



State Public Charter School Commission 2014 Final Application Recommendation Report

Charter Application for
Kamalani Academy

Evaluation Team

Team Lead: Danny Vasconcellos

Evaluators: Beth Bulgeron

Jeff Poentis

Kirsten Rogers

Kenneth Surratt

GG Weisenfeld

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

Kamalani Academy

Mission and Vision

Mission: “The mission of Kamalani Academy is to provide an education that nurtures the whole child, celebrates the uniqueness of each child, and provides an innovative arts integrated education to increase academic achievement. Arts integration actively engages and challenges students in meaningful curriculum that will increase their literacy skills and overall academic achievement. The positive learning environment embraces cultural diversity and nurtures the child’s self-esteem and love of learning. The Kamalani Academy strives to actively involve families and the community in our learning process.”

Vision: “The vision of Kamalani Academy is to develop life-long learners with leadership skills acquired from the arts integration approach to learning. Students at Kamalani will be thoughtful communicators, critical and analytical learners, confident decision makers, resilient problem solvers, collaborative workers, and imaginative and creative thinkers, who positively advocate for themselves and others. Students will develop the skills and understandings essential for college, career, and life readiness. Kamalani students will thrive as contributing members of our local and global community.”

Geographic Location

Kamalani Academy proposes to be located in East Oahu. While the applicant has not secured a site, it is looking at two possibilities, one in Hawaii Kai, which is currently occupied by the Japan-America Institute of Management, and another at the Halekauwila Plaza in Kakaako that Voyager: A Public Charter School previously occupied.

Anticipated Student Population

Kamalani Academy proposes to be open to all Oahu students but will target those living in East Oahu, specifically those in the Honolulu and Windward Districts (comprised of the Kaimuki, McKinley, Roosevelt, Farrington, Kaiser, Kalani, Kailua, Kalaheo, and Castle Complex Areas). The applicant “expects to have a racial/ethnic student population of English Language Learners (ELL), Students with Disabilities, and economically disadvantaged equivalent to that of the surrounding public schools.”

Contribution to Public Education System

Kamalani Academy proposes to be a place for “future educators, visiting artists, [and] current educators to practice, teach, and learn.” The applicant states a possible partnership with the University of Hawaii College of Education could “prepare teachers of music, dance, and drama” through mentorships with “Kamalani teacher leaders,” and the university could use Kamalani Academy for “potential research for its doctoral and graduate students who want to research the arts and education.” The applicant also states that it contacted a couple of Educational Specialists in the Department of Education that would “like to look at opportunities to work together to further advance arts integration in the public school system.”

Enrollment Summary

Grade Level	Number of Students											
	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Capacity	
	2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021	
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	50		50		50		50		50		50	
1	50		50		50		50		50		50	
2	50		50		50		50		50		50	
3	50		50		50		50		50		50	
4	50		50		50		50		50		50	
5	50		50		50		50		50		50	
6	50		50		50		50		50		50	
7			50		50		50		50		50	
8					50		50		50		50	
9												
10												
11												
12												
Subtotals	350	0	400	0	450	0	450	0	450	0	450	0
Totals	350		400		450		450		450		450	

Executive Summary

Kamalani Academy

Recommendation

Deny

Summary Analysis

The Evaluation Team recommends that the application for Kamalani Academy be denied. The applicant did not meet the standards in any of the four areas, and the Academic Plan falls far below the standard.

The Academic Plan falls far below standards because it does not provide a clear and comprehensive curriculum development plan, fails to explain how the arts would be integrated into the academic framework of the school despite a focus on arts integration, and does not provide a clear and comprehensive plan for assessing student progress and performance.

The Organizational Plan does not meet the standard because the start-up plan is inadequate and fails to specify tasks, timelines, and responsible individuals and raises questions as to the applicant’s understanding of the amount of time, effort, and resources that are required to open a new charter school. Also, a lateral relationship between the school principal and the educational management organization (“EMO”), Academica Nevada, LLC (“Academica”), is unclear as the EMO is currently assisting the applicant in selecting the principal.

The Financial Plan does not meet the standard due to the lack of complete, realistic, and viable start-up and three-year operating budgets and the absence of a contingency plan—even a three percent drop in the targeted enrollment would have significant impact on the budget.

Lastly, the applicant group has failed to demonstrate that it can successfully implement the Academic, Organizational, and Financial Plans.

