

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:30 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U423A180059)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	17
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	17
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 12: 84.423A

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U423A180059)

Questions

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:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) The extent to which the training or Professional Development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) 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 proposes “utilizing a high-quality, research driven curriculum focused on the three core components: instructional leadership, adaptive leadership, and leading for equity” (pp. e30-31). The 3 core components are well described on pages e36-40. Campus principals are the instructional leaders on their campuses. They must be well trained to evaluate, support and lead their teaching faculty. The 3 core components described by the applicant are supported by current research, and are expected to train the KIPP principals to effectively lead their faculties. Plans to train principals in engaging important stake holders, parents and community, are also included (p. e33). Knowing who the key stake holders are, and how to engage them, is crucial to principal success.

Additionally, the applicant states, “All program content is based on extensive principal effectiveness research, large - scale analytical studies, and case studies of high - performing schools, as well as the experience of principals and senior leaders from across the 209 KIPP schools” (p. e32). It is clear the applicant has researched and implemented what needs to be included in an effective training program for principals.

The applicant also describes a “successor” program that includes support, coaching and additional training (p. e33). This program also reflects sound training practices.

The professional development inclusion is well described and is of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The proposal states, “In - person professional development is cohort - based, led by experts and proven school leaders, and includes opportunities for authentic practice through role - plays, small group activities, and video - recorded practice. Participants gain further real - time experience through job - embedded leadership opportunities. Participants are expected to attend and actively engage in 100% of programming; proactively seek feedback; and complete intensive pre - and post - work for each session. Finally, participants receive direct one – on - one feedback and support from a personal leadership coach” (e41). Through these stated research-based activities, the professional development piece promises to be successful.

The benefits of effective STEM instruction are well touted. The skills obtained are important skills students need to be

successful in 21st century careers. Although STEM has been endorsed for a number of years, many educators do not truly understand what STEM means. Often mathematics, science, technology and engineering skills are still taught in isolation. The applicant proposes, “SEED - trained principals, trained in instructional leadership will ensure the curriculum is coupled with excellent instruction by establishing a clear academic vision; supporting STEM teachers in understanding and analyzing standards for upcoming modules and lessons; supporting STEM teachers through frequent observation, feedback and coaching; and overseeing the administration of multiple forms of assessment to measure and improve teaching and learning” (p. e42). The applicant’s vision for K-12 STEM is stated in a figure (p. e84). Twelve criteria are listed. It is an excellent vision that includes integration among the STEM disciplines and active learning through relevant projects and inquiry.

The proposal notes several collaborating partners expected to maximize the effectiveness of the project’s services. These include KIPP school staff and regional partners and external practitioners (p. e43). The external practitioners are found to be well credentialed. Letters stating their commitment to the project are found in the Appendices.

The design of the proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. As advised by the applicant, “Collectively, the KIPP principals trained under this grant will lead schools that will educate 48,000 students –a population on par with the 100th largest school district in the U.S., similar in size to Shelby County (TN), Seattle Public Schools, Sacramento City Unified, or Omaha Public Schools. Schools led by principals trained with SEED support will be located across the U.S. in high - need urban and rural communities and will serve a student population in which over 80 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced -price lunch. Utilizing KIPP’s model...” (p.e28).

“In addition, to deepen and expand impact, KIPP’s SEED project will train administrators of public school districts, charter school systems, and leadership training organizations on KIPP’s effective principal selection, development, and evaluation practices. In total, these leaders will reach at least three million public school students during the grant period” (pp.e28-29).

“KIPP students – who are 95% African American or Latino, with 88% qualifying for free or reduced – price meals – complete college at a rate that is comparable to the national average and approximately three - times the rate of students from similar economic backgrounds. Rigorous independent research that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards with and without reservations confirms KIPP’s positive and substantial impact on student achievement” (p.e29). Through these statements, it is clear the KIPP program will address the needs of a diverse, under-privileged population nationally. Additionally, its impact will reach target audiences outside of the KIPP network. Additional detailed statistics and information are provided (p. e43) supporting this.

