

**U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2018 02:37 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DreamHouse, Inc. (U282B180027)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	17
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	20	12
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	11
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	6
Sub Total	100	56
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Access to High Quality Educational Choice		
1. Increasing Access	4	3
Sub Total	4	3
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs		
1. Enrollment Programs	4	2
Sub Total	4	2
Total	108	61

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers (84.282B) - 1: 84.282B

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: DreamHouse, Inc. (U282B180027)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvanta

- 1. The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to open will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students and serve those students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools.**

Strengths:

The application provides a comprehensive plan for establishing its presence within the target community. Specifically, the application identifies two methods for creating awareness of the school within communities with educationally disadvantaged students. First, the application identifies partnerships with local organizations that have relationships with families in the community that are characterized as a network of support for marginalized and disadvantaged families with educationally disadvantaged children (e27). Second, the application describes effective recruitment strategies that are designed to maximize interactions with families of disadvantaged students. These strategies specifically address, economically disadvantaged families, migrant, and EL families. Further, the application indicates that listening and informational sessions will be held for these families (e28). These components describe a well-rounded plan that strategically identifies the target population and multiple opportunities for interactions to educate, inform, and discuss how the school is specifically designed to meet the needs of these educationally disadvantaged students.

In addition to providing a detailed plan for recruitment, the application has a comprehensive educational plan that directly addresses the needs of educationally disadvantaged students. The application indicates the school has established a goal of 100% of students meeting or exceeding proficiency in English and Math on the state assessment (e25). The applicant's Universal Response to Intervention incorporates processes and strategies that support this goal. Screening every student and creating individualized education plans for each student is an appropriate and effective strategy not only to monitor each student's progress toward proficiency targets but to track progress toward the goal of 100% proficiency in English and Math. Additionally, the application states that the plan is adaptable and flexible based on student needs. Interventions and modifications to individualized learning plans are presented as a method for building student success and ongoing progress toward mastery goals (e24). The combination of recruitment plan and Universal RTI program demonstrate that the school has been specifically designed to close educational gaps for disadvantaged students.

Weaknesses:

The application does not provide detail regarding the rates at which nearby public schools serve educationally disadvantaged students. Without a quantifiable target against which to measure itself, it is not clear how the school will be able to demonstrate that it is serving educationally disadvantaged students at a rate comparable to surrounding public schools. (e28)

The project will be implementing an original, non-scripted, in-house created curriculum (e144). The implementation of an unproven, untested curriculum, especially with a high-need population as the school intends to serve, raises concerns as to its effectiveness in closing gaps and student proficiency in English and Math.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 17

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable

Strengths:

The application describes specific, quantifiable, and measurable goals. Seven goals are described by the application, each with a quantifiable measure that can be used to determine whether the goal has been reached (e31). Further, connections between each goal and 4 of the 6 project objectives can clearly be identified. Based on these connections, it is possible to identify methods that may be used to determine whether portions of objectives have been accomplished.

Weaknesses:

The application does not identify the methods or criteria to be used to measure outcomes (e29) or objectives (e30). Although the outcomes and objectives contain descriptors that could be used for defining more measurable aspects, the application does not provide specific or measurable descriptors for the objectives and outcomes. Without this level of detail, it will not be possible to determine whether, or to what extent, each of these outcomes and objectives is reached.

The project outcomes, objectives, and goals do not address the expectation that 100% of Dream House students earn college credit via Running Start. Without an outcome, objective, or goal to support this expectation, the application does not demonstrate that this priority is integrated into the project design.

Reader's Score: 8

2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs..

Strengths:

The application identifies 5 specific needs areas (e32) and provides demographic data to support identified need for some of these areas. For example, the application indicates that "over 40% of children speak a language other than English at home" (e32) to support the English Learners as an identified need. Additionally, several of the needs areas align with goals of the project. For example, the first identified needs area, College Attainment, aligns with the project goal of 100% of students earning college credit via Running Start (e21).

The application then identifies three key elements of the project design to address needs. (e33)

Weaknesses:

The application provides a minimal amount of detail regarding the design of the proposed project. Although areas of need are identified (e32-e34), the application lacks detailed descriptions of program elements to address these needs. Additionally, the application lacks a connection between the goals, objectives, and outcomes and the needs of the population. Correlation between described needs and program goals, objectives, and outcomes where

Sub Question

applicable are not directly stated in the application and must be inferred. Insufficient detail in the description of the design of the program is provided to demonstrate that the project is appropriate to address the described needs of the student population to be served by the school. There is no clear correlation between goals, objectives, and outcomes and needs to demonstrate that successful implementation of the program will address the needs identified in the application.

