

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M180024)

**Reader #1:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	37
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	27
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	14
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>95</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #1: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M180024)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

#### 1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 37

##### Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and, where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State.**

##### Strengths:

KIPP has a comprehensive data set that has been utilized in independent evaluations and documents significant outcomes compared to state or national data across virtually all subgroup comparisons. KIPP's data set includes student growth data utilizing Northwest Education Association (NWEA) MAP assessment which allows for growth over time analysis. In both reading and math, the percentage of KIPP students who met or exceeded their individual growth goal was over the national average. (e46)

KIPP had an independent evaluation by Mathematica Policy Research (e43) which documented that the KIPP network out performs local schools and the state on test score improvement and proficiency, increased attendance and retention rates, high school graduation, college attendance and college completion rates (e44) while serving students from educationally disadvantaged districts. The analysis of the percentage of KIPP classes outperforming the state and district (e45) are significant across every subgroup. Attendance and retention rates were also examined and KIPP matched the national statistics of 94% attendance. (e47) In terms of high school graduation rates were 92% but college graduation rate with a degree was 36% matching the national average but when compared to educationally disadvantaged students it was three times the average of 12%.(e48)

##### Weaknesses:

KIPP's data on outperforming districts and states on state assessment have variances across subgroups in different locales but consistently Students with disabilities, performed significantly lower in both math and reading than the comparison groups. No specific strategies or interventions were identified to address this outcome. (e45)

Reader's Score: 13

2. (ii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or**

**Sub**

**regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.**

**Strengths:**

KIPP provided significant details regarding the 14 school closures, 1 scheduled to close this year and the 2 which closed after one or fewer years of operations due to unusual circumstances. (e51-52)

None of the schools had their charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements. But all 17 had their affiliation revoked or terminated most by voluntary disaffiliation.

**Weaknesses:**

A total of 17 KIPP affiliated schools have been closed, while this is only 2% of operating schools, there still needs to be a plan developed to identify systematic interventions and assistance that can be provided prior to closure (e50-51) addressing each of the identified reasons provided by KIPP. (e51-52)

Each of the 17 previous KIPP schools had their affiliation revoked or terminated by voluntary disaffiliation and 8 closed after the action of voluntary disaffiliation while others remained open as charter schools or were merged with an existing school. (e51-52)

**Reader's Score: 12**

- 3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

**Strengths:**

KIPP provided data regarding the charters with significant issues with management, operational, fiscal or student safety issues. (e51-52) The well documented six instances of compliance issues had corrective action taken by KIPP and none of these issues led to the revocation of the charter.

Kipp's recent focus on building a stronger set of risk management assessments that would translate into professional development training for staff are designed to support a new, proactive focus on prevention of risk, especially as related to student safety. (e53-54)

**Weaknesses:**

KIPP's response shared data on the issues leading to the closures, including philosophical differences with KIPP, disagreement with authorizer, low student enrollment, and financial unsustainability. It did not provide any plans to address these identified issues. (e51-52) Most of the closures occurred after multiple years of operation which indicates that the support from KIPP was not significant in addressing the issues that lead to the closures. The new school safety risk management assessment is not adequate to examine these identified issues of concern. It would need to be broadened to include a strategy that provides for the analysis of KIPP's operational support for these schools.

**Reader's Score: 12**

## Selection Criteria - Significance

### 1. Selection Criteria 2: Significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students

In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 27

Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.**

#### **Strengths:**

The KIPP network maintains an extensive data base which produces demographic statistics regarding their students including the fact that 89% or more of KIPP's student population are educationally disadvantaged based on the free or reduced lunch for each of the last five years. (e133, e57) 95% of their students are African American or Latino, 11% students with disabilities, and 17% English language learners which are significantly higher than national averages and often are disproportionately represented on a specific KIPP campus. What makes these statistics so compelling is the academic outcomes that KIPP achieves compared to national averages.

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

2. (ii) **The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

#### **Strengths:**

KIPP has an advantage of a well-developed plan for scaling up their network based on their ability to open multiple new charters annually. Based on their 25-year history, KIPP has established a strong infrastructure that provides not only evidence of successes but a reputation for effective organizational management, recruitment tools tailored to specific subgroups with translations in multiple languages (e59), a detailed recruitment plan of action and a cadre of regional leaders (e58) who have direct experience in making a new charter successful.

