidence of a plan to encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students. The narrative does provide evidence of charter schools that were denied. It is not clear if an appeals process is provided within the State's existing charter law. (iii) The application makes the case that charter school funding is on par with public school funds per pupil, in fact, a bit higher, however an important point is also made that the Charter School Community disputes this. A resolution is being sought. This makes a complete evaluation of this criterion difficult. (iv) The State offers ample evidence of its commitment to provide charter schools with funding for facilities through leasing as well as purchase. The application is expansive and detailed in providing evidence to meet this criterion. (v) The application provides brief evidence that under existing statute and policy, innovative public schools are enabled but then offers no visibility to any that have been created and fails to address anything with regard to autonomous public schools.		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	2
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The application provides a description of legislative achievements across prior years but does not link these laws to evidence of student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps or any other specific outcomes as required by the criterion.		
Total	55	29

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: Hawaii is clearly committed to an emphasis on STEM as evidenced throughout its statewide reform agenda. Career and College ready diplomas, a compelling plan to infuse STEM education across the State's K-12 curriculum, funding from the Governor to support a STEM initiative, support from the University of Hawaii, intensive training for significant numbers of math and science teachers, and a variety of solid examples of school level efforts all support a strong, sustained emphasis on STEM.		

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: This application comprehensively and persuasively addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. Hawaii is most certainly on the path of systemic education reform for all of its students. The extraordinary participation and commitment from a vast number of critical stakeholders offer ample support to successfully implement and achieve the goals in the State's reform plans. The application also gives visibility to the embedded priorities of the State to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. While there are a couple of areas of particular weakness, the overall impact of this application in effectively articulating a well-reasoned, ambitious yet achievable reform agenda is outstanding.		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	398
--------------------	------------	------------

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	26
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The state reports that it has 288 schools, 257 public schools and 31 charter schools. Of the 288 schools in HI, 90 are in restructuring and 10 are planning for restructuring. These 100 schools represent approximately one third of the state's schools. Over the past four years, the state used external contractors as well as AYP teams to support 114 low performing schools. While the state believes that a comprehensive approach to school improvement is the most successful, it acknowledges that the transformational approach has not been successful for some schools. The fourteen schools in the bottom 5% of the persistently low performing schools will participate in one of the four approved intervention models. The state has a series of criteria that it plans to use to identify the intervention approaches; however, the designated model for each school was not stated in the application. As a result, it is difficult to determine if the state has made the designations, if the designations do not exceed the 50% cap for the transformation model, and if the state will have the human and financial resources that will be needed to implement the range of interventions. In addition to the implementation of intervention models, the state plans to hire and place new teachers and administrators to serve the targeted schools. In the absence of data regarding the intervention models selected for the 100 schools, and in light of the state's intention to hire new staff, the question arises as to whether the state has the resources and a pool of trained educators available to implement a large scale turn around initiative. HI plans to implement several activities for the lowest achieving schools. The state plans to implement a Zone for School Intervention to coordinate support and intervention activities, create an Office of School Innovation, hire a Special Executive Assistant for School Reform, implement Literacy for Learning and Mass Insight's High Poverty High Performing Schools Readiness Framework. ZSI schools will be given additional resources and operational flexibility, implement extended learning opportunities, and offer wrap around support for students. Additionally, the state plans to identify effective educators to work in Zone schools; however, this initiative is pending the approval of a MOA with the employee unions.		
Total	50	35

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	9
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The state reports that the percentage of the state budget allocated to education has continued to increase. Although the state funds for education have increased, the state does not describe the financial circumstances that led to the teacher furlough discussed in the supporting documents submitted with this application or whether the strain on available funds would prevent the state from implementing and sustaining its proposed reform agenda. Since the state operates as a single LEA system, HI indicates that it does not have equitable distribution problems in allocating funds across divisions or districts. Additionally, the state was recognized for its equitable distribution of funds between affluent and poor districts. In this section of the application, the state demonstrates that the HI legislature has continued to increase the amount of funds allocated to education. In the application, the state discussed the percentage of the total revenues available to the state and verified that the state's policies lead to equitable funding between high-need and other schools [HI is a single LEA state]. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the concern that the state did not describe the financial circumstances that led to the teacher furlough and whether the state has the funds to support its regular operations and fully implement an enlarged reform agenda.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	18

