

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2010 02:44 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M100014)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	50	48
Contribution assisting disadvantaged		
1. Contribution	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of design	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality Management Plan	25	25
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		
1. Overall Comments	0	0
Total	100	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M100014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including educationally disadvantaged students, served by charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.
 - (ii) The degree 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).
 - (iii) The degree to which the applicant has achieved results for low-income and minority students that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State.Applicants are invited to submit objective data that they believe would provide relevant information in support of these three factors, along with comparison data for similar schools, where available. In particular, the Secretary is interested in the following data: (1) Performance (school-wide and by subgroup) on statewide tests of all charter schools operated or managed by the applicant as compared to all students in other schools in the State or States at the same grade level, and as compared with other schools serving similar demographics of students; (2) annual student attendance and retention rates (school-wide and by subgroup), and comparisons with other similar schools; (3) where applicable and available, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates (school-wide and by subgroup) of students attending schools operated or managed by the applicant. When reporting data for schools in States that may have particularly demanding or low standards of proficiency (for example, see the report available at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/studies/201456.pdf>), applicants are invited to discuss how their academic success might be considered against applicants from across the country.

Strengths:

This section reflects a comprehensive analysis of performance at the school wide level and with subgroups. On pages 10-12 the application provides strong data which reflects student attendance and retention rates. Page 14 also provides a high level of detailed data that discusses high school graduation rates and attendance rates. Pages 10-12 also provide strong indicator performance levels that reflect attention to college readiness. Page 5 illustrates high levels of student attainment and page 8 indicates the sustained growth over four years. Data provided in appendices also illustrate a high level of performance in both reading and math. Organizational support illustrated in the appendices provides a strong level of understanding with the ability of the applicant to effectively deliver a quality program. Community support, teacher professional development, instructional benchmarking, educational environment, recruitment and retention strategies, continuous learning and educational leadership training are evident.

Weaknesses:

There is limited evidence in the appendices and in the data analysis portion on pages 10-12 that suggest attention to reading over math, yet it is unclear as to how the applicant distinguishes while attending to these two domains.

Reader's Score: 48

Selection Criteria - Contribution assisting disadvantaged

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.

Strengths:

As with the previous section, there is considerable effort in detailing disadvantaged student data. Additionally, on page 4 and in the appendices, the evidence in section 1 also applies to this section as it details the success that KIPP has had in working with disadvantaged students in an effort to prepare them for career and college. Levels greater than 70% disadvantaged student populations at the schools is consistent with efforts to deliver a quality program and are research proven as on pages 18 and 19. The KIPP program includes five pillars of: high expectations, choice & commitment, more time, power to lead and focus on results. Additionally, to support these pillars, KIPP focuses on community support, teacher professional development, instructional benchmarking, educational environment, recruitment and retention strategies, continuous learning and educational leadership training. All of these are applied to a community-based approach to the provision of educational services to disadvantaged students, as detailed on page 21, 25 and the appendices.

Weaknesses:

There were no identifiable weaknesses in this section.

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--**
 - (i) **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 should address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**
 - (ii) **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.**

Strengths:

Project objectives and performance measurements are provided with specific reference on page 25. Project objectives and measurements are aligned with overall instructional goals captured within appendices (instructional methods). A logic model that supports the project objectives is included on page 27. The narrative provides ample evidence to support the KIPP network of schools and the composite level of interaction among and within the network as well as within and among the community that the schools are nested within, as detailed in the appendices. KIPP programs rely upon external research generated through Mathematica Policy Research, which provides objectivity as well as quantifiable measures of success as listed on pages 30-31.

Weaknesses:

There are no identifiable weaknesses.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers--**
 - (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.

(ii) The business plan for increasing, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools opened under this program beyond the initial period of Federal funding, including, but not limited to facilities, financials, central office, academics, governance, oversight, and human resources of the schools.

