

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2020 03:31 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kairos Academies (S282B200014)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	30	25
<b>Quality of the Continuation Plan</b>		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
<b>Significance of contribution for students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	20	13
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	15
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	14
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	77
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Rural Community	7	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Native American Students	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 5</b>		
1. New Potential Grantees	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	15	3
<b>Total</b>	115	80

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 Developers 84.282b - 1: 84.282B

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

Applicant: Kairos Academies (S282B200014)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 25

#### Sub

1. (i) 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 simple project plan that consists of a list of items and some activities along with the names of persons responsible for carrying out the activities. For example, items included in the project plan are chrome books, classroom sets of books, salary and benefits. A list of start and completion dates corresponds to the items and activities (p. e- 20-22).

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a sufficiently detailed list of activities in its project plan (p. e-20-21) that describes the responsibilities of the key personnel. The applicant lists several start dates of 10/01/2020 and end dates of 06/30/2020. The end date of 06/30/2020 is prior to the start date and reduces the credibility of the management plan. For example, the start date for the training of SEL and school-wide culture is 10/01/2020 and the end date is erroneously listed as 06/30/2020. The proposed project plan does not include milestones for accomplishing project tasks (p. e-20). The management plan consists of only a limited number of abbreviated activities such as training for SEL and school-wide culture, staff recruitment, and executive team professional development without being connected to objectives they may support. The two objectives for the proposed project are only broadly stated, and it is unclear from the management plan how these objectives will be achieved as no obvious connections are made between the proposed activities and how they potentially support the objectives. For example, objective one seeks to provide key infrastructure needs to grow and scale to serve 360 students by Year 3 of operation drawn from one of St. Louis' most under-served student populations (p. e-42) which is not sufficiently specific to attribute project tasks to achieving this objective. These limited number of activities along with the lack of a clear description of how the activities support the objectives of the proposed project diminish the adequacy of the management plan to achieve its goals.

Reader's Score: 11

2. (ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal

**Sub**

**investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant appropriately lists the time commitment of 60% for the Project Director toward the proposed project (p. e-18). In addition, the Chief Strategy Officer's time commitment is effectively demonstrated as being 90%, while the Chief Academic Officer's commitment is effectively expected to be 50%. The Chief Operating Officer's time is appropriately allocated at 75% as he or she supervises the Building Manager to runs the day-to-day operations of the school (p. e-18).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not sufficiently describe the commitments of each of the key personnel in relation to the objectives to be achieved, which makes it difficult to determine if the allocated time commitments are adequate. For example, the applicant simply states that the Chief Executive Officer will commit 60% of his time to manage this project without providing descriptions of his responsibilities that would support and correspond to the time commitment (p. e-18).

**Reader's Score: 9**

- 3. (iii) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(v))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant fittingly proposes to utilize its Parent Teacher Organization to ensure that a diversity of stakeholder perspectives are considered in the operation of the proposed project. The Parent Teacher Organization will contribute to the proposed success of the project as it organizes community outreach, school volunteering, and family education workshops. In addition, it will provide feedback to key personnel and will ensure that parent perspectives are considered (p. 22). Support for the project is pledged by various organizations and community partners via letters of supports, which will provide additional diverse perspective in the operation of the proposed project. For example, the Business Association located within the target area is expressing its commitment to the project through a continued partnership (p. e-77).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

- 1. In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (NFP)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant fittingly describes that it has the ability to generate funds to reach its goals once grant funds under this program are no longer available (p. e-24-25). For example, the applicant states that it has a record of generating funds from philanthropic organizations that would provide contingency funding to provide more comprehensive services for its students (p. e-25). The proposed budget indicates a sufficient amount of resources that are available to operate the

proposed project even without the requested funds requested for the proposed project under this grant.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Significance of contribution for students**

- 1. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to open, replicate, or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, which include children with disabilities and English learners. (NFP)**

**Strengths:**

The applicant demonstrates that it has the capacity to address the needs of educationally disadvantaged students as specialized staff such as a special education coordinator overseeing the implementation of students' IEPs. The applicant provides data that underscores that its special education population and its English Learners population grew faster in math and language arts than their national peers according to the NWEA MAP assessments (p. e-30 and p. e-33). Innovatively, the applicant provides IEP services and case management to all of its students including educationally disadvantaged students which allows the proposed project to support SPED students inconspicuously and effectively (p. e-28).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not sufficiently demonstrate how it plans to expand educational opportunities for students with disabilities in meeting State academic standards. The applicant provides proficiency rates for English, Math, and Science toward State standards among middle and high schools within its enrollment zone, but does not offer any achievement data related to State standards from its school and how it plans on increasing the achievement scores toward State standards among educationally disadvantaged students.

