

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/13/2011 11:15 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U282M110020)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Low-Income Demographic</b>		
1. Low-Income Demographic	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>School Improvement</b>		
1. School Improvement	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	5	2
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	50	44
<b>Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	10	8
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	8
<b>Quality of the management plan and personnel</b>		
1. Quality of Mngt. Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Quality of the eval. plan	5	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>106</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

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

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U282M110020)

## Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low-Income Demographic

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families.

Individual from a low-income family means an individual who is determined by an SEA or LEA to be a child, ages 5 through 17, from a low-income family, on the basis of (a) data used by the Secretary to determine allocations under section 1124 of the ESEA, (b) data on children eligible for free or reduced-price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, (c) data on children in families receiving assistance under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, (d) data on children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program under Title XIX of the Social Security Act, or (e) an alternate method that combines or extrapolates from the data in items (a) through (d) of this definition (see 20 U.S.C. 6537(3)).

#### Strengths:

85% of the students are eligible for free or reduced lunch (p 5).

#### Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 10

### Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more local educational agencies (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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

#### Strengths:

The applicant presents extensive evidence about the framework and plans for expansion as well as the results of the prior expansion.

#### Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 5

### Competitive Preference Priority 3 - 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 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 this priority 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 served population is 95% African American or Latino (p. 5).

#### **Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not present sufficient information on students with disabilities -- providing neither information on prior services nor plans for improving services. Only 20 of the 82 KIPP schools serve students with disabilities. Also only 31% of the KIPP schools serve ELL students.

**Reader's Score:** 2

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (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).
- (2) Either (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).
- (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 has a substantial history of providing high quality services, achieving excellent results with educationally disadvantaged students, and reducing the achievement gaps.

**Weaknesses:**

KIPP appears not to have developed a full program for serving students with IEPs and KIPP is not as successful with these students.

**Reader's Score: 44**

**Sub Question**

1. **(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:**

KIPP has provided substantial documentation, including data from a number of research studies that provide evidence for the efficacy of the KIPP model.

KIPP students scored 94% proficient in math and 87% proficient in ELA compared to 41% for both math and reading for students in Washington, D.C. KIPP middle school students in Gaston, NC, achieved 99% proficiency in math, and 78% in ELA compared to 71% and 47% for surrounding schools (p 4).

The system uses the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress as a guide. When KIPP students enter middle school, only 32% perform above grade level in math and 33% score above grade level in their reading abilities. At the end of 8th grade, the percentages have grown to 62 and 57 percent, respectively, scoring above grade level in math and reading.

At the 8th grade level, KIPP students outperform their peers in local districts by 90% in math, 98% in ELA, and 93% in science (p. 13).

**Weaknesses:**

The services provided for students with IEPs are insufficient and therefore are a weakness in the KIPP schools; KIPP is not as successful with these students.

**Reader's Score: 16**

2. **(2) Either (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:**

KIPP schools have succeeded in substantially reducing both race- and income-based achievement gaps within three years. Specifically, one-half of the KIPP schools reduced the black-white achievement gap by half or more

**Sub Question**

within three years.

**Weaknesses:**

KIPP has not been as successful with students with IEPs.

**Reader's Score: 14**

3. (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 2009-2010 average daily attendance was 96%.

Approximately one-third of KIPP schools have lower attrition rates than corresponding school districts; one-third have equivalent levels, and one-third were greater. However, the schools have lower attrition for African-American and Latino students and lower attrition rates for African-American males. The KIPP students graduate at one-and-a-half times the rate of their low-income, demographic peers.

The applicant reports that 95% of KIPP students who complete 8th grade go on to graduate from high school. KIPP students enroll in college at two times the rate of the peer population; 89% of the KIPP graduates are accepted into college. KIPP students graduate at four times the rate of their peer population (p. 3); specifically, 33% of KIPP students who completed 8th grade have graduated from college, which is four times the national average according to the applicant.

**Weaknesses:**

For four KIPP schools, the rate of acceptance into college is 32-35% (in 2006) (p. 19). For other KIPP it is at 41-78%.