The application identifies 5 specific needs areas (e32) but does not identify project elements that address each of these areas of need. The identified areas of need not addressed by the project are: Heritage and Multi-Family Households. The issues identified that pertain to Heritage are "the need to ground educational practices and the school model in culture, history, and people" (e32). The application does not address how culture, history, and people will be integrated into instructional practices and the school model. For Multi-Family Households the application indicates that an appropriate school model "will be cognizant of the knowledge of these older generations, while highlighting the importance of bridging 'old knowledge' with emergent technologies and a dynamic 21st century curriculum." (e32)

The pedagogy of the school is described as "evidence-backed" and "driven by years of research and community engagement". (e34) The result is "leadership and identity development in the context of a rigorous academic environment focused on empowering leaders for out islands". While this provides a description of the expected outcome of the pedagogical approach to be implemented, it does not address culture, history or people or demonstrates bridging of knowledge from "older generations" with a "dynamic 21st century curriculum".

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. Note: The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 12

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability**

Strengths:

The application includes a table (e35) that demonstrates the founding team of the school includes a diverse group consisting of Native Hawaiian, female, and persons of color. Further the application identifies two recruitment networks that continue to be leveraged to ensure that traditionally underrepresented groups are prioritized in the hiring process.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 2

- 2. (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The application provides descriptions of education and relevant experience for key project personnel. The qualifications highlighted in the application focus on the areas of special education (e36) and education policy (e37). One of the team members has experience writing and monitoring student IEPs and previously managed a caseload of 22 students with IEPs. (e36) This experience demonstrates the capacity to ensure that IEPs are created and monitored for students with disabilities that enroll in the school.

Another team member is currently the Director of Education Policy for New Mexico. (e37) This experience demonstrates capacity to ensure compliance and stay current with any changes to policy that will require the school to implement changes to policy and procedures.

Weaknesses:

Although the application identifies relevant experience of key personnel, details are lacking to demonstrate how this experience is appropriate for specific roles and responsibilities. There are three individuals identified with experience in the area of special education (e36), but the application does not describe the roles each will have within the project to demonstrate that this experience is valuable for each of their roles. Furthermore, a list summarizing the group's combined experience and education is provided, but no information or detail is provided to demonstrate how each of these items is important for the program. This summary provides a broad and general picture of the overall capacity of the team, but does not demonstrate how this applies to key aspects of this specific project. Additionally, because information is provided in a list it is not clear whether the majority of the items represented a few individuals or whether there is an even distribution of experience and expertise across all key project personnel.

The organizational plan (e45) identifies an Operations Lead. The application does not identify any experience or education among key personnel to demonstrate experience and knowledge exists among key personnel to ensure that the Operations Lead is qualified to fulfill the described responsibilities.

Resumes are provided (e73-e104) for 14 individuals, however no information is provided in the application to identify roles or responsibilities for any of these individuals. It is not clear whether these are governing board members that will serve in an advisory capacity, or will be key personnel involved in the day to day operations of the school. Without additional information it is not possible to determine whether sufficient capacity to successfully implement the project design exists.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

Academic plan includes quarterly timelines that identifies assessment and data analysis opportunities for each month of the school year. The monthly Staff Huddle and twice monthly Instructional Coach meetings provide multiple opportunities for teachers to analyze student performance data and create appropriate action plans.

The academic plan provides adequate processes and strategies to support the project's academic goals (identified on e31). The academic plan is detailed on e155-e192. The application states that the project is "designed with and specifically for children in Ewa Beach" (e145). Course descriptions for grades 6 and 7 are provided. (e158-e170)

Organizational Plan detailed on e208-233 describes how to grow from capacity for 300 to 700 students. (e229-e230). A Financial Plan detailed on e234-244 describes three contingency strategies.

Weaknesses:

The academic plan does not identify the number of formative and/or summative assessment each month. The individual student academic goals/targets (e43) do not align with the project's academic goals (e31). The academic plan does not describe how the academic plan builds toward reaching the project academic goals (e31).