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the state reported that it has 283 schools; however, in section E2, the state reported that it has 288 schools in the HI system. Both sections of the application report that the state has 31 charter schools currently in operation. The state has charter school governance legislation that establishes a review panel to approve, monitor, and revoke the state's charter schools. Approved charter schools are evaluated on a predetermined cycle and are required to submit an annual self-evaluation. Since 2007, the panel has reviewed eight charter school applications, approving four new charter schools. State law limits the number of conversions to charter schools to 25 and state policy requires that charter schools receive funding equal to other public schools in the state. Additionally, the state provides equitable funding for charter schools but the state acknowledges in the application that neither public or charter schools have access to adequate facilities. The state plans to ask the legislature to expand the charter school code by enacting a charter school reauthorization law that will require public schools to be held accountable for student performance. Charter schools, like other public schools, can use its school community council to request waivers from policies, rules and procedures. In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it has laws and guidelines regarding how charter schools are approved and operated. The state also verified that charter schools receive funding compared to traditional public schools. The number of points awarded for this section of the application is due to the state's acknowledgement of the lack of adequate facilities for either public or charter schools and the fact that the application does not describe how the state enables the LEA to operate innovative, autonomous public schools. Additionally, the number of points for section i is based on a predetermined number of points given to an applicant that imposes a limit on the number of conversions to charter schools to 25.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions**5****4****(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The state reports that over the past 15 years, there have been three separate educational reforms implemented in HI. The first reform was the educational accountability system, the second was a consent decree that reformed the provision of special education services and the third reform involved a series of budgetary and decision-making requirements approved by the HI BOE. The state described these reforms as providing vertical and horizontal equity for students throughout the system.

Total**55****31****Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments:		
The HI application does not include a comprehensive, coherent plan to develop STEM education; however, the application does discuss funded initiatives, the updated high school program and proposed new diploma, the adoption of STEM embedded Common Standards, activities to support rigorous STEM courses, the use of STEM partnerships to create applied learning opportunities, and advanced study opportunities through STEM Academies. On balance, the state does place emphasis on STEM education and implements a number of initiatives to support expansion of STEM.		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments:

The HI application addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria; however, it should be noted that the state did not submit evidence or include a plan in the application regarding the equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals in high poverty and high minority schools, or in hard to staff subjects and specialty areas. On balance, the state addresses the four education reform areas and the State Success Factor Criteria, and demonstrates sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in the plan.

Total**0****Grand Total****500****345**

concrete manner. The explanation in the application more than adequately meets the requirements of (E) (2) (i). Five points are awarded. (ii)- Each of the priority schools will be required to participate in one of the four outlined intervention models referenced in Race to the Top. The Hawaii Department of Education will make these decisions based on a school readiness assessment tool and feedback. Of special note is the strategy of a Special Executive Assistant for School Reform- this individual will oversee the intervention model process. The Zone of Innovation concept is also proposed to support the local school community in this area. Overall the state is the first to admit the efforts to turn around these low performing schools has not been successful. Only 18 of 118 schools have successfully exited from the low performing schools category. The state has a high quality plan with specific strategies and activities that build on past lessons learned and creates comprehensive support system for the identified low performing schools in this application. The application is awarded twenty five points.