**Reader's Score: 14**

**Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

**1. Contribution in assisting economically disadvantaged students**

**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.**

**Strengths:**

The percent of students who have free or reduced lunch, by region ranges from 73-92% (p 21).

The applicant includes plans for canvassing neighborhoods to recruit families and students. These plans indicate that they are also working to increase the number of students with disabilities.

The KIPP model offers through-college support (p 27) to their students.

**Weaknesses:**

KIPP does not serve a comparable number of students with disabilities when compared to surrounding schools. The applicant did not describe procedures that would be undertaken to increase this percentage, nor were there descriptions with regard to the effectiveness of services for this population.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**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 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 applicant is requesting \$ 12.7 million to support charter schools in 10 states, including \$2.3 million per year for personnel, and \$1 million for equipment. The indirect request is for \$35-46,000 per year. There are no matching funds described. The funds will include subsidized housing for principals.

The current network of 109 schools serves 32,000 students. The applicant requests support to open 18 new schools.

The expected outcome is that the new schools will serve over 8,000 students in 12 unique communities in nine states and in Washington D.C.

The applicant provided examples, such as the KIPP school in Houston will open in co-located buildings in order to drive change with other schools. In Newark, NJ, KIPP is in partnership with BRICK Avon Academy, which has been ranked in the bottom five percent of Newark Public Schools and is currently being restructured.

The goals are to expand the KIPP network of high quality schools. There are 109 KIPP schools in 20 states and in D.C. By 2015, the applicant anticipates an enrollment of 55,000 students in nearly 200 schools.

The objective is to use the grant funds to open 18 new schools in educationally disadvantaged neighborhoods. The applicant has listed outcomes (p 31) that are measurable and feasible.

KIPP displayed its Growth Management Process (p 33) that begins with a sustainability analysis, including developing a business plan, and ends with identifying and executing critical growth measures.

KIPP Founders are selected by a national committee of peers to participate in KIPP's flagship leadership development program. This includes a one-year, cohort-based program that has a summer institute, multiple workshops, individualized leadership coaching, and residencies.

KIPP presented a timeline with milestones and responsibilities designated to the appropriate parties (p 37); the applicant also included a business plan for ensuring quality performance (p 38).

The KIPP model does not prescribe or implement any one curriculum over schools--there is local control. Each region has its local board of directors.

KIPP teacher recruitment and retention are critical; 77% of the teachers returned to KIPP in the fall of 2009. Over the last

eight years, the portion of teachers remaining with KIPP has increased by 8%.

KIPP hosts an annual summit with more than 2000 participants.

KIPP employs a Leadership Competency Model that describes the competencies and behaviors that define effective leaders. KIPP uses 360 degree evaluation? career progression roadmaps, and proficiency roadmaps.

KIPP described its procedures for oversight of its schools and also its procedures for closing KIPP schools that are not meeting expectations.

**Weaknesses:**

While KIPP has obtained remarkable results, the information presented in the application did not adequately describe the plan for implementation.

KIPP does not serve a comparable number of students with disabilities when compared to surrounding schools, leaving many questions regarding programs, procedures, and plans for improvement.

**Reader's Score: 8**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the management plan and personnel**

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

**(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.**

**(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.**

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

**(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.**

**Strengths:**

KIPP displayed its Growth Management Process (p 33) that begins with a sustainability analysis, including developing a business plan, and ends with identifying and executing critical growth measures.

KIPP Founders are selected by a national committee of peers to participate in KIPP's flagship leadership development

program. This includes a one-year, cohort-based program that has a summer institute, multiple workshops, individualized leadership coaching, and residencies.

KIPP presented a timeline with milestones and responsibilities designated to the appropriate parties (p 37); the applicant also included a business plan for ensuring quality performance (p 38).

The KIPP model does not prescribe or implement any one curriculum over schools--there is local control. Each region has its local board of directors.

KIPP teacher recruitment and retention are critical; 77% of the teachers returned to KIPP in the fall of 2009. Over the last eight years, the portion of teachers remaining with KIPP has increased by 8%.

