

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/04/2016 09:32 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M160007)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	40
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	9
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	1
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Total	108	88

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Charter Management Organization - 4: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M160007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 40

Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

Strengths:

The applicant holds a compelling and impressive track record with disadvantaged and general education students - citing numerous research based studies and (pg. 12) and national rankings. Impressive gains are particularly highlighted in Los Angeles, Massachusetts, Denver, and Newark pg. 46

Weaknesses:

Data on all schools are not provided thereby making it challenging to ascertain the average success rate for any number of 'new schools' during establishment. Opening 65 schools across 32 communities is an aggressive strategy - with clarity and detail on the schools that did not successfully open (historically) - the reviewer can better understand the systems in place to ensure the success of the new 65. Lastly performance data is not disaggregated to demonstrate the average performance of special education and English language learner sub groups in comparison to national/ statewide averages.

Reader's Score: 18

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

Strengths:

The applicant demonstrates some success as it relates to the closing of the achievement gap. Information provided however is not specified as it relates to achievement gap statistics in various states as the applicant has

Sub Question

summarized this information.

Weaknesses:

In some grades only 50% of the applicants schools are closing the achievement gap at a higher rate than district schools specifically amongst special education and English language learner populations. Evidence cited in this section references an extensive study that is more than 3 years old and contains data almost 10 years old. (Mathematica Policy Research)

Reader's Score: 9

- 3. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

Strengths:

The applicant successfully demonstrates (p.24) that the network of schools has raised the achievement level significantly for disadvantaged and at risk students – as evidenced in graduation data. For example 80% of KIPP students start college compared to 64% of the U.S average and 45% of low-income students.

Weaknesses:

Student retention is not included in the data provided and though performance following graduation is strong, from the data provided on the previous pages there are gaps in performance levels across some grades P-8 that are not comparable to graduation data.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

The proposed project will support several communities that serve disadvantaged students across the U.S and the applicant successfully demonstrates a history of success when working with an Educationally Disadvantaged Population per data provided The applicant states that most schools will open near already existing schools however 14 unique communities will be serviced and 65 new schools will be founded and expanded. The applicant has a proven model grounded in a “Five Pillar Operating Model” which consists of “high expectations”, “choice and commitment”, “more time”, the “power to lead and a “focus on results”. A quality assurance model labeled the “healthy schools and regions framework” ensures holistic school health and performance. Pg. 29

A "leadership design fellowship training program" is additionally in place to support the leadership pipeline of the school network, assure quality and a consistent culture.

Weaknesses:

It is unclear what interventions are in place to support schools in existence whom are not out performing its local district (pg. 22) to ensure that the network has the capacity to support such extensive school growth.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

Strengths:

The goals and objectives are rigorous, compelling, measurable and attainable and center on expansion, serving an area of need, attrition goals, and academic achievement pg. 36. For example - the applicant states that it intends to have equal or better retention than established KIPP schools and the data will be collected nationally and validated through the rigorous Healthy Schools & Regions data collection process.

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses found

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 15

Sub Question

- 1. 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 (4 points).**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant states that the foundation will manage the product in addition with KIPP local leadership. There are clear positions to assess the viability of each new site and implement a plan for founding. KIPP founders are thoroughly trained through the Fisher Fellowship yearlong program p. 41

Weaknesses:

The application would benefit from additional information on how local sites for establishment are selected and relationships with local leadership are formed.

Reader's Score: 3

- 2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).**

Strengths:

School evaluations are in place as a quality assurance metric, which include assessments on student achievement, impact on learning, leadership and management, learning community culture and finance site visits. Facilities selection is managed by the local leadership/ regional team and a facilities finance expert. A regional Chief Academic Officer provides school support and the Foundation director spearheads the support and training of local board leadership while a regional recruiting team supports new hire acquisition.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 4

- 3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

A detailed financial narrative is provided. Expenses appear to be reasonable and necessary for expected success.