Summary of Section Ratings

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

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

Academic Plan

Fall Far Below 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

Kamalani Academy

Rating

Fall Far Below the Standard

Plan Summary

The educational philosophy of Kamalani Academy focuses on bringing the arts into the classroom through cross-curricular integration. In addition, the school will implement English language arts and mathematics curricula that are based on the Common Core State Standards and use Positive Behavioral Supports to nurture the social and emotional growth of each child.

Kamalani Academy will offer kindergarten through grade 6 in its first year, then add grade 7 in its second year, and grade 8 in its third year. Doral Academy, Inc. (“Doral Academy”), a nonprofit charter management organization based in Florida, will serve as the school’s educational service provider (“ESP”) and as an affiliate, which would allow Kamalani Academy to use Doral Academy’s trademarked instructional materials and instructional strategies.

The applicant has yet to develop or select the school’s curriculum, so, in accordance with the application requirements, the applicant provided a curriculum development plan in its place.

Analysis

The Academic Plan **falls far below standards** because it is undeveloped and demonstrates lack of preparation. The applicant’s responses raise substantial concerns about the viability of the plan and the applicant’s capacity to carry it out.

The Academic Plan does not provide a clear and comprehensive curriculum development plan. The full curriculum development plan included in the application is as follows:

- *June 2015: Identify Principal for Kamalani Academy;*
- *June 2015-January 2016: Principal to identify Kamalani Administrative Team ;*
- *January through April 2016: Decide on Basal Text and other support materials to be used at Kamalani Academy that will best align with the Standards listed in the proposed Instructional Framework;*
- *February 2016-July 2016: Hiring of Teacher for Kamalani Academy; and*
- *Prior to the Start of School: Professional development days will be done in accordance with collective bargaining limits...The professional development for Kamalani Academy teachers will focus on the chosen basal text, development of course pacing, and arts integration.*

During the applicant interview, when the Evaluation Team asked the applicant to describe how this plan and the selected basal texts would lead to the development of the curriculum, the applicant did not provide a clear answer. The applicant’s response focused on how the school would provide teachers with autonomy and access to online resources and did not reference curriculum development.

The limited information provided by the applicant about the curriculum development plan both in the application and during the interview, the absence of curriculum development activities in the plan, and the applicant’s focus on unidentified “off-the-shelf” resources, such as basal readers and online

materials, demonstrate that the applicant does not fully grasp the scope and magnitude of the task of developing curriculum, particularly when it involves cross-curricular integration.

The Academic Plan does not present a comprehensive framework for rigorous, high-quality instructional design that reflects alignment with academic standards and addresses the needs of the school's anticipated population. Despite the school's stated emphasis on arts integration, the application does not identify specific arts integration pedagogy, nor does it describe how the schools' arts integration approach will be aligned with the Common Core State Standards and is intended to be woven into the Academic Plan.

Likewise, the application adequately describes methods for identifying students who may be eligible for special education services and the strategies that the school will use to meet the diverse needs of all students; however, it does not explain how the identified strategies (providing curriculum, daily schedule, instructional needs strategies, and resources, as well as using research-based methods and instructional techniques from intensiveintervention.org) will achieve this goal.

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. The plan fails to illustrate how the progress of individual students will be assessed on identified metrics or goals. For example, one of Kamalani Academy's identified goals is for eighty percent of the students enrolled at the school for three years to achieve proficiency or higher on the annual statewide assessment. When asked to describe how the proposed school would assess or demonstrate progress toward this goal, the applicant was unable to explain how student performance would be measured, what targets would be used to demonstrate progress, and why the goal is important and relevant to the school's mission and its students' academic achievement.

The applicant's inability to articulate this basic information in the application and during the applicant interview indicate that the applicant lacks the necessary knowledge and capacity to assess student academic performance and progress.

While the application contains many assurances that, once developed, the curriculum and instructional design will be of high quality and will meet all of the stated application requirements, it includes very little detail about the development of an arts-integrated, standards-aligned curriculum and the implementation of the Academic Plan.

Organizational Plan

Kamalani Academy

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

Kamalani Academy proposes a governance structure that consists of the governing board leading the school, a school principal that will be the instructional and academic leader of the school, and an EMO, Academica, that will be responsible for the financial and organizational administration of the school. The school principal and Academica have a lateral relationship in the organizational structure and will work collaboratively to administer the school.

Kamalani Academy intends to create a nonprofit organization to act as the school's foundation. The nonprofit organization would support the school by engaging the community through fundraising activities and searching for and applying to grants that could generate funds for the school.