KIPP hosts an annual summit with more than 2000 participants.

KIPP employs a Leadership Competency Model that describes the competencies and behaviors that define effective leaders. KIPP uses 360 degree evaluations, career progression roadmaps, and proficiency roadmaps.

KIPP described its procedures for oversight of its schools and also its procedures for closing KIPP schools that are not meeting expectations.

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Reader's Score: 25**

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

- 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 and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant uses the Healthy Schools and Regions Framework to measure academic and non-academic factors, to identify best in-class practices, and to share strategies for improvement. This framework addresses who KIPP is serving, if students are being retained, if they are progressing, if they are entering and staying in college, and whether the people and financial models are sustainable. Measures of performance include annual site visits, and staff, student, parent surveys. Also included is an annual review of school records and norm-referenced test results.

**Weaknesses:**

Applicants did not provide information on who will conduct evaluations.

**Reader's Score: 4**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/13/2011 11:15 AM



Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/12/2011 11:12 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U282M110020)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Low-Income Demographic</b>		
1. Low-Income Demographic	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>School Improvement</b>		
1. School Improvement	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	5	1
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	50	46
<b>Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	9
<b>Quality of the management plan and personnel</b>		
1. Quality of Mngt. Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Quality of the eval. plan	5	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>110</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

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

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U282M110020)

## Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low-Income Demographic

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families.

Individual from a low-income family means an individual who is determined by an SEA or LEA to be a child, ages 5 through 17, from a low-income family, on the basis of (a) data used by the Secretary to determine allocations under section 1124 of the ESEA, (b) data on children eligible for free or reduced-price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, (c) data on children in families receiving assistance under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, (d) data on children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program under Title XIX of the Social Security Act, or (e) an alternate method that combines or extrapolates from the data in items (a) through (d) of this definition (see 20 U.S.C. 6537(3)).

#### Strengths:

KIPP schools (109, serving 32,000 students) serve a population in which 85% qualify for free or reduced lunch.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 10

### Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more local educational agencies (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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

#### Strengths:

KIPP has several partnerships with school districts related to sharing facilities, successful models of instruction, and approaches to leadership training and development (pages 28-29). It also has a more formal partnership with Newark Schools to assist in restructuring one of its failing schools, which will result in a School Start -Up and Student Achievement Manual.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

### Competitive Preference Priority 3 - 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 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 this priority 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:

KIPP purposefully locates schools in neighborhoods that have a high percentage of educationally disadvantaged students. The KIPP philosophy stresses that all students are welcome and can learn.

#### Weaknesses:

Because of locations, the student populations are almost always racially homogeneous (primarily African American). Only 32 of 82 KIPP schools for which data exists serve English language learners at a rate comparable to or higher than surrounding district schools. Only 20 of these 82 schools serve students with disabilities at a comparable rate to district schools.

Reader's Score: 1

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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).

(2) Either (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).

**(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 has an impressive track record with schools already in operation and provided convincing data related particularly to low income and African American students.

**Weaknesses:**

The data related to English language learners was spotty and the data related to students with disabilities was not convincing.

**Reader's Score: 46**

**Sub Question**

- 1. (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:**

Data presented and analyzed by the applicant clearly indicate significant achievement gains related to neighborhood schools as well as significantly higher scores based on number of years students attend KIPP schools. Data from one LA KIPP school which includes 33% English language learners and 95% from low income families indicates that 87% of eighth graders scored at the proficient or advanced levels in math, compared to 32% in the local district.

**Weaknesses:**

The applicant does not present a body of evidence related to the achievement of students with disabilities or English language learners.

**Reader's Score: 18**

- 2. (2) Either (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:**

Although students entering KIPP schools are typically achieving 1 to 2 grade levels behind the national average, 90% of their 8th grade classes outperform their school districts in math and 98% in ELA (page 5). The 2010 Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. interim report of a multi-year study of 22 KIPP middle schools comparing results to neighborhood schools summarized as follows: "estimated impacts are frequently large enough to substantially reduce race and income based achievement gaps within 3 years of entering KIPP (page 7).

