

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/15/2012 05:13 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP regions (U282M120012)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Applicant Quality	50	50
Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Assisting Students	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	6
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	4
Total	100	93

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP regions (U282M120012)

Questions

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 presents a significant number of students being served by its network of schools with significant percentage of students being socio-economically disadvantaged or African-American or Latino (p. 5).

The applicant demonstrates academic achievement over three grades that is approximately 34% in reading and 25% in math (p. 7).

The applicant presents data indicating significant growth on the norm referenced tests given by its schools (p. 8).

The applicant provides an overview of two research studies indicating KIPP is substantially closing achievement gaps (p. 9-11).

The applicant provides data demonstrating how students at its schools outperform when compared to district and state averages on state testing (p.12-16).

The applicant demonstrates strong attendance and retention rates leading to increased student achievement (p. 17-18).

The applicant provides reasonable evidence regarding high school graduation and college acceptance and persistence rates for 8th grade students indicating a successful academic program and successful contribution of diversifying the country's college going culture (p. 18-20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 50

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant presents a significant number of students being served by its network of schools with significant percentage of students being socio-economically disadvantaged or African-American or Latino (p. 5).

The applicant demonstrates academic achievement over three grades that is approximately 34% in reading and 25% in math (p. 7).

The applicant presents data indicating significant growth on the norm referenced tests given by its schools (p. 8).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 20

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.

Strengths:

The applicant provides an overview of two research studies indicating KIPP is substantially closing achievement gaps (p. 9-11).

The applicant provides data demonstrating how students at its schools outperform when compared to district and state averages on state testing (p.12-16).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

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.**

Sub Question

Strengths:

The applicant provides reasonable evidence regarding high school graduation and college acceptance and persistence rates for 8th grade students indicating a successful academic program and successful contribution of diversifying the country's college going culture (p. 18-20).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

Strengths:

The applicant indicates that if it is awarded a grant it will serve over 16,000 educationally disadvantaged students in 25 different communities (p. 20).

The applicant provides locations and proposed locations across the country for opening schools to meet the needs of an educationally disadvantaged population and how it will recruit a diverse population of students to enroll in each of the schools (p. 21-23).

The applicant provides significant information on how its replication and expansion will ensure that academic outcomes are commensurate with its existing schools, thus further closing the academic achievement gap - race and socio-economic (p. 24-28).

Weaknesses:

The applicant does explain how its expansion and growth will increase the number of educationally disadvantaged students receiving a high quality education, but the applicant does not address its strategy to meet the idiosyncrasies (e. g., educational needs and expectations, politics, real estate market, etc.) that may arise at the various locations - too much of a "big box" approach.

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 provides strong objectives and outcomes for the project that will help increase the number of educationally disadvantaged students from communities where high quality educational opportunities are deficient (p. 32-33).

The applicant intends to open 36 new schools over four years in educationally disadvantaged neighborhoods. This approach is intended to give the applicant similar or greater rates of student achievement (p.32-34).

Weaknesses:

The applicant relies on its previous experiences for ensuring academic success for their educationally underserved students in the new communities where the applicant will open its new schools. This approach lacks an implementation strategy thus indicating how these schools will actually come to fruition.

The applicant provides measureable outcomes, but does not provide a methodology for how it will gauge its success or failure.

Reader's Score: 6

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 applicant provides a clear plan to achieve the objectives of its proposed project and delineates the various role and responsibilities along with the timeline for completing the project (p. 35-36).

The applicant provides a reasonable overview of how new schools are opened and how new schools benefit from opening within existing regions, thus helping to ensure success of the school and providing an opportunity for educationally disadvantaged students a choice for a high quality education (p. 37-38).

The applicant provides a thorough budget demonstrating the appropriate use of grant dollars (p. e508-e533).

The applicant provides a realistic and reasonable plan for ensuring operational success of the school, thus allowing students to attend a high performing school that is academically and fiscally sound (p. 37-47).

The applicant provides financial data that demonstrates reasonableness in its approach to opening and sustaining high quality schools (p. 41, 45, 46).

The applicant addresses the importance of closing low performing schools and the efforts to help low performing schools turn around, thus not to immediately jeopardize the learning of its educationally disadvantaged students (p. 47-48).

The applicant identifies key personnel who have significant experience overseeing the projects identified in the application as well as managing the grant (p. 49-51).

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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 applicant presents an evaluation plan for student outcomes and student performance designed to ensure significant student success (p. 51-55).

The quantitative and qualitative data the applicant intends to collect will provide a reasonable understanding of how the schools are performing both academically and fiscally (p. 51-55).