KIPP has already identified specific schools and regions for inclusion in this grant with 3 new schools including a restart campus, a middle and high school in one region. In 2020, 16 new schools will open and in 2021 plans are in place to expand or replicate 34 schools. (e60) The ability to scale up in such a significant manner is not possible with other CMOs and puts KIPP in a category of an exemplary service provider to its schools and a national leader in charter development.

KIPP has evidence of their ability to effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students. Some of the supports the CMO provides to their charters includes leadership development, regional academic team support, common curricula (with an implementation blueprint e36), systematic common assessments, and professional development. (e62)

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

The KIPP plan to expand by 16 new charters in 2020 and expand or replicate 34 schools in 2021 is very ambitious. (e60) The written plan did not provide a historic perspective of annual growth the KIPP network which would have provided some comparison to their current plan. While this massive expansion occurs, KIPP is also restructuring its regional team approach. The plan did not provide enough details to provide assurance that these two massive interventions can result in success.

**Reader's Score:** 12

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. Selection Criteria 3: Quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project**

**In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers 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 proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan's performance measures are ambitious, based on the logic model, have defined outcomes and are measurable. (e66-67) These are supported with a comprehensive evaluation implementation plan with a defined baseline for each performance measure, when they will be reported and evaluated and a definition of why the target is ambitious and achievable. This is an exemplary document that can provide leadership and teachers with a comprehensive guide to implementation focus for the next five years across the entire KIPP network. (e68-70)

KIPP has a sophisticated data infrastructure in place that produces high quality data collection, analysis and reporting. This is a critical element of the evaluation plan and is already integrated into KIPP operations at the charter level, regional centers and national office. (e60) This comprehensive system will produce both quantitative and qualitative data.

**Weaknesses:**

No independent evaluators were identified. All analysis and reports will be generated by staff. There were no staff resumes or assignments identified specifically to support the evaluation plan. KIPP has a significant infrastructure and talented staff but the lack of an evaluation timeline with defined tasks and measurable outcomes needs to be developed. (e5-63)

**Reader's Score:** 9

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan**

**In determining the quality of the applicant's management plan, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score:** 14

**Sub**

- 1. (i) The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended, as demonstrated by the multi-year financial and operating model required under section 4305(b)(3)(B)(iii) of the ESEA (5 points). (NFP)**

**Strengths:**

KIPP has plans to scale up 52 school sites during this grant with the support of the KIPP infrastructure and regional offices. (e74) These funds will be utilized to realign and reconfigure regional offices to establish greater capacity for growth based on the new regional design. (e75)

This ambitious growth plan utilizes the infrastructure and services provided by the national and regional teams in the areas of financial management, central office operational support, facilities (including federal funds to assist in financing) and Human Resources. (e77) KIPP has developed an extensive operational design with both regional and national operational structures that has staff expertise and fiscal resources to support the sustainability of their expansion plan. KIPP has a well-defined multi-year fiscal and operating model that has been successful in growing their network of schools while maintaining their quality educational focus.

**Weaknesses:**

Leadership development and training has always been a significant component of the KIPP model. There was no discussion of the ability of the current leadership pipeline to produce enough school-based leaders to run the 52 new school sites within the grant specifications. Staff recruitment and training are essential to assuring the educational program can be implemented with fidelity. The plan did not contain a projected training schedule to assure staffing would not be a significant issue impacting KIPP's aggressive expansion.

KIPP is also examining a realignment of the regional support system as an outcome of the grant. There was no projected training schedule included in the application to assure that regional staffing would not be an issue that would significantly impact KIPP's aggressive expansion plan based on their critical role in growing schools.

**Reader's Score:** 4

- 2. (ii) 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. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The management plan with timelines, responsibilities and milestones is a comprehensive one-page document that details the major project tasks (e79) supported with narrative descriptors of the infrastructure KIPP has in place to meet the challenge of implementation.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

- 3. (iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The KIPP leadership team has a wide range of charter experiences and specialized training in their area of expertise. (e80-82) Full resumes for the key leaders are in the Appendix (e5-63)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Diversity**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1— Promoting Diversity.**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds, and maintaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies in those charter schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

