Commission Outcomes Committee

June 1, 2023

SUSAN PCOLA-DAVIS

TESTIMONY

Discussion Items

1. Presentation on rationales for each declined opportunity for improvement finding from 2022 Board of Education ("Board") performance evaluation of State Public Charter School Commission ("Commission")

AGREE with Charter School Commission submission requested by the Commitee. If the Committee opposes the rationales, I suggest a sit-down meeting for clarifications between the BOE Commission Committee and the Commission.

Action Items

1. Committee Action on Commission continuous improvement plans to address all deficiency findings and selected opportunities for improvement findings in 2022 Board performance evaluation of the Commission.

AGREE with Charter School Commission submission requested by the Committee regarding that the Commission has developed all of the continuous improvement plans required by the Board's 2022 performance evaluation report of the Commission." If the Committee opposes the continuous improvement plans to address all deficiency findings and opportunities for improvement findings then, I suggest a sit-down meeting for clarifications between the BOE Commission Committee and the Commission.

The BOE and DOE have not set up anything in the Strategic Plan or elsewhere that is as stringent and rigorous as this committee's request.

In my opinion, HAPES is excessive. However, based on the following required.

Pursuant to Hawaii Administrative Rules ("HAR") §8-515-11, the Board of Education (the "Board") is required to conduct a performance evaluation of each charter school authorizer no less than every five years. Pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes ("HRS") §302D-11(a), the Board is "responsible for overseeing the performance and effectiveness of all authorizers." The Board adopted Subchapter 3 of HAR Chapter 8-515 to establish an oversight and evaluation system for authorizers to implement the statutory intent. Accordingly, the Board also adopted the Hawaii Authorizer Performance Evaluation System ("HAPES"),

pursuant to HAR §8-515-10, to provide the framework for the performance evaluations of authorizers.

The BOE and DOE have not set up anything in the Strategic Plan or elsewhere that is as stringent and rigorous as this committee's request. Such as the requirements set forth by the Commission Committee below. If the expectations from the Charter Commission are as seen below, I would suggest using these requirements for the Strategic Plan.

1. A sufficiently detailed timeline that includes:

a. Steps intended to reach outcomes that remedy the finding for which the continuous improvement plan was designed;

- b. Projected completion dates of each step; and
- c. Who is responsible for executing each step;

2. Standards of success to assess the effectiveness of the outcomes in remedying the finding for which the continuous improvement plan was designed;

3. A description of how the Commission **(Department)** will use the standards of success to assess the outcomes;

4. Actions the Commission (**Department**) will take if the outcomes do not meet the defined standards of success; and

5. Any resources required to implement the plan.

If a continuous improvement plan does not contain all of these elements, the Committee will not consider it developed, and the Commission **(Department)** will need to revise that particular plan, have its board review and approve it, and present the revised plan to the Committee.