Weaknesses:

None Noted.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

As described, the proposed KIPP project utilizes sound research-based practices and proven KIPP results (pp. e44-48) that promise to further improve teaching and student achievement nationally. The project's significance lies in the applicant's vision for K-12 STEM (p. e84). Twelve criteria are listed. It is an excellent vision that includes integration among the STEM disciplines and active learning through relevant projects and inquiry. Results from this project is expected to add substantially to the current body of research.

A well-developed budget is offered (Appendix 5) (p.e277). Additionally, the budget and its components are well described in a budget summary (pp. e278-289). Budget costs are reasonable in relation to the large number of persons who will be served.

As it is stated in the application, the applicant plans to "annually train approximately 50 administrators of school districts and charter organizations through its KIPP Leadership Design Fellowship (KLDF)" (p. e35). This is one of several methods the applicant plans to use to disseminate their results in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies. Additional methods include on-line open sharing, conferences, and workshops (p.e53). All 3 methods are very effective at disseminating information.

Weaknesses:

The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding is weak. Although the applicant discusses how the newly trained principals will be supported following the grant period, the applicant does not discuss how future expenses will be met.

Although Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (p. e53) is a stated partner, no mention is made of writing and publishing journal articles. White papers and practitioners' journals are also not mentioned. Including these methods of dissemination would have strengthened the proposal; as, they are additional effective means of disseminating program results that would promote replication.

Reader's Score: 17

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 following factors:**

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

(2) 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.

(3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Two over-reaching goals are shared (p. e53). Objectives and measurable outcomes are well described for each goal in a table (p. e54). An additional table is offered further describing the measurable outcomes in relation to baselines and how each outcome will be measured (p. e55). Information provided in the two tables is sound. In addition, the applicant states it, "will leverage two national assessments (above and beyond the state specific student assessments." Both assessments are well-described by the applicant, including their validity and reliability (p. e56).

The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.

Major activities and milestones, along with responsible parties, are well outlined in a table (p.e57). A reasonable timeline is also included in the table. In a table provided (p. e58) project leadership and key personnel are described. Resumes are also included in the Appendices. It is clear they are well-credentialed and have good experience training instructional leaders. It is expected the management plan will adequately achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks.

The applicant states, "Feedback is actively collected via both formal and informal mechanisms; programming is then adjusted accordingly to ensure that all programs are continuously improving and increasingly tailored to participants' needs" (p. e59). The formal and informal mechanisms are well-described (pp. e60). Examples are provided including participant surveys. It is noted design teams and program leaders will meet regularly to study the data and make necessary changes. Coupled with the timeline, major activities, and milestones, procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project are adequate.

Weaknesses:

None Noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. will be the external, independent evaluator on this project (p. e103). This is a strength because the organization is well versed in conducting program/project evaluations. They are also noted to be unbiased.

Research questions tied to project outcomes are provided and described in a table (p. e104). The research questions are more fully described along with appropriate instruments (i.e. surveys) used to collect data (pp. e104 – 109). Each proposed training component is discussed. Additionally, validity and reliability are addressed and discussed (p. e106 and e109). The research questions are good questions that should result in an effective evaluation. It is important that the evaluation be valid and reliable, and the proposal does a good job of addressing this. It is expected the methods of

evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. It is also expected the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Matched comparisons are included and described with the Successor Prep component (p. e107-108). Limitations are also discussed and accounted for (p.e108). With regard to the quantitative measures, the study looks good.

Weaknesses:

The applicant advises, "The evaluation and implementation study will produce, to the extent possible, quantitative and qualitative data about the effectiveness of KIPP's school leaders program (Table 1) (p. e108). This indicates a mixed methods approach; however, little is described with regard to the qualitative methods (i.e. observational data, focus groups, interviews). More information is needed to determine whether or not the program evaluation will produce sufficient qualitative data.

Reader's Score: 17

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: Science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based Professional Development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

Strengths:

The applicant's vision for K-12 STEM is addressed (p. e84) with twelve criteria listed. It is an excellent vision that includes integration among the STEM disciplines and active learning through relevant projects and inquiry. The proposed training would improve educational outcomes for all of the STEM disciplines including technology. The number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields would increase through evidence-based professional development administered to principals who are the instructional leaders for their campuses.