Weaknesses:

Although support letters are included – specific partnerships are unclear.

Reader's Score: 2

- 4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).**

Strengths:

No strengths found.

Weaknesses:

The organization provides a plan for “name removal” as opposed to a closure plan.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 0

- 5. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).**

Strengths:

The establishment and dissemination team is highly qualified and includes deep experience in KIPP's culture, high level consulting, and corporate and educational leadership.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of 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 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.**

Strengths:

Student information systems, Assessment Management Tracking, data portals, NWEA, Illuminate data portals and other platforms will be used to assess the 6 essential questions that undergird the KIPP model. Surveys are additionally leveraged as qualitative data in support of the schools Healthy Schools & Regions Framework.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

- 1. This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.**

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

- (a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).**

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

- (b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).**

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will

be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility, and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The certification form is available at https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

On page 27 the applicant notes that its schools opening in 2017 are located in promise zone cities, including: Atlanta, Los Angeles, Nashville, Philadelphia, San Antonio, and St. Louis.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --
 - (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
 - (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
 - (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it

would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Strengths:

The applicant provides a plan for increasing and sustaining diversity in and across its schools. For example on page 7, the applicant notes that materials are presented in both English and Spanish, and Spanish language newspapers and radio stations are used to inform potential families of the KIPP school in their community. On page 6 the applicant warrants that increasing the amount of special needs students is critical to the mission of the school.

Weaknesses:

none found

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/04/2016 09:32 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2016 06:36 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M160007)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	41
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	10
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	6
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	1
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	3
Total	108	89

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Charter Management Organization - 4: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M160007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 41

Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

Strengths:

The organization has a school that ranks the highest in the state of CA for a school serving a majority of low income students. This demonstrates that one of their schools is the best in the state at serving educationally disadvantaged students (p. e31). A number of their high schools have high rates of students taking and passing AP exams. (p. e32) Students in the applicant's schools enter well below grade level and when they leave the schools they are either on or above grade level (p. e33).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

Strengths:

Research demonstrates the success the organizations schools have had on closing historic achievement gaps. Findings by Mathematica concluded that, "The average impact of KIPP on student achievement is positive, statistically significant, and educationally substantial" (p. e35).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

It is not entirely clear how they specifically have closed achievement gaps. (p. e35).

Reader's Score: 9

- 3. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

Strengths:

On statewide tests the organizations schools clearly outperform the districts they are located in. (p. e37)

On statewide tests a number of the organizations schools clearly outperform the state average. (p. e40)

The schools outperform both the districts and the states in terms of attendance.(p. e41)

In terms of graduation, college attendance and college persistence rates their schools surpass district and state averages for all of their students, most of whom are low income and educationally disadvantaged. (p. e42-43)

Weaknesses:

Retention rates are similar to other schools in their districts. (p. e42)

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

It is clear that the schools opened will serve educationally disadvantaged students. (p. e44)

The organization has a clear and proven model for helping students succeed academically. This includes the Five Pillar Operating Model, a strong focus on continuous improvement and college-preparation support beyond the classroom (p. e47-9).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

Strengths:

The organization has clear goals, objectives and outcomes and sufficient plans to track their progress and achieve success. For example, they detail specific performance measures and targets including rationales for their baselines and incorporation into their current data collection system. They also provide rationales for why each measure is ambitious (p. e53-5).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

- 1. 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The management plan has very clear responsibilities, timelines and milestones. It has a high level of detail. Figure D.1 - Responsibilities, Timelines and Milestones for Accomplishing Project Tasks provides details on responsibilities, timing and where each milestone falls in the project timeline (p. e56-7).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).**

Strengths:

The organization has extensive capacity in facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources. The scope of their organization is vast and they provide details on how they develop their capacities in each of these areas. Some examples include their training process for school leaders and the dynamic support offered through the KIPP Foundation(p. e58-65)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