The academic plan does not address the project expectation that 100% of students earn college credit (e21).

The organizational plan addresses contractual compliance, but has no clear connection to project outcomes, objectives, or goals.

The financial plan provides a brief and general description for the annual financial audit and monitoring of school financial health. The application does not describe a plan for monitoring the project budget (e49-50).

Overall the application does not identify milestones for project implementation or monitoring. The plans provided in the application are broad and general, and although they pertain to the general operation of the school they do not provide specific responsibilities, timelines, or milestones. Additionally, the three plans provide for the general operation of the school, but do not demonstrate how the plans will result in achieving project outcomes, objectives, and goals.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Reader's Score: 11

Selection Criteria - Continuation Plan

- 1. The extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate charter schools that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available.**

Strengths:

The application provides projected operating and growth costs from opening through 7 years of operation. (e53) The projections show that once enrollment reaches 300 students the school will be able to operate solely on per pupil revenue alone, which coincides with the end of grant funds.

The application states that \$200,000 has been secured in start-up funds (e52) since May 2017 and will continue to leverage relationships with local and national foundations for continued financial support.

Weaknesses:

The application indicates that the proposed school is not financially viable without CSP funding during the first three years. Fiscal viability depends upon enrollment reaching at least 300 students in the third year of operation (e53).

Budget includes significant dependence on fundraising in initial years (e238) requiring a 3-year near million dollar campaign. E238 states that funders wanted to see charter granted before committing, now that charter has been granted the application does not provide any follow-up to demonstrate that funders have been secured to fill the near million dollar gap needed.

Reader's Score: 6

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Access to High Quality Educational Choice

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Supporting High-Need Students by Increasing Access to High-Quality Educational Choice

This priority is for projects that are designed to increase access to educational choice and improve academic outcomes and learning environments for one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students in communities served by rural local educational agencies
- (ii) Children with disabilities
- (iii) English learners
- (iv) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian Tribes.

Note: Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that it intends to serve the local EL population. Based on the populations of local feeder schools, the EL population will be greater than the state average (e20)

The applicant intends to serve the local special needs student population. Additionally, the applicant estimates that it will serve nearly twice the percentage of special needs students than the nearby district schools. (e19)

The applicant describes its intended student population to be 50% Native Hawaiian or part-Native Hawaiian. (e20)

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant describes its community as "rural", it has not demonstrated that the students are served by a "rural local education agency" as defined in the NIA (eligible under the SRSA or the RLIS)

The applicant provides no basis for its estimation of 50% of students identifying a Native Hawaiian or Part-Native Hawaiian.(e20)

Reader's Score: 3

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2—Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools

The extent to which the proposed project is designed to increase student access to, participation in, and completion of dual or concurrent enrollment programs or early college high schools.

Strengths:

The applicant state that it has established partnerships with several local organizations that include generations awareness of dual enrollment courses (GEAR UP), facilitate dual enrollment courses (Running Start), as well as a post-secondary institution (University of Hawai'i as West O'ahu) (e21)

Weaknesses:

The applicant describes a strategy for providing students with access to college credits, but does not describe a fully developed dual or concurrent enrollment program. (e21)

The applicant does not describe a process or strategies to ensure that it will meet its goal of 100% of students earning college credit. (e21)

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/18/2018 02:37 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/18/2018 05:55 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DreamHouse, Inc. (U282B180027)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	12
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	22
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	20	14
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	20
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	8
Sub Total	100	76
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Access to High Quality Educational Choice		
1. Increasing Access	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs		
1. Enrollment Programs	4	3
Sub Total	4	3
Total	108	83

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers (84.282B) - 1: 84.282B

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: DreamHouse, Inc. (U282B180027)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvanta

1. The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to open will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students and serve those students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools.

Strengths:

The applicant provided a plan built by experienced and qualified Special Education professionals for the proposed project (p. 6, e23). The applicant provides a diagram of the model DreamHouse that includes Vision, Mission, Outcomes, and Goals, Teaching and Learning Process, Assess Growth and Outcomes. The applicant built a model to support educationally disadvantaged children aimed to eliminate all academic achievement gaps (pgs. 6-11, e23-29).