**Strengths:**

KIPP plans to implement an ambitious expansion plan resulting in 52 new campuses based on their successful model. One of the strengths of the KIPP network is their ability to establish and maintain an extensive data set on each of its campuses. This provides the network with specific data regarding the diverse student body that KIPP recruits and serves. KIPP's recruitment plan is committed to establishing a student body that is significantly educationally disadvantaged (currently 89%) based on the free or reduced lunch rates and is ethnically diverse. (e133, e57)

One of the outcomes of the KIPP plan is to open in New York city, KIPP Beyond Charter School middle school. This unique school model has as its focus diversity. Programmatic design elements include restorative justice and a focus on culturally responsive pedagogy. This new school will serve as a pilot for KIPP's diversity agenda by developing new curricular tools and strategies focusing on diversity. Once the program is piloted, it will be shared across the KIPP network for full implementation. (e32)

**Weaknesses:**

KIPP provides evidence of a high network rate of educationally disadvantaged students across racially diverse campuses. When individual school data is examined there is significant variability with (Appendix G) examples of KIPP schools that do not reflect diversity in their student populations. This problem was not addressed and there was no evidence of attempts by KIPP to examine or modify this lack of diversity.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each competitive priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those priorities.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools**



## 1. Competitive Preference Priority 2— Reopening Academically Poor-performing Public Schools as Charter Schools

Under this priority, applicants must:

(i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and

(ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--

(A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

(B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

### Strengths:

KIPP provided three exemplary urban restart examples (Bragaw, Whittier, and Arts and Technology Academy). In each of the sites KIPP was able to restart an underperforming school and dramatically increase academic achievement in a short time frame. For example, Quest Academy within two years of the restart, the performance rate in math doubled and tripled in language arts. (e33) These significant academic turnaround success stories indicate the ability of the KIPP network to successfully reopen low performing schools and impact academic outcomes.

KIPP has a new restart opportunity in Washington DC at Somerset Prep which would provide a high school restart model and will be part of this grant proposal since it has been approved by the DC Charter board and KIPP DC Board of Directors. (e34)

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 3

## Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students

### 1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

(i) Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;

(ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;

(iii) Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and

(iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

(v) For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the ESEA, and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

#### **Strengths:**

KIPP plans to use the grant dollars to replicate or expand six high schools (e37) and open a total of 52 new charters. Each of the secondary campuses will utilize existing high-quality interventions focusing on college entry and completion. KIPP has developed a strong set of programmatic strategies including the KIPP AP for All Success program with a result that 76% of KIPP Seniors in 2018 took an AP exam. (e37) This success is paired with the KIPP Through College counselors who provide college and career counseling using the College Match Strategy resulting in an application portfolio of six or more college and post-secondary options by 74% of the Seniors (e38) and 93% of Seniors applied for federal or state financial aid. (e40) The alumni counseling program at KIPP has data to indicate that 87% of their college freshmen return to college in the fall. Each of these initiatives eliminate barriers to college entry and support the ability of students to become college graduates based on the KIPP 45% rate of their high school students earning a bachelor's degree. (e41)

KIPP has developed an infrastructure of partnerships with higher education with over 100 college/universities and 25% of KIPP graduates attend a partner higher ed institution.(e42)

KIPP has a systematic approach to the successful transition of high school students to college graduates. There are specially designed student interventions, support services that are tracked in a comprehensive data set that makes documentation of KIPP's outcomes important to both higher education partners, policy makers and secondary practitioners. (e37-40)

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

### **Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools**

#### **1. Competitive Preference Priority 4— Replicating or Expanding High-quality Charter Schools to Serve Native American Students.**

(i) Propose to replicate or expand one or more high-quality charter schools that--

(A) Utilize targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

(B) Have a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

(C) Have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Indian organizations located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school;

(ii) Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school; and

(iii) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Indian organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

**Strengths:**

This competitive preference was not addressed.

**Weaknesses:**

This competitive preference was not addressed.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M180024)

**Reader #2:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	37
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	30
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	15
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	3
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>99</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M180024)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

#### 1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 37

##### Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and, where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State.**

##### Strengths:

The applicant provides narrative to demonstrate that academic achievement results outperform state averages (e44-e50). Using state assessments and growth metrics to show achievement, the applicant shows that students outperform at various grade levels and within subgroups. The applicant indicates that gains in student achievement are significant over time, such that by fourth and eighth grade when the cumulative impact of several years are evident. For example, within the economically disadvantaged subgroup in 2018, 70 percent of 4th grade classes outperformed the district, in tests of reading, 78 percent did so in math; similarly, 78 percent of 8th grade classes outperformed the district in reading in 2018, and 80 percent outperformed in math. In the same year, English Language Learners in 96 percent of 8th grade classes outperformed those in the state.

