

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 2014 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.

Final Application Evaluation Process

The Commission examined feedback from its 2013 Application Cycle and researched the application processes from several states to develop a new, multiphase charter school application 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 Final Application phase of the application evaluation process are as follows:

Final Application Evaluation. The Evaluation Team conducted individual and group assessments of completed Final Applications (including Initial Proposals and Initial Proposal Amendments). 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. The Commission's Operations Section produced informational reports on Charter Management Organizations and Educational Management Organizations associated with applicants for the Evaluation Team to consider.

Consensus Judgment. The evaluation teams 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 Final Application.

Recommendation

An overall judgment regarding whether the proposal meets the criteria for approval.

Evaluation

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

The rating given to each primary area is based on a holistic evaluation of the Final Application Evaluation Criteria and its impact on the overall plan.

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.

Proposal Overview

Proposed School Name

iLEAD Kauai – Alakaʻi O Kauaʻi Charter School

Mission and Vision

Mission: “iLEAD Kauaʻi prepares learners to thrive as creative, conscientious leaders who achieve individual potential while contributing to their world. Our project-based constructivist method, offered in a safe and nurturing environment, cultivates deeper understanding and innovative thinking. With roots in the islands and wings for the world, our learners are free to think and inspired to lead.”

Vision: “iLEAD Kauaʻi students will thrive as creative, confident global citizens demonstrating respect and social justice practices, while impacting the greater good of society. They will ask questions, collaborate and communicate effectively to learn from and reflect on the past while contributing to the present. It would not surprise us if the next world leader, significant artist, or technologically-minded designer with the mission to end world hunger, will have attended one of our iLEAD Schools. Rooted in the cultural perspective of Hawaiʻi, with deep respect for all people, the care of our ʻaina, and collaborative problem-solving skills, the world will be their platform for making a difference. Individually they will be empowered; collectively they will shape and mold the endless possibilities for the future.”

Geographic Location

iLEAD Kauai proposes to be located on the eastside of Kauai. The applicant states that it is looking at two prospective facilities: 1) the All Saints’ Episcopal Church Gym building in downtown Kapaa; and 2) existing school facilities at Mount Kahili Park, which is 18 miles from Kapaa.

Anticipated Student Population

iLEAD Kauai proposes to be open to students throughout Kauai but anticipates serving mostly families from the Kapaa and Wailua areas. According to the applicant, “Kapaʻa, the most residential part of the island, has hard-working families with many holding down multiple jobs. The town is comprised of several small businesses. Families in the area range from low to medium socio-economic bracket.” The applicant also states that there is an “influx of Marshallese and other diverse families into the area.”

Contribution to Public Education System

iLEAD Kauai proposes to have innovative practices, such as “a global focus, small class sizes, data-driven individualized learning plans, collaborative professional development, student empowerment, curricular innovations and equity, and integration of technology.” The applicant also states that iLEAD Kauai will provide educational choice and “immediate capacity assistance” to the “most populated area” of Kauai, further explaining that it will “especially provide relief for Kauaʻi’s largest elementary school, Kapaʻa Elementary School, which is struggling in size and performance” and that the “enrollment situation at Kapaʻa Elementary School may be a contributing factor to their ‘focus’ status as referenced in the 2013-2014 Strive HI System School Report.” In addition, the applicant states that “traditional schools provide a one-size-fits all model” and that “many Micronesian families have immigrated to Kauaʻi and schools are not meeting their specific needs.” Finally, the applicant asserts that there is a “need for more choice, project-based instruction, and performance assessment,” concluding, “[as] more public schools move in the direction of Common Core Standards, we would love to share our discoveries and successes regarding the use of PBL with other schools.”

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Capacity	
	2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2025	
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	27		46		40		40		40		40	
1	23		23		46		40		40		40	
2	13		25		25		50		50		50	
3	12		13		25		25		50		50	
4	13		12		13		25		25		50	
5	12		13		12		13		25		50	
6	10		12		13		12		13		50	
7	10		*		12		13		12		50	
8	5		*		*		12		13		50	
9												
10												
11												
12												
Subtotals												
Totals	125		159*		212*		230		268		430	

*The applicant changed its enrollment projects for Years 2 and 3 of operation from 144 to 159 and 186 to 212, respectively, but did not provide updated enrollment numbers per grade level for those two years. Therefore, the sum of the grade level projections for Years 2 and 3 do not equal the total enrollment.