Weaknesses:

None Noted.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2018 02:30 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2018 01:25 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U423A180059)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	35
Significance		
1. Significance	20	18
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	16
Sub Total	100	94
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	97

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 12: 84.423A

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U423A180059)

Questions

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:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) The extent to which the training or Professional Development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) 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 proposed project represents an exceptional approach. The applicant is focusing on evidence-based activities, where all were reviewed by WWC with or without reservations, and the studies found statistically significant positive effects on learning outcomes. There are two main components to the project design. The Fisher Fellowship and the Successor Prep leadership preparation programs. These two programs focuses on three components, instructional leadership, adaptive leadership and leading for equity (pages, e36-e39). The curriculum for these three components are directly related to the anticipated learning outcomes for instructional leadership, adaptive leadership and leading for equity (pages, e42-e43). All of these activities have been shown by WWC with or without reservations to have a positive effect on student outcomes (page, e48). All of these activities will be delivered with sufficient quality, intensity, and duration, which should lead to improvements in practice among the participants of this program, given the success with past participants of these programs. The applicant provided a very detailed figure outlining the days of training, hence, intensity of the services provided (page, e40). The intensity and duration should lead to improvements given the well-documented and verified success with previous participants. The quality of these activities will be assessed periodically, as the applicant has a thorough plan for implementation fidelity (page, e59-e60). The services will be provided by partners who have been delivering the two preparation programs for many years, and have a structure in place for continued operational efficiencies (page, e42-e43). The applicant will be providing services for those with the greatest needs. The students who will be impacted positively by having high-quality leaders represent 88% who qualify for free and reduced-price lunch, and 95% are African American or Latino, both groups traditionally part of the underrepresented groups of students. The applicant design is based on an already proven approach that has addressed the needs of the target population identified.

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

- (1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.
- (2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.
- (3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.
- (4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

This applicant's proposal is based on WWC standards with or without standards research studies, where similar outcomes of interests (students' gains) were shown to increase positively (page, e24). These same proposed programs are being delivered today, and students in these districts where the leaders were trained show learning gains of .36 standard deviation above their counterparts. This is a very significant difference in learning outcomes. The importance of this project is also related to the number of students who could benefit, over 36,000. In addition, the possibility of replication is strong, hence, extending the reach to many more students in other states. There cost is about \$360 per student over the three years. This is very reasonable given the already proven success of the leadership program. There are two primary reasons why the potential for the incorporation of the project activities are highly likely after the end of the federal grant. First, these trained principals will continue to receive a variety of support. Secondly, the evaluation results will strengthen all future leadership programming, which will be based on a high-quality WWC evaluation design (page, e50-e51). The dissemination plan should enable others to use best practices from this project, as it will be available and/or presented in many venues such as online open sharing, conferences and workshops. In addition, the applicant has a leadership fellowship program, where senior district leaders who are responsible for principal recruitment, selection and/or professional development can learn about the applicant's principal development practices (page, e52).

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant provided a dissemination plan including many components, ensuring the results are in peer-reviewed journals is also an important venue. There are many educators who read scholarly journals to learn about new policies and practices within education.

Reader's Score: 18

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 following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.
- (2) 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.
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant on pages e54-e55 provided clearly specified objectives and measurable outcomes. As example of a measureable outcome, train 120 new principals. This outcome can be objectively assessed by the evaluator to determine if it was met. The other outcomes were similarly defined. The applicant provided the qualifications and experience of the project lead and key personnel assigned to this grant, e58-e59. The qualifications and experiences of these key personnel are appropriate based on the number of years cited and previous work experience cited by the applicant. The applicant provided the objectives, staff roles/responsibilities, milestones and timeline which are all appropriate based on the project design. This information was clearly presented in Figure C.3 (page, e57). The applicant provided the amount of time the key personnel will be assigned to this grant, and the FTEs are appropriate to ensure quality oversight (page, e282-e283). It was also clear how the applicant will ensure the objectives will be met on time and within budget. This will be achieved by seasoned management who have managed federal grants (page, e56).The applicant plan for continuous improvement is sufficient and should allow for incremental improvements if necessary. There is a design team of the programs who meet regularly to examine formative data from participants' surveys and one-on-one calls to identify themes and trends, and action plans are created for making revisions if necessary (page, e60).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:**
 - (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.**
 - (2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
 - (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.**
 - (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.**