##### Weaknesses:

Weaknesses in the narrative show one group not performing as well. For example, data does not show special education students performing better than their non charter school counterparts (Appendices 5 and 6).

Reader's Score: 13

2. (ii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.**

##### Strengths:

The applicant provides narrative to support this indicator (e49-e53). Explanations are provided for schools that have been removed from the network due to performance. Schools that are not with the applicant's network but have remained opened are cited in the narrative.

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not properly account for schools that have closed and how or if plans are made to avoid closure of any future schools. The applicant indicates that 17 schools were closed and although some school reopened; it is not clear how the applicant avoided such closure.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 3. (iii) The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides narrative to indicate that there are not significant fiscal or operational issues within the management of its charter school organization (e53-e57). For example, following policies are in place: Code of Ethics, Whistle Blower Policy, Document Retention and Destruction Policy, and Conflict of Interest Policy. Board members are required to disclose on an annual basis any conflicts of interest, which are reviewed by the Board in accordance with state and federal law.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant's narrative shows information on a charter school affiliated with its network that has demonstrated fiscal concerns (e55-e56). As part of the applicant's organization, affiliated schools should demonstrate the same fiscal solidarity.

**Reader's Score: 14**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

- 1. Selection Criteria 2: Significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students**

**In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

**Reader's Score: 30**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides sufficient narrative that it extensive served educationally disadvantaged students (e57-e58). Data is included in the narrative. Specifically, in the 2017-18 academic year, the most recent year for which we have data, across the KIPP network of schools, 96 schools qualify for CEP, 89 percent of students in the remaining 113 schools are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch; 95 percent of KIPP students are African American or Latino. Across the network, 11 percent of KIPP students receive special education services, and 17 percent are designated English Language Learners. The percentages are comparable to the areas where network schools are

**Sub**

present.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

2. (ii) **The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides sufficient narrative to address this indicator (e62-e64). The applicant provides supports for educationally disadvantaged students within its academic curriculum. For example, the applicant trains instructional leaders, provides common curricula, implements common assessments, and leads professional development and communities of practice to ensure a consistently strong academic model. Student performance is measured within the application of this model. The applicant provides a convincing plan to recruit and enroll students using community partners.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. Selection Criteria 3: Quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project**

**In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers 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 proposed project, as described in the applicant's logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a high quality evaluation plan that measures performance objectives and goals of the project (e64-e71). The outcomes are measurable and tracked through multiple data sources. Data managers within local and regional offices work collaboratively with the Foundation's national Research & Evaluation, Insight & Analytics, and Technology teams to collect data and report on annual performance metrics. This is part of the evaluation plan to track performance outcomes.

**Weaknesses:**

Absent from the narrative is a description of how the applicant will capture qualitative data. Goals and objectives are not aligned with qualitative data collection to provide this type of data to inform the project.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**

**1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan**

In determining the quality of the applicant's management plan, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. (i) The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended, as demonstrated by the multi-year financial and operating model required under section 4305(b)(3)(B)(iii) of the ESEA (5 points). (NFP)

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a sufficient model for sustaining the operation of the program (e72-e77). This include uses of local and state funds. Beyond the grant period, schools will continue to be operated locally with support from applicant's Foundation. Through a combination of public and private funding, the Foundation and the consortium of Regions will have the resources to operate the new and expanded schools beyond the grant period.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) 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. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a management plan with responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (e79). The multi-year timeline provides dates and persons responsible for each activity.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210 (e)(3)(ii))

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a sufficient narrative to indicate the qualifications and relevant training and experience of key personnel (e80-e82). All key personnel are described in relation to duties and their background. For example, the Chief Research, Data and Innovation (RDI) Officer, is responsible the applicant's national Research & Evaluation and Insight & Analytics teams (focused on creating ongoing visibility into the network-wide performance, generating actionable insights, and ensuring high quality data and research to support network leaders in making data-driven decisions); the national applicant's Through College team (focused on ensuring that KIPP alumni nationwide successfully matriculate to and graduate from college); and the applicant' technology team (focused on application development and technology infrastructure). The individual has more than 10 years at The Boston Consulting Group (BCG) where, as a principal and partner, he spent several years helping to build and lead BCG's public education practice.



Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 5

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Diversity**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1— Promoting Diversity.**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds, and maintaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies in those charter schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant indicated that it would enroll 365 students, with approximately 60 percent qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch. KIPP Beyond will be aligned to the applicant's national model and will leverage its proven curricula (e32)

**Weaknesses:**

Additional narrative is needed to explain how this competitive preference priority will be fully met. General statements are provided to indicate the applicant how the applicant will recruit its students. For example, it is unclear how diversity would be promoted among multiple ethnic groups in addition to African American and Latino.

“This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each competitive priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those priorities.”

**Reader's Score:** 2

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2— Reopening Academically Poor-performing Public Schools as Charter Schools**

**Under this priority, applicants must:**

**(i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and**

**(ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--**

**(A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and**

**(B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights**

laws.

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses this competitive preference priority. The applicant cites its success in previous years in reopening or expanding poor-performing schools (e32-e35). Additionally, in the fall of 2019, the applicant will to restart Somerset Prep PCS, a public charter school educating students in grades 6-12 in Ward 8 of the District of Columbia. The restart model has been approved by the District of Columbia school board.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

**Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.**

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

- (i) Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;
- (ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;
- (iii) Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and
- (iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.
- (v) For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the ESEA, and one-year training programs that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

**Strengths:**

The applicant addresses this competitive preference priority. The applicant provides a comprehensive plan to expand 6 high schools. Previous strategies are described in the narrative which have led to students persisting in post secondary education (e35-e42). For example, the applicant provides information on the financial aid process to its students. The

applicant describes its success with postsecondary enrollment including high numbers of students enrolling in college and applying for financial aid.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4— Replicating or Expanding High-quality Charter Schools to Serve Native American Students.**

(i) Propose to replicate or expand one or more high-quality charter schools that--

(A) Utilize targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;

(B) Have a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and

(C) Have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Indian organizations located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school;

(ii) Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school; and

(iii) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Indian organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.

**Strengths:**

None noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address this competitive preference priority.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 02/12/2019 05:08 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M180024)

**Reader #3:** \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	45	34
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Disadvantaged Students	30	27
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	10	9
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	15	14
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	3	1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools</b>		
1. Reopening Public Schools	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>High School Students</b>		
1. High School Students	3	2
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools</b>		
1. Replicating/Expanding	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>89</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #2 - CMO - 2: 84.282M

Reader #3: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M180024)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

#### 1. Selection Criteria 1: Quality of the eligible applicant

Reader's Score: 34

##### Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which the academic achievement results (including annual student performance on statewide assessments and annual student attendance and retention rates and, where applicable and available, student academic growth, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates) for educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have exceeded the average academic achievement results for such students served by other public schools in the State.**

##### Strengths:

External evaluators have identified KIPP schools as outperforming similar students served by other public schools (e43). The elementary and middle schools have "...positive, statistically significant, and educationally meaningful impacts on student achievement in math and reading, and the high schools "...have positive impacts on a variety of college preparation activities and the likelihood of applying to college." (e44).

KIPP's data indicates that their students as a whole outperform state and local public-school students, and that students gain academic growth as they stay enrolled in KIPP schools (e44-45).

KIPP schools in general have higher or comparable attendance rates than the public-school districts in which they are located (e47).

##### Weaknesses:

KIPP presents data, in the body of the application, on the performance of their very large network. A review of more individualized data does show areas of weakness (especially for Special Needs Students) revealed by a review of the data in Appendix 5.6. While KIPP demonstrates overall strength outperforming the districts and states where their schools are located, examination of more individualized data reveals less than 100% consistent results.

Reader's Score: 14

2. (ii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have closed; have had a charter revoked due to noncompliance with statutory or regulatory requirements; or have had their affiliation with the applicant revoked or terminated, including through voluntary disaffiliation.**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

Across nearly two decades, of the 238 schools opened by KIPP-trained educators, 229 schools (96 percent) are in operation, and 224 schools (94 percent) still operate within the KIPP network (e49).