Total	50	35
--------------	-----------	-----------

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (i)- The report of budget funding and priority issues indicates that the trend in Hawaii has been increased support for public education. This is validated with budget details in Appendix F-1. (ii)- Equitable funding is a hallmark of the state, and as reported in the proposal, Education Week gave Hawaii an "A" for equity in school finance. Equity among schools, especially high needs, has been a source of pride in Hawaii as evidenced through legislative initiatives for students of high poverty and those in isolation on rural islands.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	18
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (i)- The statement was made in the application that; "Hawaii currently limits the total number of conversion charter schools to 25." There is no definition of the term conversion charter school, and there is not a clear explanation as to whether or not there are legal requirements regarding a cap. Therefore, no points can be awarded for (F)(2)(i). (ii)- The approval process as described is murky, vague and apparently resulting in a bottleneck of some sort that limits effective approval of charter schools. Two points are awarded. (iii)- Equitable funding is allowed and practiced based on state statute and policy. There appears to be some disagreement among charter school communities about this, but from a legal standpoint, equity is supported. Full points are awarded. (iv)- The State does provide charters with facilities funding. Full points are awarded. (v)- While the information on waivers from policies, rules or procedures is a State Board policy, it is not clear whether the basic requirement of allowing innovative, autonomous schools is met. Zero points are awarded as the application does not adequately address this criterion.		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: The state has provided a number of positive examples of efforts to provide significant reform that are designed to help schools achieve. From various legislative acts around accountability, mandated education reform and the Weighted Student Formula, it is clear that Hawaii is actively seeking the reform conditions to dramatically improve student achievement for all students.		
Total	55	33

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
Competitive Reviewer Comments: The state is prepared to raise STEM-foundation academic standards for high school courses (Algebra, Geometry and Algebra II) and for all students (K12) through a Science, Engineering and Technology framework. In addition, the state passed legislation in 2007 to create the Hawaii Innovation Initiative and funding to support STEM education. Finally, the legislature enacted a cooperative partnership that focuses on the Hawaii Excellence in Science and Technology Academies to further involve the business community, tourism, community colleges and other agencies to implement STEM-related efforts. These are very positive projects and programs, but the information provided in the plan does not rise to a level as required in the criteria.		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		No
Absolute Reviewer Comments: The state has an absolute strength in the reform areas of standards, assessments and data systems. As a part of the national consortia, there is strong evidence that Hawaii is comprehensively and coherently addressing these areas of reform. Student achievement gains on NAEP are quite impressive, as is the increase in the graduation rate. Progress is definitely occurring from a statistical standpoint. In addition the state's top leaders are all supportive and on board the reforms being proposed. A third area around persistently low performing schools has not been overwhelmingly successful to date, but the state is open, honest and willing to admit this area needs help, and they have developed new ideas to make improvement a reality. The most troubling concern relates to Great Teachers and Leaders. Some of the parts of this area were not answered, and either there are printing issues or this was inadvertent- whatever the reason, it raises questions. Most troubling as well is the apparent 'closed shop' on credentialing of administrators that needs to be addressed. Thus it seems logical to conclude that this area of the four reform areas is not comprehensively and coherently addressed, and thus the absolute priority is not met.		
Total		0
Grand Total	500	341

i. The state has a high quality plan to identify the persistently low-achieving schools that includes specific data to be collected, the analysis to be completed, and the criteria to use in identifying these schools. The state has analyzed its data on persistently low-performing schools and identified the root causes for low student achievement. Non-title I eligible secondary schools were not mentioned in the plan. ii. Past experience has taught the state that one turnaround model does not fit all schools. Therefore, the state plan is to identify 14 persistently low-performing schools (priority schools) for state intervention. Determination of which of the four RTTT turnaround models to be used with these schools will be decided by a review team that conducts a comprehensive needs assessment and an assessment of "readiness to reform." If a cluster of priority schools that consists of a feeder schools (elementary, middle, and high school), based upon the needs assessment and feedback from school and community leaders, the group of schools could be identified as a "Zone for Innovation, allowing for community-wide interventions and coordination of services and support. Other approaches to turning around these schools are also addressed in the plan. The score for this criterion is high because the state has set aggressive targets for turning around the schools, put considerable thought and analysis into the various turnaround models and how they might be matched to different schools based upon data and community, thought through the criteria it will use to identify 14 high priority schools, and has used findings from past failures and successes to help define the plan. The state might have obtained the full score points were it not for its past record. Out of 118 schools that were in the status of restructuring or planning for restructuring by meeting AYP, only 18 have exited. While the plan seems aggressive and well defined for the future, the state will have to overcome its past record.