**Reader's Score: 13**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to provide an alternative to the traditional middle and high schools in its project area (p. e-17). The applicant's proposed model of fostering self-directedness is supported by a logic model that appropriately depicts the project components, its corresponding theoretical and operational relationships, and the objectives they support. For example, marketing is necessary to reach the projected enrollment goals as funding relies on student enrollment (p. e-40).

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not describe how the rationale for the proposed project was determined as there is no evidence of a needs assessment or a feasibility study to support the rationale. The applicant does not offer research or best practices that would support the proposed self-directed pedagogical approach, the curriculum, and the experiential learning model, which would reinforce the applicant's proposed rationale.

**Reader's Score: 8**

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes two broad objectives, which anticipate serving 360 students by Year 3 of operation and reaching academic excellence (p. e-42). The applicant lists several anticipated outcomes in terms of performance measures, which will aid in demonstrating success for students in grade eight.

**Weaknesses:**

The objectives are not specifically stated and are not measurable. For example, objective one does not have a clear timeline with realistic intervals regarding how the enrollment of 360 students by year three of the operation will be achieved. For objective two, the applicant simply states that the performance goals are about 65% higher than the district's performance which is not sufficiently specific with regards to the individual subject areas as the applicant did not present baseline data that would allow comparisons between its target population's state assessment results and overall state-wide assessment results. The proposed GPRA measures are not listed by grade levels and only contain the subject areas of English and math. For example, proposed GPRA measures are for 8th-grade students and "school students" where the grade level is not adequately defined. It is unclear if the group "school students" is comprised of grades 9-12 or whether it includes all students served.

**Reader's Score: 4**

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project. (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(x))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant proposes to utilize an independent contractor who will effectively evaluate the proposed project (p. e-44). The outcomes of the evaluation will appropriately use student growth data to quantify school, teacher and program effectiveness. The evaluation seeks to attribute academic growth to the effectiveness of its teachers and programs (p. 44).

**Sub**

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not provide a detailed project design. Specifically, the project design does not convincingly describe proposed activities and how they will lead to achieving the proposed goals (p. e-44). For example, objective two anticipates that the performance goals of its students is going to be about 65% higher than the district's performance. The project design does not clearly establish a link between the proposed methods and the anticipated outcomes. This contributes to a fragmented project design which does not present clear and concise methods to reach the learning outcomes listed in the GPRA Performance Measures (p. e-153-156). The applicant does not list specific evaluation methods that would link the proposed strategies to outcomes.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.**

**Reader's Score: 14**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(2))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant fittingly demonstrates that it encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, age, or disability (p. e-9). For example, the applicant clearly establishes that it strives to be diverse and innovatively adds to the existing employment criteria that it encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on sexual orientation, income level, proficiency in the English language, or athletic ability (p. e-9).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (ii) In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant adequately describes the qualifications, training and experience for some key project personnel. In addition, resumes of key personnel support the rich and vast qualifications of each of the key personnel (p. e-66-72). For example, the Chief Operating Officer has teaching experience and relevant involvement in school operations, which supports the objectives of the proposed project (p. e-45).

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not list the qualifications needed for all of its key personnel. This would be pertinent if one of the key personnel would leaves the project. The applicant does not list qualifications for teachers, which play an important role in this proposed project.

Reader's Score: 9

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Rural Community (0 or 7 points).**

Under this priority, applicants must propose to open a new charter school or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school in a rural community.

**Strengths:**

No strengths are noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address Competitive Preference Priority 1.