KIPP provides ongoing support to schools operating under the KIPP trademark licensing agreement (e49-50). KIPP monitors school performance and provide staff to work with the struggling school.

**Weaknesses:**

KIPP has a network of 224 schools and has closed or disaffiliated 14 schools (e50-e53). While this is a small percentage of KIPP schools, it demonstrates that there are weaknesses in overseeing such a large and widespread network.

**Reader's Score: 10**

3. (iii) **The extent to which one or more charter schools operated or managed by the applicant have had any significant issues in the area of financial or operational management or student safety, or have otherwise experienced significant problems with statutory or regulatory compliance that could lead to revocation of the school's charter.**

**Strengths:**

KIPP works with their regional boards to assess risk management and has implemented augmented policies across their network of schools (e54).

Nationally KIPP is financially sound and works closely with authorizers to ensure strong operational and financial management (e53)

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant reports on six operational, safety, or compliance issues in the KIPP network (e55-56) and an extensive description of problems at KIPP Houston including fiscal and compliance issues, and a personnel issue that had student safety implications (e56-57). Although it is a small number of incidence over a large network of schools, it does demonstrate the difficulties of overseeing such a large system.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Significance**

1. **Selection Criteria 2: Significance of contribution in assisting educationally disadvantaged students**

**In determining 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, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

Sub

1. (i) **The extent to which charter schools currently operated or managed by the applicant serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners, at rates comparable to surrounding public schools or, in the case of virtual charter schools, at rates comparable to public schools in the State.**

**Strengths:**

Within the KIPP network of schools there are high percentages of students identified as economically disadvantaged (eligible for CEP and/or free/reduced price lunch) (e57) indicating the KIPP is serving a substantial population of economically disadvantaged students.

KIPP asserts that 95% percent of their student populations across the network are of African-American or Latino descent, demonstrating that they serve a large population of traditionally underserved students (e57).

11% of KIPP students receive special education services, and 17% are English Language Learners, indicating that they serve populations that are educationally disadvantaged (e57-58).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not provide regional information for their demographics as compared to the districts in which they are located. The demographics in Appendix G are by school so an appraisal of how each district or region where KIPP schools are located compares in terms of educationally disadvantaged is difficult to tell.

An overview of KIPP schools in Newark, for example (Appendix G, 151) shows how one school in the district can skew the percentages – Newark Collegiate Academy has 0% African American students while Thrive Academy has 98%, as compared to 46% in the district. Special Education percentages overall in the Newark KIPP schools are lower than those of the Newark Public Schools with the exception of TEAM Academy. On a large scale the applicant's demographics demonstrate that they are serving high percentages of educationally disadvantaged students which is not always true on a smaller scale.

Reader's Score: 13

2. (ii) **The quality of the plan to ensure that the charter schools the applicant proposes to replicate or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, particularly students with disabilities and English learners.**

**Strengths:**

The new or expanded schools planned by KIPP will be located in and targeted to communities with high levels of educationally disadvantaged students (e58).

KIPP will actively recruit families with door-to-door visits, information tables at community events, and will work with local faith-based communities and other non-profits that serve students and families (e58) to reach economically disadvantaged and other educationally disadvantaged students.

KIPP will provide parents, including those whose students may require special services, with information about their programs and services (e59) to recruit students with disabilities.

KIPP uses various methods to reach out to English Language Learners including using materials and having translations available in the dominant languages of the area (e59) in order to recruit English Language Learners.

The application includes lists of planned new schools and expansions and provides the data on the economically disadvantage percentage of students to be served, indicating that the growth plans of the KIPP network will provide

**Sub**

services to economically disadvantaged populations (e60-61).

KIPP implements its model through training, common curricula, common assessments, professional development and communities of practice (e62) to ensure adherence to the model.

**Weaknesses:**

For a public school to be legitimately open to all students with special needs, it is necessary to advise parents that whatever programs, services and accommodations that are needed by the student per their IEP will be provided, rather than tell them what programs, services and accommodations are available (e59) as that might discourage a parent whose child needs something other than what the school currently offers.