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

The analyses of the key outcomes will be based on a quasi-experimental design (QED) that will be WWC standards with reservations. The QED will be based on a matched comparison groups that will satisfy WWC baseline equivalence (page, e64). The matching covariates were discussed and should ensure baseline equivalence (page, e64). The outcome measures are provided and are associated with the key variables of interests as related to this project (Table D.1, page, e61). As an example related to student academic, state standardized test will be used. These are standardized

measures which are both reliable and valid. In addition, the following important evaluation information was provided with clarity, (a) the key evaluation questions which will guide the evaluation (page, e61); and (b) the measure/source (page, e61); The applicant's discussion related to the extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes was sufficient. The applicant plan for continuous improvement is sufficient and should allow for incremental improvements if necessary. There is a design team of the programs who meet regularly to examine formative data from participants' surveys and one-on-one calls to identify themes and trends, and action plans are created for making revisions if necessary (page, e60).

Weaknesses:

There was some key missing information in the evaluation section: (a) the stated detectable effect size, based on the sample sizes the applicant provided for the impact questions related to the teacher and student outcomes for the Fisher Fellowship; and (b) the type of quantitative analysis for the impact questions was not provided. This information is important to determine if an appropriate method will be used to address the nested nature of the data: students-in-classrooms, classrooms-in-schools, and schools-in-districts.

Reader's Score: 16

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: Science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based Professional Development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

Strengths:

The applicant's participants of this program will adopt and implement STEM curriculum, Eureka Math, Amplify Science, introductory computer science courses, and Project Lead the Way's engineering curriculum in their assigned schools. The trained principals will be required to ensure excellent instruction is taking place in the classroom through frequent observations, feedback and coaching, and overseeing the administration of multiple forms of assessment to measure and improve teaching and learning (page, e42).

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 06/29/2018 01:25 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2018 05:40 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U423A180059)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	35	32
Significance		
1. Significance	20	19
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	19
Sub Total	100	95
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science		
1. CPP1	3	3
Sub Total	3	3
Total	103	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #12 - Supporting Effective Educator Development - 12: 84.423A

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U423A180059)

Questions

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:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.
- (2) The extent to which the training or Professional Development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (3) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services.
- (4) The extent to which the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs.
- (5) 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:

(1) The proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition. The proposed project had an exceptional approach because it supported effective principals or other school leaders which is Absolute Priority 2. (Ex. of evidence found on Page e34, "...With SEED support, schools with a Successor Prep participant will also be able to hire a new assistant principal six months before the principal transition. By staffing this position early, the Successor Prep participant can step away from his or her day-to-day job responsibilities (often as an Assistant Principal in the school) to begin planning the transition, working with the regional leadership team, and shadowing the outgoing principal. Successor principals are in the unique position of needing to lead within a school's existing operating environment while creating and beginning implementation of their own vision for the future.) (+7pts)

(2) The training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. The training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project are of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services because...as stated on Page e34, "...KIPP's Fisher Fellowship and Successor Prep programs offer aligned, rigorous training that is intensive, collaborative, job-embedded and differentiated. KIPP's research-driven curriculum forms the basis of all programming, and all content is structured so that participants have the chance to learn through both direct instruction and opportunities for deliberate practice. KIPP developed a curriculum that emphasizes three core components: Instructional Leadership, Adaptive Leadership, and Leading for Equity. (Page e36). Additionally, the proposal states that an intensive, three-week Summer Institute with rigorous coursework taught by dynamic faculty and educational leaders in a university setting. A five two-to three-day in-person sessions held throughout the year focusing on the elements of maintaining effective and lasting organizations, including change management, transition planning, strategic planning and execution, instructional coaching, and performance management, up to two mini-residencies or focused school visits at high-performing KIPP schools across the country and one-on-one coaching with a leadership coach throughout the program to maximize strengths and identify areas for development..." (+7pts)

(4) The services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs. As indicated in the proposal the services to be provided by the proposed project are focused and evidence in the proposal includes, "...KIPP students 88% qualify for free and reduced-price lunch 95% are African American or Latino 11% receive special education services 17% are designated English Language Learners (Note: Some schools serve a much higher proportion of ELL students than others) (Page e43) (+7pts)