Reader's Score: 0

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3—Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students (Up to 5 points).**

Under this priority, applicants must—

(a) Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—

(1) Utilizes 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;

(2) Has 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

(3) Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;

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

(c) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American 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:**

No strengths are noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not address Competitive Preference Priority 3.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5**

**1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0 or 3 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant states that it has never received a discretionary grant from the Federal Government and has not received or been part of a group that received a Charter School Program grant or sub-grant (p. e-18). As a result, the applicant meets Competitive Preference Priority 5.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses are noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/21/2020 03:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2020 03:31 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kairos Academies (S282B200014)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	30	26
<b>Quality of the Continuation Plan</b>		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
<b>Significance of contribution for students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	20	15
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	18
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	84
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Rural Community	7	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Native American Students	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 5</b>		
1. New Potential Grantees	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	15	3
<b>Total</b>	115	87

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 Developers 84.282b - 1: 84.282B

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

Applicant: Kairos Academies (S282B200014)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 26

#### Sub

1. (i) 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's management plan details the engagement of a wide variety of stakeholders who coordinated aspects of the design of the school. (page e18) Specific components of the project plan are straightforward with activities aligned with the line items in the project budget narrative. To achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget the school has engaged a Principal Investigator for the project's evaluation. The Principal Investigator will assess and provide regular feedback on the project's attainment of enrollment goals, performance, and cost effectiveness of federal funds. (page e19) Additionally, the Missouri charter Local Education Agency (LEA), the authorizing sponsor will conduct regular quality control and compliance reviews for the course of the project. (page e19)

#### Weaknesses:

The project plan is insufficient in detail with an abbreviated list of activities and no milestones. Additionally, a review of the project plan finds that the start date and end dates for activities do not correlate properly with the end date being earlier than the start date. For an example, the activity for Executive Team Professional Development has a start date 10/1/2020 and end date of 6/30/2020. These issues are consistent throughout the plan making the overall quality questionable. (page e20-e22)

Reader's Score: 12

2. (ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))

#### Strengths:

The application details the time commitments of pertinent personnel who have executed similar projects. The allocations of time for respective positions include the following percent of time on planning activities for key personnel: Project director spending 60%, 90% of the Chief Strategy Officer, 50% of the Chief Academic Officer, and 75% of the Chief Operating officer. (page e18) The time commitments are appropriate to meet the objectives of

**Sub**

the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

No qualifications are provided for these key personnel, which is needed to make a proper assessment of their abilities. This information is needed to assess if they are able meet objectives of the proposed project.

**Reader's Score: 9**

3. (iii) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate. (34 CFR 75.210(g) (2)(v))

**Strengths:**

As evidenced in the application, Kairos Academies is designed to be diverse in student population. The student and Dutchtown community contributed to the planning of the school through the Parent Teacher Organization. (page e22) The city of St. Louis and state of Missouri teaching pool is overwhelmingly white, 75% and 93% respectively and female, 73% and 78% respectively. The applicant actively works to recruit diverse high-quality staff by presenting at local Historically Black Colleges and Universities. (page e47) The school's educators/administrators identify as people of color with 56% being male. (page e48) In keeping with their strategy, the school collaborates with a wide network of community partners and affiliates. (page e54-e56) These ongoing partnerships provide various services for the school and students. This is further evidenced by the letters of support included in the application. (e77-e81)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

1. In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant's application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (NFP)

**Strengths:**

The application includes Kairos Academies five-year financial plan [REDACTED] (page e104) The plan does not include funding support from this grant. The applicant has a proven track record of raising funds from philanthropic organizations to support the Year 1 operations totaling \$ [REDACTED] from local and national foundations. These and other donations provide adequate contingency funding for the continuation plan. (page e25) Support is also evidenced in the application with several letters of support from the Opportunity Trust, William T. Kemper Foundation and others. (page e85-e86)

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted

Reader's Score: 10

### Selection Criteria - Significance of contribution for students

1. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students to meet challenging State academic standards, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to open, replicate, or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, which include children with disabilities and English learners. (NFP)