Executive Summary

iLEAD Kauai – Alaka’i O Kaua’i Charter School

Recommendation

Deny

Summary Analysis

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for iLEAD Kauai – Alaka’i O Kaua’i Charter School (“iLEAD Kauai”) be denied. The applicant did not meet the standards in all of the four areas.

Significant issues stem from a major amendment that adds middle school grades in Year 1 of operations. The amendment does not appear to be a well-thought addition, which leaves the Evaluation Team with concerns regarding the quality of the middle school division. Organizational issues include highly qualified and teacher licensure compliance concerns in the middle school grades and an unrealistic hiring plan that depends on the recruitment of two half-time middle school teachers who between them would need to be highly qualified in the four core subject areas to meet federal requirements.

Academically, the applicant does not present a cohesive education plan and includes too many components without clear plans for successful implementation. For example, the Academic Plan provides numerous standards that make up the framework for the school’s instructional design but does not explain how these standards fit together. Additionally, the academic model provided by the applicant’s educational service provider, iLEAD Schools Development (“iLEAD Schools”), has not demonstrated academic success in schools that have implemented iLEAD Schools’ model.

Financially, the applicant does not provide a sound contingency plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated. A contingency plan is essential as the applicant’s budget for Year 1 is strictly balanced, meaning that enrollment targets must be met to implement the financial plan.

Summary of Section Ratings

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

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

Academic Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Financial Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Organizational Plan

Does Not Meet the Standard

Evidence of Capacity

Does Not Meet the Standard

Academic Plan

iLEAD Kauai – Alaka‘i O Kaua‘i Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

The proposed school will follow the instructional theories and methods that form the acronym for its name, iLEAD: international learning, leadership, entrepreneurial development, arts, and design thinking.

iLEAD Kauai will contract with iLEAD Schools, a nonprofit charter management organization (“CMO”) based in California, for educational services, which include access to curriculum and professional development training and coaching for teachers.

At iLEAD Kauai, students will participate in project-based learning (“PBL”), taking charge of their own learning by actively designing, researching, and developing an in-depth study on a topic of interest. The school seeks to use PBL to teach students to solve complex problems using fundamental skills (reading, writing, and math) and workplace skills (teamwork, problem solving, research gathering, time management, information synthesizing, and utilizing high-tech tools). Assessment strategies will include graphic organizers, cooperative learning activities, self-reflection, oral and written reports, and Presentations of Learning.

Initially, iLEAD Kauai was planned as an elementary school (kindergarten through grade 5); a later application amendment added a middle school division and expanded the grade offerings to include grades 6 to 8.

Analysis

The Academic Plan **does not meet the standard** for approval because it has substantial gaps, lacks detail, and requires more information in the area of Curriculum and Instructional Design. The plan does not provide enough specific information to show thorough preparation and fails to present a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.

The Academic Plan does not provide a comprehensive framework for rigorous, high-quality instructional design that is aligned to academic standards. The plan identifies numerous standards that will guide the school’s instructional design—such as the Common Core State Standards, the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards, the Hawaii Department of Education General Learner Outcomes, and International Society for Technology Education Standards for Learners—but does not explain how they are incorporated into the curriculum. It also identifies PBL as the crux of the school’s instructional design but fails to describe how the school will use PBL to achieve its stated academic goals. Furthermore, the applicant amended the application to add a middle school division that would be a combined class of sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students but does not provide the rationale for a mixed grade-level classroom or describe how the school will deliver standards-aligned instruction in this type of learning environment.

Additionally, the lack of demonstrated academic success at iLEAD Schools’ existing charter schools, which use the same PBL curriculum that iLEAD Kauai proposes to implement, raises important questions about the rigor and quality of the school’s instructional design. The applicant provided Fall 2014

assessment data for iLEAD Schools' longest-running school, Santa Clarita Valley International Charter School ("SCVi") in California, as evidence that iLEAD Schools' currently operating schools are academically successful. However, based on the Evaluation Team's analysis of the provided Northwest Evaluation Association's Measures of Academic Progress test data and additional due diligence, it does not appear that SCVi's academic performance is strong. When compared to California statewide data, every tested grade level at SCVi performed below the 50th percentile in reading and below the 40th percentile in math.