(5) The design of the proposed project is appropriate to and will successfully address the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (Page e40-53) (+7pts)

Weaknesses:

(3) The services to be provided by the proposed project involve the development of the programs, in close partnership with KIPP's regional academic leaders and Executive Director, but the collaboration of many partners lacked in the proposal. To be specific, services to be provided by the proposed project did not indicate involving any external collaborations. The proposal does not involve the collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing the effectiveness of project services. Although, proposal indicated on Page e42 KIPP's 209 schools, clustered together in 31 regions across the country, and work alongside and in deep partnership with our regional leaders to design coherent, the specific or potential collaborators were never mentioned. The indication that those would be established (future-tense) through network feedback etc. was proposed. (+4pts)

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Significance

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

(1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

(2) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits.

(3) The potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding.

(4) The extent to which the results of the proposed project are to be disseminated in ways that will enable others to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

(1) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement were identified, for example, Page e47, "...Education is understood as the key to greater opportunity and economic mobility, and as a way out of poverty. And yet, outcomes among low-income and minority students paint a sobering picture and confirm that America has not yet become a land of opportunity for all. Today, only one in ten students from low-income families will graduate from college in their mid-twenties. This is happening at a time when a college graduate will earn one million dollars more in lifetime earnings than a high school graduate. AND KIPP services to be provided by the proposed project are focused on those with greatest needs. KIPP schools serve a high-need student population. Page e47, explicit in our mission is a commitment to "helping students from educationally underserved communities..." (+5pts)

(2) The costs are reasonable in relation to the number of persons to be served and to the anticipated results and benefits. The proposed project states on Page e49 that at a cost of \$350 per student, during a three year grant period, and a \$270 per student at full enrollment, indicating a reasonable cost. (+5pts)

(3) The proposal discusses the potential for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing

program of the agency or organization at the end of Federal funding. (Page e50) For example on page e51, "... KIPP foundation supports principals, including with continued training and resources for instructional leadership; specific professional development retreats for teachers; and direct professional development support."(+5pts)

(4) The proposed projects state ways in which the results are to be disseminated for example, "...KIPP Leadership Design Fellowship (KLDF) and Online Open Sharing–KIPP will capture and disseminate via KIPP’s online Resource Library (www.kipp.org/approach/resource-library/). This open-access platform on our website features hundreds of KIPP resources for instruction and culture, college counseling, and school leadership. KIPP aims to present lessons learned through participation in education and related conferences such as Aspen Action Forum, ASU+GSV Summit, National Charter Schools Conference, South by Southwest (SXSW) for Education, and the Yale School of Management Education Conference. (Page e52-53). All of which is good, but the proposed project does not include practitioner journals, white papers, peer-reviewed etc. and should be considered to enable others to use the information or strategies. (+4pts)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 19

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 following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable.**
- (2) 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.**
- (3) The adequacy of procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project.**

Strengths:

(1) The proposed project stated the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved. (Page e35, 27) For example, Successor Prep participants identify three strategic priorities to address during their first year as principal. For each priority, successor leaders undertake a root cause analysis, generate actionable goals articulating what they hope to achieve, and develop success measures from which progress can be monitored throughout the year. The goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and Measurable for example KIPP’s SEED project has two overarching goals over the three-year grant period: train 120 new principals to lead high-performing schools that educate 48,000 students annually from high-need communities and share approach to principal training with 150 administrators whose districts and CMOs collectively educate 3 million students. (+9pts)

(2) 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 was adequately accomplished. For example, as written into the proposal, "...KIPP will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, under seasoned management, in close collaboration with KIPP regional leaders across the country, and drawing on deep experience running principal-preparation programs, collecting and analyzing diverse performance data, and managing federal grants. Each partner’s roles, as well as major activities and milestones related to the proposed project, appear in Figure C.3. (Page e57) (+8pts)