**Reader's Score: 14**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation**

**1. Selection Criteria 3: Quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project**

**In determining the quality of the evaluation plan for the proposed project, the Secretary considers 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 proposed project, as described in the applicant’s logic model, and that will produce quantitative and qualitative data by the end of the grant period.**

**Strengths:**

KIPP’s evaluation plan includes performance measures aligned to those of the NIA: KIPP’s outcome of growing the network of KIPP schools will expand opportunities for all students, particularly traditionally underserved students (e65), KIPP’s outcome of maintaining consistently high-quality schools will support students in meeting challenging State academic standards, and KIPP’s project will evaluate how well they prepare students for post-secondary success (e65).

KIPP’s logic model and project measurement plan are clearly articulated and relevant to the project’s outcome goals. Project performance measures range from student enrollment data, students achieving proficiency and above on state assessments, and measures of college preparedness such as taking AP classes, college entrance exams and persisting in secondary education (e66).

KIPP has data managers in each regional office and a robust data collection and analysis program (e70) indicating an experienced and ongoing evaluation system.

KIPP maintains a database of post-secondary outcomes to evaluate the success of the KIPP model in students’ postsecondary success (e66).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide much information, other than the mention of stakeholder surveys, on collecting valid and reliable qualitative data (e70-71).

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan**



## 1. Selection Criteria 4: Quality of the Management Plan

In determining the quality of the applicant's management plan, the Secretary considers the following factors:

Reader's Score: 14

Sub

1. (i) The ability of the applicant to sustain the operation of the replicated or expanded charter schools after the grant has ended, as demonstrated by the multi-year financial and operating model required under section 4305(b)(3)(B)(iii) of the ESEA (5 points). (NFP)

### Strengths:

KIPP Foundation is experienced in opening and sustaining schools, including a sound multi-year financial and operating model (e71).

KIPPs sustainability plan is that their schools will continue to operate locally, beyond the grant period, with financial support from the KIPP Foundation, through a combination of public and private funding (e72). KIPP funders include such philanthropic partners as the Doris and Donald Fisher Fund, the Walton Family Foundation and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. KIPP also has regional philanthropic partners supporting KIPP schools locally (e73).

### Weaknesses:

KIPP has had three schools close due to financial instability (e51-52), indicating that their sustainability is not 100% successful.

Reader's Score: 4

2. (ii) 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. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(i))

### Strengths:

KIPP has a detailed plan for achieving project objectives with clearly defined milestones and timelines (e79).

### Weaknesses:

None found.

Reader's Score: 5

3. (iii) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))

### Strengths:

Key KIPP staff are experienced in education and governance, such as prior experience as a senior level administrator in the New York City Department of Education (e80), public education research (e81) and non-profit financial management (e82).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Promoting Diversity**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1— Promoting Diversity.**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to replicate or expand high-quality charter schools that have an intentional focus on recruiting students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds, and maintaining racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies in those charter schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.**

**Strengths:**

In 2020 KIPP New York City will open “KIPP Beyond Charter School,” a middle school serving grades 5-8 that will offer strong academics and co-curricular activities in an environment that reflects the diversity of the district and the city. This school will have an intentional focus on enrolling students from racially and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds (e32).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant only provides one example of its intention to intentionally recruit and serve racially and socioeconomically diverse student populations. The applicant will be opening 52 new schools so the project’s intent to fulfill this Competitive Preference Priority in all of the planned expansion is unclear.

The applicant does not supply an analysis of the demographic information provided in Appendix G. A review of the information in that appendix demonstrates that KIPP schools have a mixed record of diversity that is comparable to the districts in which KIPP schools are located.

This application was thoroughly discussed with respect to each competitive priority. My scores reflect my professional assessment of the application with respect to those priorities.

**Reader's Score: 1**

**Competitive Preference Priority 2 - Reopening Poor-performing Public Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 2— Reopening Academically Poor-performing Public Schools as Charter Schools**

**Under this priority, applicants must:**

**(i) Demonstrate past success working with one or more academically poor-performing public schools or schools that previously were designated as persistently lowest-achieving schools or priority schools under the former School Improvement Grant program or in States that exercised ESEA flexibility, respectively, under the ESEA, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB); and**

**(ii) Propose to use grant funds under this program to reopen one or more academically poor-performing public schools as charter schools during the project period by--**

**(A) Replicating one or more high-quality charter schools based on a successful charter**

school model for which the applicant has provided evidence of success; and

(B) Targeting a demographically similar student population in the replicated charter schools as was served by the academically poor-performing public schools, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws.