#### Strengths:

The applicant operates in Dutchtown with the 1st, 2nd, and 4th largest educational service gaps. The proposed project design is to provide seats that don't exist in the enrollment zone. The latest state assessment found that in this enrollment zone only 26.5% of students are proficient in English, 14.8% in math, and 10.8% in science. The closest high school, Roosevelt High, has 44.3% of students that are proficient in English, 40.3% in math, 19.5% in science, and 14.3% in social studies. The applicant's enrollment zone and neighborhood is one of the most ethnically and socioeconomically diverse in the city. (page e26) The student recruitment activities are inclusive. The outreach strategy includes various activities and includes a partnership with the Children's Education Alliance of Missouri knocking on over 2,000 doors in the community, bringing on translators and interpreters, and engagement with youth-oriented community organizations. (page e27) The application details educational strategy in the proposed project that will expand educational opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students. All students will have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). The applicant utilizes a differentiated curricular approach, which included a SPED teacher ratio of 8:1 with them integrated within the student population. (page e28) Evidenced-based practices utilize assessments and modified activities are used to implement techniques in curricula and instruction. (page e29) Staffing includes a SPED Coordinator with a cross-categorical special education certification to ensure compliance with legal provisions pertaining to students' disabilities. (page e28) The application addresses steps to address language barriers for students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) using the DESE-approved WIDA Screener Assessment. The curriculum includes combined blended learning programs. Karios will hire additional staff if enrollment exceeds the original projects. The proposed project provides comprehensive evidence as it pertains to expanding educational opportunities for educationally disadvantaged students.

#### Weaknesses:

The application focuses on national assessment standards but not information at the state level which would provide more insight. Without this information there is difficulty in understanding the rationale behind the projected growth and student baselines. (e36-e38)

Reader's Score: 15

### Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

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

Reader's Score: 18

Sub

Sub

**1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant Kairos, is planning to open in Dutchtown near the city's largest educational service gaps where the population of students in middle and high school have the fewest quality school seats. (page e33) 70% of the existing school seats in surrounding zip codes are elementary (K-5) in an area that is ethnically and socioeconomically diverse. A letter of support from the State Board of Education speaks to the confidence in the vision and plans. (page e73) The applicant is partnering with Summit Learning for use of their curriculum and learning management systems that provides a personalized learning platform that partners primarily with lowincome schools. (page e59) Project components are detailed in the logic model. (page e40) Based on this information detailed in the proposed plan, the need and rationale is adequately documented.

**Weaknesses:**

The logic model does not clearly define targets and outcomes. (page e40) Measurements pertaining to the components of the project objectives are not clearly stated. By not including this pertinent information, benchmarks cannot be established. Furthermore, at this stage of the project the applicant needs to demonstrate how the project will be effectively managed and evaluated.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The application includes stated objectives of the project to provide key infrastructure to serve 360 students by Year 3 and setting the bar for excellence in St. Louis meeting targeted proficiency levels for the school and all at-risk subgroups. (page e42) The application details GPRA Performance Measures and Project Goals along with associated targets for each project year. According to the NWEA MAP, targets for students proficient in reading and math are based on baseline student data. Kairos' track record is expected to move at an average national percentile rank 10+ points in a half year. (page e44) Students in the local district have an average math proficiency score of 22% and reading proficiency score of 33%. Public school in St. Louis City School District have an average math proficiency of 22% (versus the Missouri public school average of 47%), reading proficiency score of 33%. This information provides significant evidence as to the reasoning surrounding the planning of the goals, objectives, and desired outcomes for the proposed project.

**Weaknesses:**

The objectives are lacking in details with no associated timeline. Absence of this information finds that they are not specifically measurable. For an example, the project component planning and project management should have included both start and end dates along with benchmarks. This information along with assigned tasks would clarify the objective along with expectations.

**Reader's Score: 6**

**3. (iii) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project. (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(x))**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The applicant will be contracting an external evaluation of the project, Informed Improvement LLC who has experience evaluating multiple Charter School and Department of Education Program projects. (page e44) The contract will utilize research-based models to quantify the program's effectiveness. The applicant notes that the evaluation will be informative to schools considering replicating elements of the project by quantifying effectiveness in terms of what percent of schools, teachers and/or programs in which students exceeds academic growth. (page e44)

**Weaknesses:**

Throughout the project design there is insufficient detail to determine with certainty if the proposed project activities to guide possible replication. The logic model does not clearly defined targets and outcomes; raising questions about the ability of the applicant to manage the project. These missing critical components impact the ability to determine if an evaluation would provide sufficient information to guide replication of project activities or strategies.