(3) The procedures for ensuring feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed project

was adequately identified. Major activities and milestones related to the proposal SEED project appear in Figure C.3 and expressed in the following excerpt, "...Feedback is actively collected via both formal and informal mechanisms; programming is then adjusted accordingly to ensure that all programs are continuously improving and increasingly tailored to participants' needs. In terms of formal mechanisms, participants provide sustained feedback through a combination of surveys and one-on-one calls. For example, during Summer Institute, participants fill out daily surveys whose results are then relayed to and reviewed by instructors, to be implemented as soon as the following day. Program design teams meet regularly to examine and synthesize participant feedback and data in order to identify key themes and trends; action plans are then created to hold the team accountable to making revisions, whether to presentations, handouts, or other programming protocols. In terms of informal mechanisms, in the process of observing and tracking participants' practice and progress, program leaders are also encouraged to critically evaluate where the training has been most effective or where the training could be improved. With each iteration, program leaders are increasingly able to gain insight into what methods are most impactful and then to act upon those insights. Furthermore, as internal data (e.g., student performance data or teacher feedback) is gathered throughout the school year, those resources also help inform where these programs can help to provide the most support and leverage to instructional leaders." (Page e57, 59-60) (+8pts)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the evaluation to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the evaluation, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet the WWC standards with or without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook.

(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on Relevant Outcomes.

Note: Applicants may wish to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation: (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbooks: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Handbooks> (2) "Technical Assistance Materials for Conducting Rigorous Impact Evaluations": <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluationTA.asp>; and (3) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/. In addition, applicants may view two optional webinar recordings that were hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences. The first webinar discussed strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-Experimental Design Studies and is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=23>. The second webinar focused on more rigorous evaluation designs, discussing strategies for designing and executing studies that meet WWC evidence standards without reservations. This webinar is available at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Multimedia.aspx?sid=18>.

Strengths:

(1) The methods of evaluation will if well-implemented produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that (would/would not) meet the WWC standards without reservations as described in the WWC Handbook. For example, as stated in the project proposal, "...The evaluation will employ a matched comparison group design to rigorously assess the effectiveness of the updated Successor Prep program. Mathematica will compare outcomes in schools led by Successor principals newly trained in the updated program with outcomes in schools led by principals who were not in the updated program. Intervention and comparison school matches will be identified based on characteristics of students in each of

several years before a leadership transition. The matching characteristics could include average student achievement and socioeconomic status. The comparison group will include participants of the previous Successor Prep program, who will be more experienced than the intervention group principals, and it will also include those who did not receive the full Successor program because they were assigned to the school through another process (such as an expedited assignment or training in a graduate school of education). To the extent possible, supplementary analyses will examine different pathways to leadership in KIPP schools. This analysis approach is designed to meet WWC group design standards with reservations, and be adequately powered to detect meaningful statistically significant effects. The matched comparison groups will satisfy WWC baseline equivalence requirements. Furthermore, the analysis will include a large enough number of schools to detect significant effects.” (Page e62-64) (+5pts)

(2) The methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. To support this statement, found on page e60, is the following “...The first, two research questions will yield periodic performance feedback for each of the three programs, supporting KIPP to make responsive changes to the programs’ design to better meet the needs of future school leaders. Mathematica will administer (1) annual surveys to participants beginning in Year 1 of the project (shortly after each cohort completes the program) to measure their levels of satisfaction and identify ways to improve the leadership programs, and (2) follow-up surveys to some cohorts of participants after they have experience in their new schools to learn how the programs supported their development as school leaders.)” (+5pts)

(4) The methods of evaluation will provide valid and reliable performance data on relevant outcomes. The evaluation and implementation study will produce, to the extent possible, quantitative and qualitative data about the effectiveness of KIPP’s school leaders program (Table 1). State standardized test scores satisfy WWC outcome requirements for face validity and reliability. (Page e63, 66) (+5pts)

Weaknesses:

(3) The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative data. However, qualitative data lacks. (Page e66) (+4pts)

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting STEM Education/Computer Science

- 1. Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: Science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects must address the following priority area:**

Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based Professional Development strategies for current STEM educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.

Strengths:

Does address the competitive preference priority of promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, or Math (STEM) Education, With a Particular Focus on Computer Science.

Projects designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in one or more of the following areas: Science, technology, engineering, math, or Computer Science. These projects address address) the following priority area: Increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields, including Computer Science, through recruitment, Evidence-Based Professional Development strategies for current STEM

educators, or evidence-based retraining strategies for current educators seeking to transition from other subjects to STEM fields.(Page e41)

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 3

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/29/2018 05:40 PM