**Sub Question**

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 15**

3. (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:**

95% of students who complete 8th grade with KIPP graduate from high school and 89% matriculate to college within 5 years. 33% have graduated from college (four times the national average for low-income students). The explanation of using all student data is well explained on page 5 (homogeneity of group). Eighth graders in 90% of KIPP schools outperform the local districts in math, 98% in ELA, and 93% in science (page 13). During the 2009-2010 school year, KIPP's average daily attendance rate was 96%.

**Weaknesses:**

There is no explanation related to the decreases in percentages on state tests by KIPP Middle School students "all grades" in ELA and math in every case except one (Latino/Hispanic) from 2009 to 2010 (chart on page 16).

**Reader's Score: 13**

**Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

**1. Contribution in assisting economically disadvantaged students**

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.

**Strengths:**

The core principles that guide all KIPP schools have been proven to be consistently successful with educationally disadvantaged students (high expectations, choice and commitment, more time, power to lead, and focus on results). Because all of the new schools will be located in areas that target these students and will be supported by existing KIPP networks and schools, the project should contribute substantially to this population.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**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 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 outcomes are clearly related to the purposes of the grant. Documentation is presented that supports the attainability of fall start-ups at all 18 sites and support to these new schools by the national and local foundations that have supported KIPP in the past. All schools will undergo strategic growth management planning and will be founded by a principal selected and trained by KIPP. The populations to be served are very similar, as each school will be in an area where existing KIPP schools are clustered.

**Weaknesses:**

Outcome #3 will not apply to many of the new schools because it pertains to schools at full enrollment.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of the management plan and personnel**

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

**(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.**

**(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.**

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

**(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.**

**Strengths:**

The two year growth management process explained on page 33 is well established and has been refined through experience. All of the schools starting through this project have begun this process. The table on pages 37-38 includes major milestones and responsible parties for each of the 3 years, the development of supporting services to ensure quality and sustainability, and oversight, management, and evaluation of the grant. The project staff is well qualified and well prepared for a project of this scope. The organization has a clear plan for closing underperforming schools after a process of multiple supports and has a history of doing so. It also has a good balance of encouraging local decisions (curriculum, budget, personnel, and marketing) within a proven, successful framework and comprehensive training programs for leaders. An explanation is provided related to how this fits with other CSP funding, and how the new schools will be financed beyond the period of the grant. A multi-year financial model is provided.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were noted.

**Reader's Score:** 25

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

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 and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**

**Strengths:**

The evaluation plan will be based on KIPP's Healthy Schools & Regions framework, which includes 6 essential questions related to student achievement, attrition, post-school success, and a sustainable personnel and financial model. All of these are closely related to starting successful schools. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be collected. Evaluation data sources and measures are presented on page 51.

**Weaknesses:**

Two staff members of the internal IT team will be responsible for supporting data collection and reporting (page e437) but it is not clear who will be responsible for the actual collection of the data for the evaluation.

**Reader's Score:** 4

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 09/12/2011 11:12 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 09/11/2011 05:09 PM

## Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U282M110020)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Low-Income Demographic</b>		
1. Low-Income Demographic	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>School Improvement</b>		
1. School Improvement	5	5
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. Promoting Diversity	5	5
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Quality of the eligible applicant</b>		
1. Quality of the Applicant	50	50
<b>Educationally Disadvantaged Students</b>		
1. Assisting Students	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Quality of Project Design	10	10
<b>Quality of the management plan and personnel</b>		
1. Quality of Mngt. Plan	25	25
<b>Quality of the Evaluation Plan</b>		
1. Quality of the eval. plan	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

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

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U282M110020)

## Questions

### Competitive Preference Priority 1 - Low-Income Demographic

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools it currently operates or manages are individuals from low-income families.