**Reader's Score: 3**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(2))**

**Strengths:**

As evidenced in their strategy, the applicant convincingly works to recruit diverse, high-quality staff. This strategy includes presenting at Historically Black Colleges and Universities through the Diverse Charter School Coalition's member job board and in local community groups that promote minority educators. Karios also anonymizes applications to reduce implicit bias. (page e48) Through this strategy, the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2. (ii) In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))**

**Sub**

**Strengths:**

The project personnel have extensive experience in education as evidenced in their respective resumes. (page e66-e72) Their early planning and management has resulted in the success of Kairos. The single-site charter school now has an annual budget of \$ [REDACTED]. In their first year, they achieved the strongest academic growth (NWEA MAP) and social-emotional learning (Panorama Education) results in St. Louis City. (page e45) This further demonstrates their exceptional qualifications as key project personnel.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Rural Community (0 or 7 points).**

**Under this priority, applicants must propose to open a new charter school or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school in a rural community.**

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not address Competitive Preference Priority 1.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3—Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students (Up to 5 points).**

**Under this priority, applicants must—**

**(a) Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—**

**(1) Utilizes 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;**

**(2) Has 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**

**(3) Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;**

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

**(c) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American 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:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The application does not address Competitive Preference Priority 3.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5**

**1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0 or 3 points)**

**Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant, Karios Academies has never received a discretionary grant from the Federal Government, nor received or been part of a group that received a Charter School Program grant or sub-grant. (page e18)

**Weaknesses:**

No weakness noted.

**Reader's Score: 3**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/21/2020 03:31 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/21/2020 03:31 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Kairos Academies (S282B200014)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management Plan	30	28
<b>Quality of the Continuation Plan</b>		
1. Continuation Plan	10	10
<b>Significance of contribution for students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	20	20
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	25	21
<b>Quality of Project Personnel</b>		
1. Project Personnel	15	15
<b>Sub Total</b>	100	94
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
1. Rural Community	7	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
1. Native American Students	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 5</b>		
1. New Potential Grantees	3	3
<b>Sub Total</b>	15	3
<b>Total</b>	115	97

# Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - FY20 Developers 84.282b - 1: 84.282B

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

Applicant: Kairos Academies (S282B200014)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

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

Reader's Score: 28

#### Sub

1. (i) 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 an overview of the proposed project within the budget with clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. On pages e18- pages e23, the proposal illustrates a clear plan of expectation of time per role to complete tasks. The plan identifies the individual with primary responsibility for the completion of each activity, as well as the planned start and end dates. The activities in the plan are aligned to the line items in the project budget narrative.

#### Weaknesses:

This plan is limited to components of the overall opening and growth of the school that would be funded in this project. Also, the plan includes the dates of activities and milestones, some of the dates do not align with the proposal. For example, some project activities start date is October 2020 and are slated to be completed in June 2020. This may be a typo that the applicant intended to type June 2021, however; this is unclear because there are several activities that begin in the fall of 2020 and end in the summer of 2020 as noted on page 23.

Reader's Score: 13

2. (ii) The extent to which the time commitments of the project director and principal investigator and other key project personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet the objectives of the proposed project. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(iv))

#### Strengths:

The project personnel have the expertise and time allocations to adequately meet the objectives of the proposed project. On page e19, the C-Suite of this charter management organization will commit to the management of this project. The principal investigator will serve as the project's evaluator. For example, [REDACTED] the Chief Executive Officer, will serve as the Project Director. [REDACTED] has 60% of his time budgeted for planning purposes, which is adequate for managing this project in coordination with other C Suite personnel. Ninety percent of the Chief Strategy Officer's time is allocated for this project, 50% of the Chief Academic Officer's, and 75% of the Chief Operating Officer's (who supervises a Building Manager to run day-to-day operations of the school). These key personnel have successfully executed similar projects, such as the launch and Year 1 management of a high-