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

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

(v) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, CEO/organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The applicant continues to successfully expand its network of high quality schools. As page 25 indicates, over the past nine years, KIPP has expanded to 82 schools, operating in 32 educationally disadvantaged communities in 19 states. The budget and fiscal analysis details a solid financial position to replicate schools effectively, as detailed on pages 33-35 and page 69. The plan also forecasts sustainability issues during and beyond the grant period. The business plan, on pages 36-39 is aligned with the project objectives and performance measurements to underscore connectedness of the overall strategy. Multi-year financial data is provided in the appendices as well as on page 43. There is a plan for closing low performing charter schools. The qualifications of the supporters of the KIPP model, including the board of directors and lead executives are listed on page 49 and included in the appendices. These individuals are of the highest quality and reflect business acumen, entrepreneurialism and educational prowess

Weaknesses:

There are no identifiable weaknesses in this section.

Reader's Score: 25

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Please provide a summary of comments for this application. There are no points awarded in this section. Please enter 0 for the minimum and maximum scores.

General:

This application represents a very high level of comprehensiveness, attention to detail and application of organizational intent to provision of highest quality educational services. This application advances the theory of replication in a manner that is not exclusive to national organizations. That is, the deliverables of the KIPP program are not only relevant to large organizations but could be employed by smaller CMOs and start-up multi-site charter organizations.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/19/2010 02:44 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/20/2010 07:24 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M100014)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	50	48
Contribution assisting disadvantaged		
1. Contribution	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of design	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality Management Plan	25	25
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		
1. Overall Comments	0	0
Total	100	98

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M100014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including educationally disadvantaged students, served by charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.
 - (ii) The degree 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).
 - (iii) The degree to which the applicant has achieved results for low-income and minority students that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State. Applicants are invited to submit objective data that they believe would provide relevant information in support of these three factors, along with comparison data for similar schools, where available. In particular, the Secretary is interested in the following data: (1) Performance (school-wide and by subgroup) on statewide tests of all charter schools operated or managed by the applicant as compared to all students in other schools in the State or States at the same grade level, and as compared with other schools serving similar demographics of students; (2) annual student attendance and retention rates (school-wide and by subgroup), and comparisons with other similar schools; (3) where applicable and available, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates (school-wide and by subgroup) of students attending schools operated or managed by the applicant. When reporting data for schools in States that may have particularly demanding or low standards of proficiency (for example, see the report available at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/studies/201456.pdf>), applicants are invited to discuss how their academic success might be considered against applicants from across the country.

Strengths:

Applicant provided three examples from diverse parts of the country where KIPP schools have outperformed similar schools in those regions. (p e2) In all three examples the students in the applicant schools significantly scored higher than those students in the State schools.

Additionally, the applicant provided strong evidence of its ability to increase achievement as compared to the local district schools. (p e9)

Further data provided by the applicant indicates that the number of college bound students are impressively high which provides this reviewer with confidence that the quality of the applicant is beyond high. (e12)

Applicant produced results from an independent auditor that asked and answered key questions regarding the impact of the applicant's program upon closing historic achievement gaps. Obtaining third party reviews such as this speak volumes in understanding the real impact of the program and applicant upon student achievement. (p e4)

Weaknesses:

Academic scores were higher in Math than in Reading. The reviewer would have appreciated a discussion of this gap.

Reader's Score: 48

Selection Criteria - Contribution assisting disadvantaged

- 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant explained, in adequate detail, the results of its program upon low-income and minority students. The nationally normed test results indicate significant achievement gains for students enrolled in the applicant's current programs. (e 7)

The applicant provides a detailed account of its historical commitment to serving and educating educationally disadvantaged students.

Again, the applicant proves its ability to effectively educate disadvantaged students by detailing the findings of three different research studies all designed to determine how the applicant's model is impacting these students. (p e19) All three studies documented the positive results of the program model on serving educationally disadvantaged students.