**Strengths:**

The applicant has experienced success with schools in New Jersey and in Washington D.C., taking over existing schools with their populations largely intact and improving student performance (e34).

KIPP plans to continue to reopen poor-performing schools in the future and has a public school in Washington DC that may close within the grant period (e34) and will continue to evaluate opportunities to reopen poor performing schools (e35).

**Weaknesses:**

The current project does not include re-opening any identified poor performing schools.

Reader's Score: 2

**Competitive Preference Priority 3 - High School Students**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3— High School Students.**

Under this priority, applicants must propose to:

(i) Replicate or expand high-quality charter schools to serve high school students, including educationally disadvantaged students;

(ii) Prepare students, including educationally disadvantaged students, in those schools for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions through activities such as, but not limited to, accelerated learning programs (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses and programs, dual or concurrent enrollment programs, and early college high schools), college counseling, career and technical education programs, career counseling, internships, work-based learning programs (such as apprenticeships), assisting students in the college admissions and financial aid application processes, and preparing students to take standardized college admissions tests;

(iii) Provide support for students, including educationally disadvantaged students, who graduate from those schools and enroll in postsecondary education institutions in persisting in, and attaining a degree or certificate from, such institutions, through activities such as, but not limited to, mentorships, ongoing assistance with the financial aid application process, and establishing or strengthening peer support systems for such students attending the same institution; and

(iv) Propose one or more project-specific performance measures, including aligned leading indicators or other interim milestones, that will provide valid and reliable information about the applicant's progress in preparing students, including educationally disadvantaged students, for enrollment in postsecondary education institutions and in supporting those students in persisting in and attaining a degree or certificate from such institutions. An applicant addressing this priority and receiving a CMO grant must provide data that are responsive to the measure(s), including performance targets, in its annual performance reports to the Department.

(v) For purposes of this priority, postsecondary education institutions include institutions of higher education, as defined in section 8101(29) of the ESEA, and one-year training programs

that meet the requirements of section 101(b)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA).

**Strengths:**

KIPP has a track record of high schools recognized for their quality (e36). This information aligns with Competitive Priority 3 for replication of high quality high schools.

KIPP high schools implement an accelerated Advanced Placement learning program with some success in increasing the number of students taking an AP test (e37). KIPP also provides counselors to support students in preparing for post-secondary opportunities (e38). KIPP provides support for college and financial aid, and standardized test completion (e40).

KIPP provides alumni advisors to support students in persisting in post-secondary education (e41). The coaching and KIPP support has resulted in 87% of KIPP high school graduates who attend college returning in the fall following their first year (e42).

KIPP has identified eight (8) performance measures related to the goals of preparing students for post-secondary success and persistence in pursuing postsecondary education (e66). The measures include percentages of students taking AP exams, scoring 21 or higher on ACTs, applying for financial aid, college acceptance, postsecondary career planning, alumni returning to college after the first year and graduating from college.

**Weaknesses:**

Although many of the measures are supportive of post-secondary success, there is no description of where the replicated or expanded high quality seats will be provided. The information pertains to current students but the expansion/replication is not described in terms of this Competitive Priority. Measures on e66 do not differentiate out the success of these measures for educationally disadvantaged students.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Replicating/Expanding High-quality Charter Schools**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 4— Replicating or Expanding High-quality Charter Schools to Serve Native American Students.**

- (i) Propose to replicate or expand one or more high-quality charter schools that--**
  - (A) Utilize targeted outreach and recruitment in order to serve a high proportion of Native American students, consistent with nondiscrimination requirements contained in the U.S. Constitution and Federal civil rights laws;**
  - (B) Have a mission and focus that will address the unique educational needs of Native American students, such as through the use of instructional programs and teaching methods that reflect and preserve Native American language, culture, and history; and**
  - (C) Have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Indian organizations located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school;**
- (ii) Submit a letter of support from at least one Indian Tribe or Indian organization located within the area to be served by the replicated or expanded charter school; and**
- (iii) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Indian organization(s) from which the applicant has received a letter of support in a timely, active, and ongoing manner with respect to the development and implementation of the educational program at the charter school.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant did not addresses this competitive priority preference.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not addresses this competitive priority preference.

**Reader's Score:**     **0**

---

**Status:**           Submitted

**Last Updated:**   02/12/2019 05:08 PM