**Sub**

performing charter school.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

- 3. (iii) How the applicant will ensure that a diversity of perspectives are brought to bear in the operation of the proposed project, including those of parents, teachers, the business community, a variety of disciplinary and professional fields, recipients or beneficiaries of services, or others, as appropriate. (34 CFR 75.210(g)(2)(v))

**Strengths:**

This plan will be executed with the engagement of a wide variety of stakeholders. Because parent engagement is strong at Kairos with regular communication between each family and their student’s coach. Continued parental input into the design and operation of the school is documented through biennial surveys as noted on page e18. Additional community organizations have committed their support to the school through letters of support. Kairos also has established city, state, and national partnerships to connect our families and students to world-class educational resources. We will continue developing, expanding, and leveraging these institutional assets going forward. These partnerships include: • Summit Learning Platform • Valor Collegiate • The Gephardt Institute • Intersect Arts and COCA.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

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

- 1. In determining the quality of the continuation plan, the Secretary considers the extent to which the eligible applicant is prepared to continue to operate the charter school that would receive grant funds in a manner consistent with the eligible applicant’s application once the grant funds under this program are no longer available. (NFP)

**Strengths:**

Kairos Academies has a record of successfully raising funds from philanthropic organizations to support its start-up and Year 1 operations. The applicant secured \$ [REDACTED] from local and national foundations, including organizations such as Charter School Growth Fund, New Schools Venture Fund, and The Opportunity Trust as indicated on page 25. The five year plan does not include funding from this grant which is a strength to commit to this project long term. Therefore, the continuation plan is justified.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Significance of contribution for students**

- 1. In determining the significance of the contribution the proposed project will make in expanding educational opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students and enabling those students

**to meet challenging State academic standards, the Secretary considers the quality of the plan to ensure that the charter school the applicant proposes to open, replicate, or expand will recruit, enroll, and effectively serve educationally disadvantaged students, which include children with disabilities and English learners. (NFP)**

**Strengths:**

On page e27, the differentiated curricular approach allows the applicant to meet the needs of students with special needs without removing students from the least restrictive environment. Anyone may receive 1-on-1 tutoring or move to a separate space (like a resource room), and all students have coaches. The applicant can support special student populations without publicly identifying them. The maintenance of a low teacher to student ratio of SPED teachers allows for targeted support. The applicant also illustrates that teachers use the techniques of whole language instruction combined with Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies to support LEP students in accessing core content (e.g., through additional Platform resources). In addition, sheltered English activities provide support for instructional delivery. Primary language support is provided to students and their families, through translation by teachers, aides, other students, and parent volunteers. Kairos' COO functions as their LEP coordinator. Therefore, the applicant describes a comprehensive significance to the contribution to expand the educational opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

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

**Reader's Score: 21**

**Sub**

- 1. (i) The extent to which the proposed project demonstrates a rationale (as defined in 34 CFR 77.1(c)). (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(xxix))**

**Strengths:**

Kairos is proposing a project to support the launch and quality of a charter school that opened in the 2019-2020 school year with its first class of sixth graders. Kairos opened in a high-needs area of St. Louis, which is not a rural community. The six broad components of proposed project activities are: 1. Support of planning for the school's opening and growth 2. Provisioning of the school model 3. Project management 4. Marketing for student and staff recruitment 5. Support for project-based learning 6. Professional development of the staff. Quantitative performance measures and outcomes for each project objective are specified. The school will grow to serve 360 students over the course of this project. Therefore, the rationale for this project is sufficient.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Sub**

- 2. (ii) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(i))**

**Strengths:**

The applicant has adequately states detailed and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes within the proposal. On page 43, the applicant stated that the objectives of this project are to: 1. Provide key infrastructure needs to grow and scale to serve 360 students by Year 3 of operation, drawn from one of St. Louis' most underserved student populations. 2. Set the bar for academic excellence in St. Louis, meeting targeted proficiency levels (detailed below), both as a school average and for all at-risk subgroups (FRPL, Homeless, Non-White, Male, SPED). Performance goals are about 65 percentage points higher than the district's performance. The GPRA Performance Measures and Project Goals for this project were listed in Table 2, along with targets for each project year.