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide comparative data between proposed project and surrounding public schools. For example, the comparative information provided was broad and referenced the State of Hawaii, and 'EWA Beach Schools compiled for Math and Reading for Special Needs students (SPED) English Language Learners. The applicant failed to provide data for specific public school districts within 'EWA Beach Schools (pgs. 1-2, e19-e20, 5-11, e22-e28).

The applicant failed to provide sufficient details on the proposed dual or concurrent enrollment component (pgs. 5-11, e22-e28). For example, the applicant stated that "key partners and strategy integration is at the foundation of our early college model." However, the strategies for the early college model were not included in the application. In addition, the applicant failed to describe how partners would support the dual credit programs through letters of commitment.

The applicant failed to provide evidence that the proposed locally developed curriculum is research and evidence-based (e144).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 22

Sub Question

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable**

Strengths:

The applicant provided specific goals, objectives, and outcomes that are measurable for the project. The applicant presented a creative approach to identifying the expected outcomes (how the children will turn out) (p. 12, e29). The applicant indicated that the curriculum proposed is data-driven, evidence-based, and uses qualitative and quantitative measures accompanied by objectives and measurable goals (pgs. 13, 14, e30, e31).

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide assurances for the monitoring of goals, objectives, outcomes for long-term success (e29, e31).

The applicant failed to provide evidence of how progress will be measured for all objectives, and outcomes indicated in the proposed project design (e.g. empowered leaders, self-driven learning experience) (p. 12, e30).

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs..**

Strengths:

The applicant presented approach used to design an evidence-based model through a research and mining of historic longitudinal data. To ensure appropriateness and effectiveness of program that meets needs of economically disadvantaged students, the applicant engaged with the children, families, and leaders of the community served to develop the program with specific key areas being addressed (e.g. College attainment, heritage, English learners, multi-family households, socioeconomics) (pgs. 14-16, e31-e33).

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to provide detailed action steps for the project design. The supports for the project are not clarified or specific in nature (p. 15, e32).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. Note: The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 14

Sub Question

1. **(1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability**

Strengths:

The applicant provides significant evidence of employing individuals from traditionally underrepresented groups. A table with the Founding Team for DreamHouse indicates that two-thirds of the team is from traditionally underrepresented groups (e.g. Native Hawaiian, persons of color, female) p. 18, e35).

Weaknesses:

No weakness indicated.

Reader's Score: 2

2. **(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel**

Strengths:

The applicant provided thorough information that demonstrates that qualified key personnel by experience and education and training will manage and support the proposed project. The applicant provided job descriptions and resumes for the leadership team, finance, Board, (p. 18-20, e35-37, 211, e69, 103, e245) and proposed School Director (p. 105, e247, p. 107-108, e249-e250).

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all key staff (p. 17-18, 37-38, e34, e54, e55, e211).

The applicant failed to provide full names of key staff for clarity (p. 18, e35, e95-e99).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

The applicant provided a management plan that demonstrated the project could meet proposed objectives on time and within budget, and includes responsibilities (e55, p. 38), timelines and milestones for accomplishing the project tasks (pgs. 21-33, e38-51). The applicant provided an "assessment and analysis map" to include formative and summative assessments administered quarterly for academic benchmarking (pgs. 24-26, e-41-e43). The applicant provides a detailed budget narrative for the proposed project (pgs. e253-266). The Founding School Director will provide the oversight for the proposed project ensuring the successful implementation of the management plan along with the support of experienced leadership team (e211, e247-e250).

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each selection criterion. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those criteria.

Weaknesses:

No weakness indicated.

Reader's Score: 20

Selection Criteria - Continuation Plan

- 1. The extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate charter schools that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available.**

Strengths:

The applicant provides a comprehensive continuation plan that will include per pupil funding, Title I Funds, philanthropy and grants (p. 35, e52). The applicant provides details for sustainability of the proposed project after the end of the grant period. Additionally, the applicant plans to secure future funding from third party financiers, or venture firms (pgs. 36, 37, e54, e55).

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to identify or provide letters of commitment from philanthropy organizations or specific grants for future financial support for the proposed project to ensure sustainability (e238, e253).

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Access to High Quality Educational Choice

- 1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Supporting High-Need Students by Increasing Access to High-Quality Educational Choice**

This priority is for projects that are designed to increase access to educational choice and improve academic outcomes and learning environments for one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students in communities served by rural local educational agencies
- (ii) Children with disabilities
- (iii) English learners
- (iv) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian Tribes.