Total	50	36
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>i. Hawaii's financial support for elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased by 5.3% from 2008 to 2009. ii. Because there is only one LEA in the state, funding was distributed equitably to the LEA. In addition, Hawaii has a weighted student formula to identify funding for schools based on student needs. The score for this criterion is high because the percent of the state's budget allocated to schools increased from 2008 to 2009 and because of the weighted formula used to provide equitable funding to schools based upon student need.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	25
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The state's approach to charter schools appears to be a "mixed bag." The present legislation does appear to thwart the growth of charter schools. There are questions raised about whether charter schools receive the same per pupil funding, although in the area of facilities, treatment of traditional public schools and charter schools appear to be equal. The climate for creating charter and other innovative schools does not appear to be great. Since Hawaii has not been extremely successful in turning around schools, the limitations on charter schools is questionable. All of this is reflected in the overall score. The state's "medium" range score is a reflection of the fact that, on the one hand, it allows charters and 11% of the schools in the state are charters, yet on the other hand, the climate does not seem inductive to charter growth. More specific information is provided below. i. and ii. The state has 283 public schools of which 31 or 11% are public charter schools. Twenty-six of these are new start-ups and five are conversions. By statute, the state Board of Education appoints a Charter School Review Panel (CSRP) that is authorized to approve, monitor, and hold accountable the state's charter schools. A current law limits the number of charter schools that can be created to the number of existing charter schools that have received Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)</p>		

accreditation. The requirement for having to get accreditation has caused a bottleneck for the creation of new charter schools. At this time, there are 5 public charter schools with WASC accreditation. Three charter schools are in the process of applying for accreditation. While the state expects that new legislation will be introduced in the upcoming session to remove the presentation limitation, the score for this criterion reflects the limitations that exist for creating charter schools. iii. The state claims that the funding for public charter schools is \$611.82 higher per pupil than the per pupil amount allotted to public schools administered by the Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE). However, the charter schools disagree, believing that they receive less. Charter school representatives are in discussion with the HIDOE over this issue. iv. It appears that the state provides charter schools with support for facilities (acquisition, leasing, improvements, etc.). Charter schools have access to public facilities and the ability to share in bonds, levies, and other supports. The state claims that there are no stricter facility-related requirements for charter schools than there are for traditional public schools. v. The state allows waivers from state policies, rules, and procedures. However, it appears that most of the waivers have to do with calendar adoptions and changes to the bell schedule. Not much was said about more innovative public schools.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

5

3

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Over the past decade or so, the state has put in place policies that have strengthened accountability and transparency and one court decree that reformed special education services. Probably the most important influence on creating favorable conditions for reform was Act 51 which resulted in "funding following documented needs." In addition, the application indicates that the state has reflected on how the mandates have affected public education positively and the lessons learned. While the application does not present a portrait of a state that has been on the forefront of creating favorable policies and/or conditions for reform, all of these things taken in consideration, the state earns a score in the medium range on this criterion.

Total

55

38

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: The state's application presents a high quality plan that qualifies for the Stem Priority points. The state has adopted a voluntary Career and College Ready Diploma, (CCR) that includes courses in Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II, as well as three credits of science of which two are lab sciences. This voluntary CCR diploma will replace the current diploma for the class of 2018. To strengthen its mathematics education for students, the state has been participating in the ACHIEVE mathematics project with other states. The state has also partnered with business and industry, community colleges, and other agencies to create Hawaii Excellence in Science and Technology Academies, and provided funding in 2008-2009 for intensive training of 137 math and 375 science teachers in association with the University of Hawaii.		
Total	15	15

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments:		

The state's application presents a comprehensive and coherent plan. Decisions for actions identified in the plan are explained in a reflective way that reflect lessons learned and builds credibility for a successful implementation. The Project Charters provide substantial detail with activities and projects that align with the overall reform goals and targets. The budget is supported by sufficient detail and roll-out plans appear to be well thought and embed evaluation that will allow for "in time" modifications.