**Weaknesses:**

The targets for the project goal for enrollment are to completely fill the planned school capacity. The targets for the GPRA performance measure of federal cost per student are the planned cumulative federal fund expenditures for this project divided by the enrollment target for the year. The targets for percent of students proficient in reading and math are based on baseline student data and Kairos' track record of moving average national percentile rank 10+ points in a half year, according to the NWEA MAP. By comparison, students in the local district have an average math proficiency score of 22% and reading proficiency score of 33%. The applicant does not specify in detail how the proposed project intends to meet the goals if the target project goal for enrollment is not made. All other targets for this project would be missed if the enrollment goal is not attained.

**Reader's Score: 6**

- 3. (iii) The extent to which the design for implementing and evaluating the proposed project will result in information to guide possible replication of project activities or strategies, including information about the effectiveness of the approach or strategies employed by the project. (34 CFR 75.210(c)(2)(x))**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project plan adequately includes contracting for the external evaluation of the project. The selected contractor, Informed Improvement LLC, was selected because of their experience in evaluating multiple charter schools and other Department of Education Program projects. This company uses student growth data to quantify school, teacher and program effectiveness using research-based models. This evaluation will be informative to schools considering replicating elements of the project by quantifying effectiveness in terms of what percent of schools, teachers and/or programs the level of student academic growth exceeds as noted on page 28.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel**

- 1. The Secretary considers the quality of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project.**

Reader's Score: 15

Sub

1. (i) In determining the quality of project personnel, the Secretary considers the extent to which the applicant encourages applications for employment from persons who are members of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented based on race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(2))

**Strengths:**

On page 31, the applicant appropriately describes how they intentionally work to actively recruit diverse, highquality staff. The school presents at local Historically Black Colleges and Universities, like Harris-Stowe University, through the Diverse Charter School Coalition's member job board and in local community groups that promote minority educators, such as The Black and Brown Teaching Trust and Black Males in Education (St. Louis). The applicant also anonymizes applications to reduce implicit bias and includes reference checks with former students and parents to verify cultural competence.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 5

2. (ii) In addition, the Secretary considers the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of key project personnel. (34 CFR 75.210(e)(3)(ii))

**Strengths:**

The current project personnel have extensive relevant training and experience for the project intended to expand. Resumes of staff include teaching and leadership experiences in various school districts nationwide. Resumes for the key project personnel are provided in Appendix B. Beginning on page 45, the key project personnel responsible have already planned, launched, and managed the launch and success of Kairos. The single-site charter school now has an annual budget of \$ [REDACTED] and, in its first year, achieved the strongest academic growth (NWEA MAP) and social-emotional learning (Panorama Education) results in St. Louis City.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 10

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 1**

1. Competitive Preference Priority 1—Rural Community (0 or 7 points).

Under this priority, applicants must propose to open a new charter school or to replicate or expand a high-quality charter school in a rural community.

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The school Kairos is in an urban community of St. Louis, Missouri.

Reader's Score: 0

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 3**

**1. Competitive Preference Priority 3—Opening a New Charter School or Replicating or Expanding a High-quality Charter School to Serve Native American Students (Up to 5 points).**

Under this priority, applicants must—

**(a) Propose to open a new charter school, or replicate or expand a high-quality charter school, that—**

**(1) Utilizes 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;**

**(2) Has 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**

**(3) Has or will have a governing board with a substantial percentage of members who are members of Indian Tribes or Native American organizations located within the area to be served by the new, replicated, or expanded charter school;**

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

**(c) Meaningfully collaborate with the Indian Tribe(s) or Native American 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:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant did not address this competitive preference priority.

Reader's Score: 0

**Competitive Preference Priority - Competitive Preference Priority 5**

**1. Applications from New Potential Grantees (0 or 3 points)**

Under this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that it has never received a grant, including through membership in a group application submitted in accordance with 34 CFR 75.127-75.129, under the program from which it seeks funds.

**Strengths:**

The applicant meets Competitive Preference Priority 5, since it has never received a Charter School Program grant before (or any discretionary funding from the federal government) as noted on page 14.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score:** 3

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/21/2020 03:31 PM