The Applicant has put a priority on assisting students through the college access process. Providing staff members to assist these students in the identification, application and financial aid process allows for a greater chance of the students attending and matriculating through college.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

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--**
 - (i) 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 should address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**
 - (ii) 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.**

Strengths:

Applicant provides well written goals and objectives of the project. This allows for the applicant to clearly articulate the outcomes of the project. (e23)

The details of the design of the project were well defined. (e24) The goals were listed and then supported by a short narrative which provided additional context to the goals. This is helpful in understanding why the applicant identified these particular goals and provided the reviewer with an clear idea of how the applicant was planning to meet the goals.

The applicant planned for evaluation and replication of the project. These two pieces are critical to the long term sustainability and success of the project (e 29, 30)

In addition, the evaluation plan was well defined and included sources, timelines and measures. This allows the applicant to continuously monitor the project and make diagnostic decisions as the project unfolds. (e 30)

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers--
 - (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.
 - (ii) The business plan for increasing, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools opened under this program beyond the initial period of Federal funding, including, but not limited to facilities, financials, central office, academics, governance, oversight, and human resources of the schools.
 - (iii) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, as well as a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success.
 - (iv) A plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality.
 - (v) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, CEO/organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

Applicant presents several letters of support for the project from community leaders. This is a strong indication of the potential of sustained success of the project.

Applicant provides detailed outline(s) of the project tasks as well as the management of these tasks. The application is strengthened by this planning document as it allows the reviewer to judge that the applicant has thoroughly analyzed the management tasks required of this project. (page e32)

Applicant provided details regarding who will be in charge of the project. All are familiar with the organization and its mission.

Applicant addresses its plan for closing low-performing schools (page e41)

Applicant provided a financial model that addresses project implementation. The details of the budget are comprehensive and provided summary text that explained the financial systems (for example, how individual schools are allocated money from the Network).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 25

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Please provide a summary of comments for this application. There are no points awarded in this section. Please enter 0 for the minimum and maximum scores.

General:

This application was written in a complete and cohesive manner which allowed for easy understanding. All components were met and the information submitted was more than complete and answered all questions this reviewer had.

Reader's Score: **0**

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 08/20/2010 07:24 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2010 09:03 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M100014)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Eligible Applicant	50	46
Contribution assisting disadvantaged		
1. Contribution	15	15
Quality of Project Design		
1. Quality of design	10	10
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality Management Plan	25	21
Overall Comments		
Overall Comments		
1. Overall Comments	0	0
Total	100	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M100014)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Eligible Applicant

1. In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:
 - (i) The degree to which the applicant has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students, including educationally disadvantaged students, served by charter schools operated or managed by the applicant.
 - (ii) The degree 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).
 - (iii) The degree to which the applicant has achieved results for low-income and minority students that are significantly above the average academic achievement results for such students in the State. Applicants are invited to submit objective data that they believe would provide relevant information in support of these three factors, along with comparison data for similar schools, where available. In particular, the Secretary is interested in the following data: (1) Performance (school-wide and by subgroup) on statewide tests of all charter schools operated or managed by the applicant as compared to all students in other schools in the State or States at the same grade level, and as compared with other schools serving similar demographics of students; (2) annual student attendance and retention rates (school-wide and by subgroup), and comparisons with other similar schools; (3) where applicable and available, high school graduation rates, college attendance rates, and college persistence rates (school-wide and by subgroup) of students attending schools operated or managed by the applicant. When reporting data for schools in States that may have particularly demanding or low standards of proficiency (for example, see the report available at <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/studies/201456.pdf>), applicants are invited to discuss how their academic success might be considered against applicants from across the country.

Strengths:

The applicant provides several studies from outside firms, including Mathematic Policy Research, National Bureau of Economic Research, and SRI, to document the success of the KIPP model (pp. 5-7, pp 20-23). These studies compare students from multiple sites on multiple measures, including nationally norm-referenced tests and statewide tests. Comparisons also have been made that show KIPP students outscore students in their home districts and the state overall. The applicant has shown success in raising student attendance and decreasing student attrition rates. The applicant also has tracked students through high school and college and found that higher numbers complete high school and enroll in college (pp. 5, 13-14). The applicant has demonstrated its success with both low-income and minority students. The applicant has a strong record of improving student achievement and closing the achievement gap.