Note: Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to

each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The applicant states it has been in development since 2012 with an emphasis of providing an increase of access to high-quality education to children with disabilities who are English learners, students in rural communities, and students of Native Hawaiian ancestry (pgs. 2, 3, e19, e20). The applicant presents research-based data and expects to serve a special education population of approximately 15% that exceeds the population served by district public schools in Ewa Beach during the 2017-18 school year.

Weaknesses:

No weakness indicated.

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2—Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools

The extent to which the proposed project is designed to increase student access to, participation in, and completion of dual or concurrent enrollment programs or early college high schools.

Strengths:

Strengths

The applicant presents a thorough plan to provide options allowing students access to dual credit in effort to increase the participation rate of economically disadvantage students (from 39% without dual credit) for ensuring an increase of student access and participation in completion of dual credit. The goal of the applicant's program design is to ensure that all students enrolled earn no less than 12 transferable credits towards a postsecondary degree. Programs of impact include partnership with GEAR UP Hawai'i, Running Start, P-20, and the University of Hawai'i at West O'ahu (p. 2, e21).

Weaknesses:

The applicant failed to present a plan to implement the strategies of the proposed project (p. 4, e21).

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/18/2018 05:55 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/16/2018 02:20 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: DreamHouse, Inc. (U282B180027)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged		
1. Disadvantaged Students	15	12
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	30	20
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Project Personnel	20	12
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	20	12
Continuation Plan		
1. Continuation Plan	15	8
Sub Total	100	64
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 1		
Access to High Quality Educational Choice		
1. Increasing Access	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Competitive Preference Priority 2		
Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs		
1. Enrollment Programs	4	3
Sub Total	4	3
Total	108	71

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - CSP Developers (84.282B) - 1: 84.282B

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: DreamHouse, Inc. (U282B180027)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvanta

1. The significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to open will recruit and enroll educationally disadvantaged students and serve those students at rates comparable to surrounding public schools.

Strengths:

Dreamhouse was awarded the only charter of the 2016-17 charter application cycle (page 5) in Hawaii. The founders are special education teachers and administrators which gives them unique perspective on meeting the needs of the target population. The mission of the school is clear and compelling because the emphasis is on what children bring to the school rather than traditional "Deficit Thinking." The visual of the Dreamhouse model (page e23) is clear and considers both the needs of the learners and how those needs can best be met. RTI and rootedness in state's academic standards as well as "collaborative and inclusive modifications," integrate data tracking, differentiated teaching and emphasis on school culture are essential components of the model. Exceptionally high goals (such as 100% proficiency rates for all students) are laid out in charter plan (see pages 8-9). The school targets disadvantaged students in its outreach. The extent of special education staff qualifications is impressive (page e37).

Weaknesses:

A more thorough explanation of "robust supports for all children (page 9)" and "highly differentiated teaching" would strengthen the application, as would further detail on the nature and extent of "partnerships with local community organizations, state agencies, and wrap around service providers (p 10)." The extent to which the concurrent enrollment piece has been fleshed out is unclear. There is no data about rates comparable to nearby traditional public schools.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 20

Sub Question

1. (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable

Sub Question

Strengths:

The seven stated goals are very stringent but measurable and clearly specified. For example, 100% of students will meet or exceed standards in math and ELA and measured by Smarter Balance.

Weaknesses:

Goals appear to be potentially too much of a “reach.” While 100% of students meeting or exceeding standards (page 8) is always desirable, this may not be achievable. There is also no specific goal on early college credit. The plan to measure such things as involvement in community and leadership experience is absent.

Reader's Score: 10

- 2. (2) The extent to which the design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs..**

Strengths:

The longitudinal data mining strategy is impressive. Community listening sessions appear to have resulted in a design that is rooted in what the community wants and says they need. Community engagement appears very strong as evidenced by the large number of community meetings that have been held. The focus on native Hawaiian heritage of the students is strong.