The organization has a detailed and viable financial model and strong commitments from partners and stakeholders. Figure D.4 KIPP Network Projected Uses and Sources of Funds During and Beyond Grant Period provides a clear and feasible financial model for operating beyond the grant period (p. e66-7)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).**

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

The organization is capable of taking away the title of "KIPP" but makes no effort to close poorly performing schools. (p. e68-9)

Reader's Score: 0

- 5. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The qualifications of the personnel involved in the project are quite extensive and clearly sufficient to successfully complete the project. Personnel have extensive experience in opening and managing schools and networks of schools. They have additional expertise in managing rapid expansion and financial stability (p. e69-71).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of 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 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.**

Strengths:

The organization has an extensive internal evaluation system. (p. e71-6)

Weaknesses:

The organization does not plan to utilize external evaluation. (p. e71-6)

Reader's Score: 6

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

- 1. This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.**

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the

2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility, and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The certification form is available at https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

The organization will work within a Promise Zone. Six of the schools they are opening will be in Promise Zone cities (p. e46).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --
 - (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
 - (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
 - (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Strengths:

The organization makes a number of concerted efforts to promote diversity including door to door recruiting in the community. Special outreach is done to parents of students with disabilities and parents who do not speak English (p. e24-6).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: **3**

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2016 06:36 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/03/2016 04:23 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M160007)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Quality of Applicant	50	40
Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Disadvantaged Students	10	9
Quality of the Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	9
Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	18
Quality of Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	10	10
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority		
Supporting High-Need Students		
1. CPP 1	5	0
Promoting Diversity		
1. CPP 2	3	0
Total	108	86

Technical Review Form

Panel #4 - Charter Management Organization - 4: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M160007)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors--

Reader's Score: 40

Sub Question

1. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including, as applicable, educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (20 points).

Strengths:

Applicant provides statements of support from multiple leaders in some communities in which schools are located (11).

Three KIPP schools have been rated among the nation's top 100 high schools (12).

On MAP tests, KIPP students outperformed the national average of students achieving one or more years of growth in 2014-15 (14).

KIPP students show substantial gains from 5th to 8th grade in reading and math (15).

In more than half of the schools identified in Appendix 5.3, KIPP schools outperform either the district or state or both. Applicant provides this data for three years, and many schools that did not initially outperform the district and/state have come to do so over time.

Weaknesses:

While the raw data exists in the appendices, applicant could have provided a fuller discussion of how it has increased academic achievement particularly for educationally disadvantaged students.

Reader's Score: 18

2. (i) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has demonstrated success in closing historic achievement gaps for the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant, or

(ii) The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which there have not been significant achievement gaps between any of the subgroups of students described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA at the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant and to which significant gains in student academic achievement have been made with all populations of

Sub Question

students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant (15 points).

Strengths:

Applicant provides information from a study done by Mathematica Policy Research on KIPP's overall impact on student achievement. This study concluded that "the average impact of KIPP on student achievement is positive, statistically significant, and educationally substantial" (16).

Weaknesses:

There is not sufficient discussion in this section of achievement gaps that have been narrowed or closed for historically underserved students. No disaggregated data is available that demonstrate closure of these gaps (15-16).

The study provided is more than three years old and, in some cases, the data is more than 10 years old.

Reader's Score: 8

- 3. The degree, including the consistency over the past three years, to which the applicant has achieved results (including performance on statewide tests, annual student attendance and retention rates, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates where applicable and available) for low-income and other educationally disadvantaged students served by the charter schools operated or managed by the applicant that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State (15 points).**

Strengths:

Data provided show that, with one exception, at least 50% of all grades in KIPP schools outperform their local district in reading and math in grades 3-8 and HS (19).

Applicant provides some detailed data for some schools with a high percentage of low income students. These data show that these schools outperform their local districts by a wide margin (20-21).

Data provided in this section show that, by grade and subgroup, more than half of KIPP schools outperform their local districts and states (22).