Weaknesses:

The KIPP model has generally scored higher in math than in reading (p. 8, 10). This difference is noted, but no clear explanation is given for the difference in student performance or a rationale for how KIPP intends to address this deficiency.

Reader's Score: 46

Selection Criteria - Contribution assisting disadvantaged

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.

Strengths:

KIPP was originally founded to assist educationally disadvantaged students prepare to be successful in college and the world of work. The KIPP model is anchored on five pillars, including high expectations, choice and commitment, more time, power to lead, and focus on results (p. 16). The model provides both middle and high school programs that relentlessly focus on student performance and character development through an extended school day and calendar. Middle school students receive the instructional time to not only make up any deficiencies that occurred before they matriculated (usually one or two grade levels below the national average (p. 4). High school students focus on preparing for college. The model has already been replicated in 82 schools (p. 16); funds from this grant will be used to expand schools in additional communities to further test the effectiveness of the model in different settings. Funds will be used to serve an additional 15,000 students in educationally disadvantaged communities. Given the strong track record of KIPP, this means that 15,000 more students will receive the education necessary for them to become successful in school.

The leadership development program further supports the proposed expansion by providing a pipeline for charter school leaders. Given the importance of school leaders in shaping and operating successful schools, the impact of this program component should not be underestimated.

Weaknesses:

None

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--**
 - (i) 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 should address the attainability of outcomes given this difference.**
 - (ii) 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.**

Strengths:

The applicant has identified two overarching goals and objectives for this initiative. Measurable outcomes are identified for the achievement of both which focus on schools outperforming their local school districts, students who attend KIPP, and the building of a foundation for K-12 education (pp. 24-25).

The applicant describes a stage gate process for opening or expanding new schools (p. 27). This two-year process builds on leadership development, market analysis, and development and implementation of a strategic business plan. In addition, KIPP currently operates 82 schools. The applicant has clearly thought through what is needed to increase the likelihood of successful expansions.

The applicant also has developed a Healthy Schools & Regions Framework (pp. 30-31) which allows the KIPP Foundation to critically assess and benchmark individual schools against a robust set of performance outcomes and leading indicators. This "balanced scorecard" further increases the chances for success.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel to replicate and expand high-quality charter schools. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers--
 - (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.
 - (ii) The business plan for increasing, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of charter schools opened under this program beyond the initial period of Federal funding, including, but not limited to facilities, financials, central office, academics, governance, oversight, and human resources of the schools.
 - (iii) A multi-year financial and operating model for the organization, as well as a demonstrated commitment of current and future partners, and evidence of broad support from stakeholders critical to the project's long-term success.
 - (iv) A plan for closing charter schools supported, overseen, or managed by the applicant that do not meet high standards of quality.
 - (v) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, CEO/organization leader, and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

KIPP has strong leadership in place. The qualifications of the CEO and key personnel are very strong. They are backed by a board of directors that is unmatched. The principal of each charter is critical to its success. There is a strong leadership development program in place to staff new charter schools. The applicant has a well-designed business plan and operational model. It has laid out milestones and responsibilities for its expansion plan (pp. 33-35). The Fisher Fellowship program develops individuals to lead expansion schools (p. 28). The proposal text clearly documents that KIPP has extensive experience in opening and supporting charter schools. It has numerous partners that suggest broad support (see Section 2Â Letters of Support).

Weaknesses:

Few details were provided about closing unsuccessful charter schools. Although KIPP acknowledged on p. 42 that it has closed seven schools during its ten years of operation, it was not clear how the decision was made and what procedures were followed in closing the school and assisting students in finding other alternatives.

Reader's Score: 21

Overall Comments - Overall Comments

1. Please provide a summary of comments for this application. There are no points awarded in this section. Please enter 0 for the minimum and maximum scores.

General:

This is a very strong proposal. KIPP provided data from three external evaluations that documented the program's positive results with the target population. In addition, detail management and business plans suggest that expansion efforts will be positive.

Reader's Score: 0

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/19/2010 09:03 AM