Analysis

The Organizational Plan **does not meet standard** because it has substantial gaps, lacks detail, and requires additional information in the Start-Up Period area. The plan 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 Organizational Plan does not provide a detailed, comprehensive start-up plan specifying tasks, timelines, and responsible individuals aligned with the start-up budget for each major area (facility, funding, student recruitment and outreach, faculty and staff, and proposed school governing board).

The start-up plan provided by the applicant is a significant weakness that negatively impacts the Organizational Plan as a whole. Through responses in the application and interview, the applicant team is relying on its selected management company to lead the start-up activities yet the management company did not share the necessary details in its plan to get the school started. The start-up plan fails to provide specific activities and actions that the applicant will need to complete during the start-up period. The plan provided by the applicant, instead, lists only the following general vague activities:

- *Identifying facility funding- the school will need to secure financing before any contracts or acquisitions;*
- *Marketing- the school will market via multiple modes to ensure that all families are informed of their educational options;*
- *Hiring school personnel- the school intends to identify a Principal as soon as possible and hopes to have all teaching and staff positions filled prior to the intended opening date for the school of August 2016; and*
- *Transitioning from a Founding to Governing Board.*

The start-up plan further fails to identify any individuals who will lead the planning and start-up plan and instead mentions only the founding board. On numerous occasions, the Evaluation Team requested the applicant to identify specific individuals who would lead start-up activities. In the capacity interview,

Kamalani Academy representatives identified only a single member of the applicant team that would be available on a full-time basis to complete the start-up activities, and in fact, the other members of the applicant team stated that they all had full-time jobs that are their priority. When again asked in the Request for Clarification to clarify and identify the specific individuals who would be completing start-up tasks, the applicant again failed to identify anyone specific, including the member of the applicant team who stated he was available full-time in the capacity interview. The sole reliance on a single full-time volunteer does not inspire confidence in the applicant's capacity to implement the start-up plan.

The Organizational Plan does not provide a description of the roles and responsibilities of the EMO that adequately and accurately captures the EMO's organizational structure and how such structure relates to the governance and operation of the proposed school. According to the organizational chart, the school principal and Academica have a lateral relationship, meaning that they are on the same level of authority. When asked to clarify this relationship, the applicant explained that the principal will be responsible for the educational program and Academica will be responsible for the organizational and financial operations of the school. It is the applicant's intent that both will collaboratively administer the school.

This lateral relationship raises concerns because this organizational structure requires the governing board to assume all oversight responsibilities of the EMO. It is unclear what would happen in the event of a dispute between the principal and Academica. This relationship is further complicated because the governing board will conduct performance evaluations of the principal and Academic, with each providing input on the other as part of the evaluation. This is particularly concerning as Academica is currently assisting the applicant in the recruitment and selection of a school principal, and this assistance goes so far as Academica identifying candidates and assisting in interviews of school principal candidates. The Evaluation Team is concerned that this could affect the ability and willingness of the school principal to provide an unbiased evaluation of Academica.

Financial Plan

Kamalani Academy

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

Kamalani Academy’s governing board will provide oversight for all aspects of the financial management of the school. Under the supervision of the board, Academica will be responsible for financial operations, including bookkeeping and financial reporting. The School Principal will supervise day-to-day cash collections at the school.

The contracted fee for Academica is based on a per child fee of \$450. In the first three years of operation, Academica will reduce the fee to \$275, \$350, and \$375, respectively. The school will also have an affiliation agreement with Doral Academy that will cost the school one percent of its per-pupil revenue. In Year 1, the cost to the school will be approximately \$22,000.

To accommodate its targeted enrollment of 350 students in Year 1, Kamalani Academy will need to secure a facility with approximately 18,000 square feet. The school’s financial plan is predicated on securing the facility in the Hawaii Kai area with an annual lease rate of approximately \$434,000. Kamalani Academy has secured a letter of interest from the Turner-Agassi Charter School Facility Fund, a nonprofit organization based in California that provides facility funding to charter schools across the nation.

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

	Total Operating Revenues	Total Operating Expenses	Total Operating Gain/(Loss)
Year 1	\$2,170,000	\$2,107,815	\$62,185
Year 2	\$2,480,000	\$2,434,111	\$45,889
Year 3	\$2,790,000	\$2,745,415	\$44,585

Analysis

The Financial Plan **does not meet standard** because it has substantial gaps, lacks detail, and requires additional information in one or more areas. 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 lack of start-up funding and a contingency plan, coupled with the high expense items and the high enrollment targets, severely weakens the applicant’s Financial Plan and significantly increases the risk of failure that could befall the school should its actual enrollment figures fall below its targets.