The Academic Plan does not provide a clear and comprehensive plan for how the proposed school will assess the progress of individual students, student cohorts, and the school as a whole on identified metrics, and the plan does not, clearly describe the formalized process for monitoring student progress, clearly identify course outcomes, and demonstrate alignment with standards from grade to grade. As with other aspects of the Academic Plan, the applicant provides a list of various assessment tools that will be used to measure student progress—such as grade level rubrics, checklists of progress, and individualized learning plans ("ILP")—but fails to describe how these tools will be used to improve student academic performance. For example, the Academic Plan states that the purpose of ILPs are to ensure that each student is treated as an individual and is working towards attainable goals; however, the plan does not describe how the school will develop ILPs and establish appropriate developmental goals that will ensure continued student progress.

The Academic Plan does not provide a clear and comprehensive plan for how instructional leaders and teachers will administer, collect, and analyze the results of diagnostic, formative, benchmark/interim, and summative assessments to inform programmatic and instructional planning decisions and make adjustments to curricula, professional development, and other school components. The Academic Plan states that the school will adopt a school information system that has the capacity to create reports on student achievement but does not describe what data the assessment tools will provide, what results/outcomes the data are intended to show, how the data will be entered into the school information system, and how teachers can use the reports created by the school information system to measure student progress and adjust student goals and curriculum, if needed.

Overall, the Academic Plan continually describes the tools that iLEAD Kauai intends to use but fails to describe how and why the tools are being used, thereby bringing into question the school's capacity to effectively implement the plan and achieve its stated academic goals.

Organizational Plan

iLEAD Kauai – Alaka’i O Kaua’i Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

iLEAD Kauai proposes a governance team, comprised of a governing board and the School Director, that will assume collective responsibility for building unity and creating a positive organizational culture in order to govern effectively. The role of iLEAD Schools will be to provide assistance with back-office business functions, leadership and instructional coaching, instructional models, information technology, facilities, and start-up guidance and support. The applicant also plans to establish a nonprofit organization, iLEAD Hawaii, to be responsible for fundraising activities, such as coordinating donation drives, developing community partnerships, writing grants, and other activities that would assist in raising funds for the school.

After submitting its Initial Proposal, the applicant amended the application by adding a middle school division with a total of 25 students. The applicant stated that the middle school grades, which would be taught as a combined class made up of grades six through eight, would be staffed by two half-time teachers.

Analysis

The Organizational Plan **does not meet the standard** for approval because it has substantial gaps in the area of Staffing Plan, Hiring, Management, and Evaluation and does not reflect a thorough understanding of key issues.

The Organizational Plan does not provide an adequate recruitment and hiring strategy that is likely to result in strong teaching staff that meet ESEA requirements for being “Highly Qualified” and are well suited to the proposed school. The applicant's staffing structure and hiring strategy are likely to result in a teaching staff that does not meet the federal highly qualified (“HQ”) and state teacher licensure requirements. The applicant proposes that the middle school grades, which would be taught as a combined class made up of grades six through eight, will be staffed by two half-time teachers for the first two years of operation. If each teacher meets the federal HQ requirements in only one of the four required subject areas—Math, English, Science, and Social Studies—middle school students will not be taught by a HQ teacher in at least two core subject areas. The applicant acknowledged that the teachers hired would need additional professional development to become HQ in the other subject areas.

This is problematic because core classes must be taught by HQ teachers according to the federal HQ requirements yet the staffing plan proposed by the applicant concedes that half of iLEAD Kauai’s middle school core classes will not be taught by an HQ teacher.