The average daily attendance rate in 2014-15 was 96% for all KIPP schools (22).

94% of students who completed 8th grade at KIPP have graduated from high school, and 81% have gone on to college (23).

Weaknesses:

No student retention data is provided.

Reader's Score: 14

Selection Criteria - Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students

- 1. The contribution the proposed project will make in assisting educationally disadvantaged students served by the applicant to meet or exceed State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards, and to graduate college- and career-ready. When responding to this selection criterion, applicants must discuss the proposed locations of schools to be created or substantially expanded and the student populations to be served.**

Note: The Secretary encourages applicants to describe their prior success in improving educational achievement and outcomes for educationally disadvantaged students, including students with

disabilities and English learners. In addition, the Secretary encourages applicants to address how they will ensure that all eligible students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education and how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.

Strengths:

Applicant provides a table of proposed schools to open in 2017 and the FRL percentage of the students which the schools would serve. All proposed schools have at least 73% FRL students (26).

Six schools proposed to open are in Promise Zones (27).

Applicant provides its "Five Pillars Operating Model", which defines how it will serve all students, particularly educationally disadvantaged students (28-29).

"KIPP through College" program provides students access to college counselors to help students find college financing, assist with college paperwork, and career services (30).

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not address how it will improve outcomes for ELL students or SpEd students in this section.

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the 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 extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. Applicants proposing to open schools serving substantially different populations than those currently served by the model for which they have demonstrated evidence of success must address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**

Strengths:

Applicant identifies the following objectives: grow the network of KIPP schools, and continue to get better as we get bigger (34).

Applicant provides a comprehensive table of project measures, rationale, data collection, and when data will be collected (36).

Weaknesses:

Applicant notes that it will address project outcomes, but instead provides program and project measures with no outcomes identified (35).

Reader's Score: 9

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan & Personnel

The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and substantially expand high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice). In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers-

Reader's Score: 18

Sub Question

- 1. 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 (4 points).**

Strengths:

The KIPP Foundation will oversee the proposed project in collaboration with local KIPP leadership (37).

A comprehensive table of milestones, responsibilities, and a timeline are provided (38).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 2. The business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools created or substantially expanded under these grants beyond the initial period of Federal funding in areas including, but not limited to, facilities, financial management, central office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).**

Strengths:

Applicant describes how its schools are organized into regions, and the system for overseeing their operations and performance (39).

Regional KIPP leadership works with the board of directors and a KIPP Foundation Relationship manager to evaluate growth readiness, identify milestones, and provide key supports during the growth process (40).

Substantial training and support are provided to school leaders (41).

Applicant provides descriptions of how it will provide direct support to schools in all areas in this section (42-46).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

- 3. A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success (4 points).**

Strengths:

Applicant provides a 5-year brief summary of public revenues, private funding, and expenses (48). All appear to be stable, reasonable, and sustainable.

Applicant provides descriptions of multiple major philanthropic partners who have pledged and continue to pledge

Sub Question

support (48).

Weaknesses:

More detail could have been added to describe the funding model, specifically in the "Others" expense category (48).

Reader's Score: 3

4. The plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality (2 points).

Strengths:

Applicant describes a comprehensive process and rationale for why and how a KIPP school may be closed (49).

Weaknesses:

Applicant provides a plan for closure, but only to the extent that the KIPP name would be removed. In some cases, the school could still continue to operate (49).

Reader's Score: 1

5. The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, chief executive officer or organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project (6 points).

Strengths:

Applicant provides information about key personnel involved in the project. The Chief Network Growth Officer is responsible for the growth of the organization, and has substantial experience managing projects of this score and size (51).

Applicant provides qualifications for and information about its President, Chief Learning Officer, Chief of Research, Design, and Innovation, CEO, and Board of Directors (52).

Most project personnel have extensive experience in growing the KIPP model across many states, which includes experience in disseminating best practices, research and evaluation, finance, leadership and professional development, and analytics (52-53).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Quality of 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 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.