Weaknesses:

The response is weakened by the lack of data on the number of community members engaged in listening sessions. It is unclear what the pieces of the project that are likely to address the clearly identified need. It is also unclear how when over 40% of students speak languages other than English, those students will be supported.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

- 1. Note: The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers:**

Reader's Score: 12

Sub Question

- 1. (1) The extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability**

Strengths:

The chart on p. 18 is compelling evidence of the founding group and their desire to replicate characteristics of founding team. They are actively encouraging applicants from similar diverse backgrounds. There are clear connections to people from diverse backgrounds in the recruiting process.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 2

2. (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel

Strengths:

There are exceptionally strong founding team members with relevant training and experience, including PhDs, EdDs, a former Teach for America Executive Director, Harvard Graduates, etc (p. 18).

Weaknesses:

It was difficult to find connections between partial names listed in the chart on page 18 and the resumes in the application supporting materials. It is unclear if "Deb" is the same person as "Debra" in the resumes. Some of the people on the chart do not have clear roles and responsibilities listed. Not all of the people for whom there are resumes provided are clearly identifiable in the key personnel listing. This weakens the application because it does not allow the reader to understand how all of those people are involved in the project operations.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.**

Strengths:

There is clearly a focus on data mining that includes what the applicant describes as "careful analysis" and adjusting based on collected data (page 38). There is a robust data collection system and clear timelines. The Leadership Support Team's role is expansive and focused on grant goal/objectives achievement. Pages 38-51 clarify ways the school plans to implement the management plan. There are what appear to be high-quality processes focused on the academic domains of the grant (e.g. board analysis, disaggregation by subgroup, professional development aligned with identified needs, etc).

Weaknesses:

While assessment timelines and benchmarks are clear on pages 24-25 of the grant, the large project milestones outside of assessments (in white) and analysis/PD (in gray) are not provided. For example, it is unclear when the larger grant goals and objectives get refined if necessary. It is also unclear when personnel decisions are made relative to grant activities. The milestones and timelines are focused on the assessments and the PD, but there are no clear descriptions of anything outside those two realms. This is a major weakness. In other words, the milestones are not focused on what might be termed "operations" because they are so focused on what might be termed "academics." The audit strategy (pages 32-33) lacks specificity.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Continuation Plan

- 1. The extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate charter schools that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available.**

Strengths:

It appears enrollment will not be an issue for a school with the kinds of obvious demand that already exists (see page 37). This is evident in the application through “The Dreamhouse” 400+ person mailing list, thousands of website views, child sign-ups for leadership days, dozens of letters of support, and overall demand for a new charter option in the community.

Weaknesses:

It is clear state revenues should continue assuming enrollment is constant, but it is unclear how PD and other data mining efforts will be sustained after the grant period. The proposed school does not seem viable without the grant funding in the first several years. The dependence on fundraising of nearly \$1 million in the first several years is concerning (pp. 34-38). There is no compelling evidence that the school can function fiscally without funds in addition to the state dollars that come from enrollment (pp. 34-38). There is no clear commitment from those who have signed Memorandums of Understanding or other letters of commitment for donations/grants/funds that come in addition to the money that comes directly from enrollment.

Reader's Score: 8

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Access to High Quality Educational Choice

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Supporting High-Need Students by Increasing Access to High-Quality Educational Choice

This priority is for projects that are designed to increase access to educational choice and improve academic outcomes and learning environments for one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students in communities served by rural local educational agencies**
- (ii) Children with disabilities**
- (iii) English learners**
- (iv) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian Tribes.**

Note: Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The emphasis in this grant application is on children with disabilities, English Learners and Native Hawaiian populations (page e19-22). The applicant proposes to serve a rural population in need. There is a compelling need for better educational attainment for the students the grant proposes to serve. The “robust menu of options for children” (page e21) and statement of purpose on page e20 support the competitive preference priority.

Weaknesses:

None noted

Reader's Score: 4

Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2—Dual or Concurrent Enrollment Programs and Early College High Schools

The extent to which the proposed project is designed to increase student access to, participation in, and completion of dual or concurrent enrollment programs or early college high schools.

Strengths:

Early college is a key to the strategy (see page 4). There are established partnerships with GEAR UP, Running Start and University of Hawaii and West Oahu to increase awareness, preparation, and enrollment in secondary education. Stats about the disparity between college enrollment rates for those who participate in dual enrollment versus those who do not are compelling (72 compared to 39 percent respectively).

Weaknesses:

Greater explanation of the extent and efficacy of existing partnerships would strengthen this section of the application. There is not a clear “program” apart from the partnerships for the dual/concurrent enrollment with the partner(s).

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/16/2018 02:20 PM