The Organizational Plan does not exercise clear, realistic, and legally sound procedures for hiring school personnel. For middle school teachers, state teacher licenses are subject-specific, unlike elementary school teachers who receive a general elementary education license. As a result, in order for iLEAD Kauai to satisfy state licensure requirements, the two half-time teachers would need to be licensed in all four core subject areas. Since teachers that do not meet federal HQ requirements will also not be able

to meet state teacher licensure requirements, the applicant's hiring strategy will likely result in a middle school division taught by teachers who do not meet federal HQ and state licensure requirements. This directly contradicts the applicant's statement that they recognize that high student achievement depends on the instructional capacity and the excellence of the teachers hired.

In order to properly staff its middle school division, iLEAD Kauai will need to find two teachers who, between them, are licensed and highly qualified in all of the four required subject areas and are willing to be hired on a half-time basis to teach a class of 25 middle school students. According to the master collective bargaining agreement between the Hawaii State Teachers Association and the State, the work hours for half-time teachers cannot exceed 17.5 hours a week and should include teacher preparation time and daily lunch time, which allows each iLEAD Kauai middle school teacher less than four hours a day of instructional time. In addition to the academic concerns that this arrangement raises, the Evaluation Team questions the practicality of this plan and its chances of success.

Financial Plan

iLEAD Kauai – Alaka’i O Kaua’i Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

Financial duties and responsibilities for iLEAD Kauai are assigned as follows: the governing board is responsible to approve all new hires and all contracts over \$5,000; the School Director is responsible for ensuring that all approved policies and procedures are followed; and the Business Manager is responsible for implementing day-to-day sound fiscal practices surrounding budget review, purchasing, processing invoices, and reporting to the governing board. In addition to educational services, iLEAD Schools will provide financial management services by providing assistance to the governing board, School Director, and Business Manager.

In Year 0, iLEAD Schools will make a loan of \$100,000 to the nonprofit organization associated with the school for start-up costs. The loan will be at a 9% interest rate with “interest only” payments for the first three years.

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

	Total Operating Revenues	Total Operating Expenses	Total Operating Gain/(Loss)
Year 1	\$914,286	\$904,738	\$9,548
Year 2	\$1,167,445	\$1,140,041	\$27,404
Year 3	\$1,548,101	\$1,515,064	\$33,037

Analysis

The Financial Plan **does not meet standard** for approval because it has substantial gaps and does not reflect a thorough understanding of key issues. It does not provide enough accurate, specific information to show thorough preparation and fails to present a clear realistic picture of how the school expects to operate.

The Financial Plan does not provide a sound contingency plan to meet financial needs if anticipated revenues are not received or are lower than estimated. The applicant’s Financial Plan already requires iLEAD Kauai to operate with minimal increases in net assets and a lean budget in Years 1 through 3. In Year 1, an operating surplus of approximately \$9,548 is anticipated; however, the applicant intends to use this to make a payment of \$9,000 to the loan that is needed to cover start-up costs. This leaves the applicant with no actual surplus or contingency funds to fall back on. Furthermore, state financing guidelines do not allow public charter schools to take out loans or lines of credit. In the capacity interview, the applicant stated that the loan would be made to the nonprofit organization associated with the school and the nonprofit would then assign the debt to the school through some kind of agreement. Therefore, this arrangement is a de facto loan to the school that may not be allowed.

The applicant’s budget narrative fails to provide a contingency plan that describes the specific actions that iLEAD Kauai would take should anticipated revenues be lower than estimated. Instead, the

applicant only says that they would seek funding from Charter Asset Management and Charter School Capital, two organizations that provide resources to charter schools. A contingency plan should explain the actions the school would take should it fail to meet enrollment targets by a somewhat substantial amount, such as 10-15%. As evidenced by charter schools that have opened in Hawaii in the last three years, achieving enrollment targets has presented challenges for new charter schools. For iLEAD Kauai, a 10% drop from its targeted enrollment would amount to about 13 students and a reduction of approximately \$81,000 in the per-pupil allocation. A detailed contingency plan is essential to the successful implementation of the applicant's overall plan.