Strengths:

Applicant has created its own internal assessment of health: the Healthy Schools & Regions framework, which addresses 6 essential questions, and will be used to evaluate the project (53).

Applicant provides an alignment of the essential questions from the framework with the project measures (55-56).

Survey data from parents, students, and staff will also be collected to evaluate the project (56).

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 10

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority - Supporting High-Need Students

1. This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through one of the methods described below. An application may receive points for only one of the three parts of Competitive Preference Priority 1, and should specify which part it is addressing. If an applicant addresses more than one part of Competitive Preference Priority 1 and does not specify whether it is addressing part (a), (b), or (c), the application will be awarded priority points only for the part addressed in the application that has the highest maximum potential point value, regardless of the number of priority points the application is awarded for that particular part of Competitive Preference Priority 1.

This priority is for projects that will serve high-need students through element (a), (b) or (c) as described below:

(a) Supporting High Need Students. (0 or 5 points).

Projects that are designed to improve academic outcomes, learning environments, or both, for students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

(b) School Improvement. (0 or 4 points).

To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools (as defined in this notice) will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more LEAs in implementing academic or structural interventions to serve students attending schools that have been identified for improvement, corrective action, closure, or restructuring under section 1116 of the ESEA, and as described in the notice of final requirements for School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

Note: Applicants in States that are exercising flexibility under the ESEA, as amended by NCLB, in the 2015-16 school year may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the Department's June 7, 2012 guidance entitled, "ESEA Flexibility," at www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility, and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE's) December 18, 2015 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transition-dcl.pdf>). Applicants in all States should review OESE's January 28, 2016 Dear Colleague Letter at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/transitionsy1617-dcl.pdf>, for information on interventions required in 2016-2017.

(c) Promise Zones. (0 or 1 point).

This priority is for projects that are designed to serve and coordinate with a federally designated Promise Zone.

Note: As a participant in the Administration's Promise Zones Initiative, the Department is cooperating with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Department of Agriculture (USDA), and nine other Federal agencies to support comprehensive revitalization efforts in 20 high-poverty urban, rural, and tribal communities across the country. Each application for Replication and Expansion grant funds that is accompanied by a Certification of Consistency with Promise Zone Goals and Implementation (HUD Form 50153), signed by an authorized representative of the lead organization of a Promise Zone designated by HUD or USDA supporting the application, will meet this priority. To view the list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations please go to www.hud.gov/promisezones. The certification form is available at <https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?>

id=HUD_Form_50153.pdf.

Strengths:

No strengths noted.

Weaknesses:

Applicant does not provide a HUD Form 50153.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority - Promoting Diversity

1. This priority is for applicants that demonstrate a record of (in the schools they currently operate or manage), as well as an intent to continue (in schools that they will be creating or substantially expanding (as defined in this notice) under this grant), taking active measures to --

- (a) Promote student diversity, including racial and ethnic diversity, or avoid racial isolation;
- (b) Serve students with disabilities at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area; and
- (c) Serve English learners at a rate that is at least comparable to the rate at which these students are served in public schools in the surrounding area.

In support of this priority, applicants must provide enrollment data as well as descriptions of existing policies and activities undertaken or planned to be undertaken.

Note: An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 2 is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project will encourage approaches by charter schools that help bring together students of different backgrounds, including students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, to attain the benefits that flow from a diverse student body. The applicant should discuss in its application how it would ensure that those approaches are permissible under current law.

Strengths:

None noted.

Weaknesses:

Appendix 5.2 shows all KIPP demographics as compared to the local district and the state. In most cases, racial demographics at KIPP do not appear to be representative of the local district. In about half the cases, ELL and SpEd appear to be at least comparable to the local district, but results are mixed. Applicant does not describe whether or not it expects it will serve these students at rates at least comparable to the districts in which it intends to locate for the purpose of this grant (6-7).

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/03/2016 04:23 PM