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

Grand Total	500	393
--------------------	------------	------------

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	10
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: The State acknowledges the need to develop a comprehensive and strategic professional development system. The State plans to incorporate a system of professional development that spans the continuum of teaching experience from induction of new teachers to on-going and specialized development for experienced teachers. The State will seek changes in existing policies and procedures for minimum hours of professional development and identification of professional development needs and activities. Principal professional development will include on-going support and training for developing, leading, and managing effective learning communities. It is not clear, however, how the plan will provide for effective, data-informed professional development. Nor are a full range of potential professional development and support systems for meeting different needs mentioned or explored. Finally, it is not clear how supports to teachers and principals will receive on-going and continuous evaluation and modifications.</p>		
Total	138	53

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The state's education board has the authority to formulate policy and adopt standards, but at this time is seeking expanded authority to intervene directly in the case of persistently low performing schools. A House bill was introduced in the last legislative session and carried over to the 2010 Session for further discussion and review.</p>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	29
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The state has processes for identifying the lowest-achieving schools based on failure to meet adequate yearly progress benchmarks as outlined under implementation of NCLB. Schools are identified in comparison with other schools and those in the bottom 5% are identified as schools in need of additional support. External contractors have provided needs assessments and services to schools struggling to meet AYP. Based on the experiences of meeting the needs of these struggling schools, a strategy has been developed to support schools by building capacity within the Complex Area and to address structural barriers that have been identified. To increase capacity for supporting the lowest-achieving schools, the State has engage external contractors such as Edison and America's Choice. The plan calls for the 14 persistently lowest-achieving schools to participate in one of the four intervention models. It is not clear what criteria will be used to determine which models may be the most effective for particular schools and it appears the State has had little experience in this area.</p>		
Total	50	34

F. General

	Available	Tier 1

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The percentage of the state budget dedicated to P-12 and post secondary education has outpaced the increases to the overall budget from FY 2008 to FY 2009. While there is only one LEA in the state, it is not clear whether the funding to all Complexes is equivalent. That the state funds public education from the General Fund and not from local tax revenues, however, suggests that there is control over the fair distribution of resources to the variety of Complexes comprising the single LEA. State statute requires distribution of funding based on need in the provision for weighted funding formulas.</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	16
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The State has approximately 11% public charter schools (26 new "start ups" and five conversions). The State charter school law effectively inhibits increasing the number of charter schools by only allowing for the addition of a new charter schools for each charter school that has received accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The requirement to achieve accreditation has created a backlog, preventing the creation of new charter schools. It is not clear what the State laws are regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools. How student achievement factors in to these decisions was not discussed in the proposal. The State does ensure equitable funding for charters and assistance with facilities acquisition and access. There is no evidence the State provides for innovative, autonomous public schools.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	3
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: Other state reform laws indicate a movement toward building capacity for and commitment to conditions favorable to education reform and innovation. It is not clear how systemic or pervasive these efforts have been.</p>		
Total	55	29

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
<p>Competitive Reviewer Comments: The state is in the early processes of developing capacity for rigorous courses of study. Providing specific support for teachers and students in the STEM fields does not appear to be a priority at this time. Participation in various consortia that focus on Common Core Standards, in particular, participation with the Achieve Consortium, suggests this is an area in which the State will be moving, however.</p>		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		No
<p>Absolute Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The state is still building capacity and partnerships. Comprehensive and coherently constructed systems of reform are not yet in place and therefore the absolute priority is not met at this time. It is not evident that each of the four assurances can be met with the plan as it currently exists. Over-reliance on commercially produced materials and external consultants also raise concerns about the capacity of the state to engage in comprehensive and fundamental reforms. Sustainability also is called into question. Teacher and principal evaluation systems and mechanisms for innovative schools structures and approaches are still in the very early planning stages.

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

Grand Total	500	316
-------------	-----	-----