Evidence of Capacity

iLEAD Kauai – Alaka‘i O Kaua‘i Charter School

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

iLEAD Kauai has identified the following individuals as key members of its applicant team:

- Deena Fontana Moraes, the proposed School Director who served as an elementary school teacher in Brazil and recently completed an internship with iLEAD Schools;
- Dr. Kani Blackwell, the proposed Outreach and Development Coordinator who has over 24 years of experience in K-12 public education and over 24 years of experience as an educator in several university systems;
- Stuart Rosenthal, the proposed Business Manager who currently serves as the Business Manager of Kawaikini New Century Public Charter School;
- Dawn Everson, the Executive Director of iLEAD Schools who has twenty-five years of experience in education, with expertise in K-8 curriculum, instruction, assessment, school leadership, and governance; and
- Amber Raskin, the Executive Director of Business Development and Operations of iLEAD Schools who has experience in school governance and business management.

Analysis

The Evidence of Capacity **does not meet the standard** for approval because the applicant does not inspire confidence in its capacity to carry out the proposed plan effectively. The applicant failed to provide sufficient evidence that its key members possess the collective qualifications—including a demonstrated understanding of challenges, issues, and requirements associated with running a charter school—to implement the proposed school’s Academic, Organizational, and Financial Plans. Several applicant group members have impressive individual credentials and experience; however, as a collective, they have failed to instill confidence in their ability to successfully open a charter school.

The applicant failed to demonstrate the academic team’s ability to develop, articulate, and implement an Academic Plan that is cohesive. The applicant listed various standards, assessment tools, student goals, and curriculum but failed to explain how these components fit together into a rigorous academic program. Despite repeated requests for further explanation, the applicant’s inability to explain beyond the recitation of these tools ultimately draws into question the capacity to effectively implement its stated Academic Plan. In addition, the proposed educational service provider, iLEAD Schools, has yet to provide evidence of the academic success of its educational program.

Further, the applicant failed to demonstrate the organizational team’s ability to implement the Organizational Plan successfully. The applicant failed to develop a realistic hiring strategy that would result in a strong teaching staff. Instead the applicant developed a hiring strategy that would likely result in the hiring of half-time middle school teachers that would not meet federal HQ and state licensure requirements.

Lastly, the applicant failed to demonstrate the financial team's ability to implement the Financial Plan successfully. The inadequacy of the contingency plan stands out as a significant weakness of the Financial Plan due to the lack of contingency funds, particularly in Year 1 of operations. Further, the applicant's intent to use school funds to directly pay off a loan to the nonprofit organization demonstrates a lack of understanding of state fiscal requirements.

Evaluator Biographies

Danny Vasconcellos

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.

Beth Bulgeron

Ms. Bulgeron is the Commission's Academic Performance Manager. She previously worked as an administrator in charter schools in Chicago, Illinois and Santa Cruz, California. She has developed standards-based curriculum and assessments for public school districts and charter schools and has served as a curriculum consultant. Prior to that, she taught for five years in charter high schools. 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.

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.

Kirsten Rogers

Ms. Rogers is an Evaluation Specialist in the Department of Education's Accountability Section, which administers the public school system's statewide accountability program with a focus on developing and implementing educational indicators on school performance. She formerly served the Commission as its Academic Performance Specialist. She has experience as a middle school teacher at both a charter school in Tennessee and at Wheeler Intermediate, a DOE school in Hawaii. She is a Teach for America alumnus, a former corps member advisor, and former content community leader for the organization. She also holds a Master of Education in Teaching from the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Kenneth Surratt

Mr. Surratt has nearly 20 years of business and operations management and analysis experience, half of which has been in education-related roles. He has worked for Charter Management Organizations, including management positions with KIPP (the largest charter school network in the nation) and as the Chief Financial Officer of Breakthrough Charter Schools. He also served as the Assistant Director of CREDO (Center for Research on Education Outcomes) at Stanford University when it authored one of the largest charter school studies in the country. He holds an MBA from Duke University's Fuqua School of Business.

GG Weisenfeld

Dr. Weisenfeld has nearly 28 years of experience in education, specializing in elementary and early childhood education. She most recently served as the Director of the Executive Office on Early Learning in the Office of the Governor and wrote the state's federal Preschool Development Grant application for Hawaii's charter schools. She also has extensive experience teaching, training, and managing teachers and served as Board President of Lanikai Elementary Public Charter School. She holds an MS in Elementary Education from Bank Street College and an Ed.M. and Ed.D. in Educational Administration from Columbia University's Teachers College.