Individual from a low-income family means an individual who is determined by an SEA or LEA to be a child, ages 5 through 17, from a low-income family, on the basis of (a) data used by the Secretary to determine allocations under section 1124 of the ESEA, (b) data on children eligible for free or reduced-price lunches under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, (c) data on children in families receiving assistance under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, (d) data on children eligible to receive medical assistance under the Medicaid program under Title XIX of the Social Security Act, or (e) an alternate method that combines or extrapolates from the data in items (a) through (d) of this definition (see 20 U.S.C. 6537(3)).

#### Strengths:

The applicant has provided a comprehensive thorough detailed explanation of each record in increasing student achievement for diverse students. The application presented documented evidence on pgs. 10 - 19, which is verified by national research firms that documents the validity of academic achievement.

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

Reader's Score: 10

### Competitive Preference Priority 2 - School Improvement

1. To meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that its proposed replication or expansion of one or more high-quality charter schools will occur in partnership with, and will be designed to assist, one or more local educational agencies (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 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), and as described in the notice of final requirements for the School Improvement Grants, published in the Federal Register on October 28, 2010 (75 FR 66363).

#### Strengths:

The applicant has documented its effort in partnering with low achieving schools so that families with established regions has a choice beyond public schools (pgs. 28-29).

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

Reader's Score: 5

### Competitive Preference Priority 3 - 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 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 this priority 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 has identified the regions in five states and the variety of outreach into different neighborhood. The rationale for providing new schools and contributing to assisting educationally disadvantaged students was strong provided and comprehensive information, pgs. 20 - 27.

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

Reader's Score: 5

### Selection Criteria - Quality of the eligible applicant

In determining the quality of the applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(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).

(2) Either (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).

(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 has presented a detailed data about the success of its academic approach over the past three years in increasing the disadvantaged students achievement. The applicant provides convincing and compelling data with national research to specify the strength in their impact on students' performance, attendance, graduation rate and academic excellence. In addition, the applicant has documented the significant achievement gaps for students' subgroups attending its schools. The detailed data for the applicant is comprehensive and exhaustive.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

**Reader's Score: 50**

**Sub Question**

- 1. (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 has presented a detailed data about the success of its academic approach over the past three years in increasing the disadvantaged students achievement, pgs. 5 - 20.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

**Reader's Score: 20**

- 2. (2) Either (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 provides convincing and compelling data with national research to specify the strength in their impact on students' performance, attendance, graduation rate and academic excellence.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

**Reader's Score: 15**

- 3. (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**

#### Sub Question

**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 has documented the significant achievement gaps for students' subgroups attending its schools. The detailed data for the applicant is comprehensive and exhaustive.

#### **Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

**Reader's Score: 15**

#### **Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students**

##### **1. Contribution in assisting economically disadvantaged students**

**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.**

#### **Strengths:**

The applicant has presented documentation on increasing students' academic achievement with rigorous research by Mathematica Policy Research, the National Bureau of Economic Research and results on National assessment and state assessment data (pgs. 5-20). Additionally, the applicant provided detailed information on its five pillars of education (p. 20).

#### **Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

**Reader's Score: 10**

#### **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 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 applicant has provided sound, thorough, and significant details on the plan to replicate the Kipp model in five different states. The project design is feasible with compelling rationale on developing additional successful schools and staff development programs based on the Kipp model.

#### **Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses found under this area.

Reader's Score: 10

#### Selection Criteria - Quality of the management plan and personnel

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

(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.

(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.

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

(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.

#### Strengths:

On pages 32-35 the applicant has a comprehensive plan for the management of their projected plan which is detailed and thorough. The applicant has included a focused, strong management plan and provided detailed process on how it will execute the plan and the budget for each phase.

#### Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses under this area.

Reader's Score: 25

#### Selection Criteria - Quality of the Evaluation Plan

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 and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.

#### Strengths:

On pages 49 - 51, the applicant includes a complete and comprehensive explanation of the evaluation data sources and the attainment of measurable goals. The applicant indicates that there will be information collected by Healthy Schools which will measure academic and nonacademic success.

**Weaknesses:**

There are no weaknesses under this area.

**Reader's Score:** 5

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 09/11/2011 05:09 PM