The Financial Plan does not provide complete, realistic, and viable start-up and three-year operating budgets. The Organizational Plan section of this report identifies Kamalani Academy’s start-up plan as a significant weakness. This weakness is further highlighted by the financial information provided in the applicant’s budget. A review of the Year 0 (start-up period) budget identifies a \$25,000 contribution from Academica as the only funding provided in this period. The only line item in the Year 0 budget is \$25,000 for recruitment/advertising, which indicates that the funds are only intended to provide

resources for marketing, recruitment, and parent interest meetings. The start-up plan mentions that the founding board intends to seek out grants or donations to supplement start-up activities but does not provide any information or details on what grants the applicant will apply for, when the applicant will apply for these grants, and the anticipated funding that these grants would provide.

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. Overall, the financial plan is based on the school achieving high enrollment targets in its first three years—350, 400, and 450 targeted student enrollment, respectively. As evidenced by charter schools that have opened in Hawaii in the last three years, achieving enrollment targets and the subsequent effect that it has had on the schools' budgets have presented challenges for new charter schools. Further, the financial plan submitted by the applicant has several high cost items in Year 1 of the budget, including the Hawaii Kai facility lease; the services from Doral Academy and Academica; approximately \$120,000 to lease instructional materials, computers, furniture, and equipment; and staffing costs for 22 positions.

The applicant's budget narrative states that should anticipated revenues be lower than estimated, Kamalani Academy would receive counsel from Academica and the school's administrator to derive a "financial plan." The absence of a contingency plan can only lead the Evaluation Team to conclude that the aforementioned "financial plan" is actually the contingency plan. The absence of a contingency plan is especially troubling given the high enrollment targets. While the applicant has built a contingency fund of about \$62,000 into the Financial Plan, the contingency fund would be wiped out if the school missed its enrollment target by just ten students, or less than three percent of its projected enrollment in Year 1. An adequate contingency plan would explain the actions the school would take should it fail to meet enrollment targets by a more substantial amount, such as 10-15%. In Kamalani Academy's case, a 10% drop from its targeted enrollment would amount to 35 students and a substantial loss in the per-pupil allocation of \$217,000.

Evidence of Capacity

Enter the proposed school name

Kamalani Academy

Rating

Does Not Meet the Standard

Plan Summary

Kamalani Academy has identified the following individuals as key members of its applicant team:

- Kuuipo Laumatia, who has educational experience as an adjunct professor at Hawaii Pacific University and experience in founding and supporting nonprofit organizations;
- Lei Cummings, who has educational experience with BYU-Hawaii and is the current president of The Mana’olana Foundation, a Native Hawaiian nonprofit organization;
- Steven Davidson, who has financial experience in the banking industry and has served as a consultant to a nonprofit organization; and
- Dr. Patrick Macy, an educator with more than 20 years of experience in public education on multiple levels.

Kamalani Academy will contract with Doral Academy, an educational service provider that will conduct professional development and allow the school to use its educational programs. Kamalani Academy will also contract with Academica Nevada to serve as its educational management organization that will be responsible for financial and organizational 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.

The Academic Plan falls far below standards, as it lacks a clear and comprehensive curriculum development plan, fails to explain how the arts will be integrated into the academic framework of the school despite a focus on arts integration, and does not provide a clear and comprehensive plan for how the proposed school will assess the student progress and performance. Overall, the deficiencies seen in the Academic Plan demonstrate the applicant’s lack of academic capacity.

The applicant also failed to demonstrate evidence of capacity to implement the Organizational Plan. Lack of capacity is demonstrated by the applicant’s inability to develop an adequate start-up plan. Instead the start-up plan contains a vague listing of tasks, provides little to no detail on specific actions occurring in the start-up period, and identifies only a single member of the applicant team who would be committed to performing the start-up activities and tasks.

Finally, the applicant failed to demonstrate evidence of the capacity to implement the Financial Plan due an unrealistic budget for Year 0 and the lack of a contingency plan. For Kamalani Academy, a viable, clear contingency plan is especially crucial due to the high enrollment targets set by the applicant. The Evaluation Team determined that only a three percent drop from the enrollment targets would have a

significant impact on the budget. The applicant team's reliance on Academica to develop a contingency plan after enrollment targets are not met emphasizes the team's lack of financial capacity.

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.