Weaknesses:

The applicant provides inadequate information regarding how it will measure the affect the grant funding will have on improving student achievement.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/15/2012 05:13 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2012 02:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP regions (U282M120012)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Applicant Quality	50	45
Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Assisting Students	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	8
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan	25	23
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	5
Total	100	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP regions (U282M120012)

Questions

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 very strong, proven track record and currently has 109 schools in its network. Effective processes have been developed over time to track academic progress and disaggregated data is presented effectively.

Weaknesses:

Some of the data are not explained fully. such as the data for kindergarteners that is only gathered at some of the elementary schools.

Reader's Score: 45

Sub Question

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

Strengths:

The applicant does an excellent job of presenting both overall and individual school longitudinal data on the 109 charter schools it currently supports. The summary data on page 8 related to middle school is impressive (entering fifth graders perform at grade level 37% in reading and 32% in math, and at the end of 8th grade 57% in reading and 62% in math).

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The data presented on pages 7-8 related to kindergarten students are difficult to analyze because it is clear from the statement on page 7 that not all KIPP schools administer the tests to kindergarteners. It would strengthen the application to state how many schools were included in that summary.

Reader's Score: 18

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.

Strengths:

Data are presented from Washington, DC; Helena, Arkansas; San Diego, California; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Lynn, Massachusetts that demonstrate significant increases in both reading and math over time and result in closing the achievement gap for many high risk students in KIPP schools (pages 4-7). The 2010 Mathematica multiyear study of 22 KIPP middle schools concluded that "estimated impacts are frequently large enough to substantially reduce race and income based achievement gaps within 3 years of entering KIPP".

Weaknesses:

Data on page 16 shows mixed results for special needs and ELL students in both ELA and Math, in many cases trending down from year to year. It would be more effective to provide longitudinal cohort data for the same group of students from grade 5-8 for a clear value added picture and describe any responses to data that is not positive. For instance, Special Needs Students who entered 5th grade in 2009 went from 65% to 81% (2010) to 57% (2011) in Math and 53% to 73% (2010) to 53% (2011) in ELA. No explanation is included for these decreases.

Reader's Score: 12

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.

Strengths:

Daily attendance rates are very high, averaging 96%. Attrition rates for middle school African American students are lower than district averages. 94% of students who completed the 8th grade at KIPP 5 or more years ago have graduated from high school and 84% have gone to college (page 18). Available college graduation rates are significantly higher than the national average and over 3 times the average for low-income students. KIPP students (average 87% low income and 95% African American or Latino) consistently outscore both district and state averages on statewide tests for all disaggregated groups as well for total student populations.

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

Strengths:

The KIPP organization targets neighborhoods that consist of at least 80% low income families. The project includes plans to locate in new neighborhoods as well as to add at least 8 elementary and 2 high schools in order to start working with students earlier and continue with them longer. New schools will be serving students similar to current populations, the framework and support structure will remain the same, and each new school will be within an established region. The graph on page 45 supports the effectiveness of the KIPP model across varying settings (rural and urban), demographics, per pupil funding levels, and state charter schools laws by comparing performance in ELA and Math on state assessments for 8th graders.

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:

A plan is included that delineates responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (page 36). The goals and objectives of the project include expanding both down to elementary and up to high school as well as adding additional schools. The target population remains the same, at least 80% low income.

Weaknesses:

It is mentioned on page 51 that KIPP currently has a CSP Replication and Expansion grant. The application would be strengthened by including information related to that, to describe how the current proposal is different, what has been added to the organization as a result of that grant, and what the organization has accomplished related to the goals of the previous project.

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:

The KIPP organization has developed an effective 2 year planning and preparation process that includes building on the historical foundation of existing schools. It also includes a market analysis of the proposed area and a strategic plan for the region. Each new school will be led by a principal trained through the Fisher Fellowship program, which includes a year-long, full time, cohort based program developed by KIPP. Each region, which includes its own Board of Directors, develops a business plan which includes facilities, financial management, central office operations, academic achievement, governance and oversight, and human resources, and is reviewed by the Founding Board. Each region has an Executive Director and is supported by a regional shared service center. The central management team is well qualified and experienced. Part of the grant funds will be used to build infrastructure and increase organizational capacity to ensure successful implementation of the model. The applicant has an impressive list of ongoing partnerships, both regionally and nationally, and the application includes a substantial number of letters of support from these partners and stakeholders. KIPP has a process for removing its name from schools that are chronically underperforming that includes support and monitoring from an assigned "Relationship Manager" as well as appropriate peer expert support.

Weaknesses:

The application would be strengthened by including specifics related to the current CSP Replication grant, how it has supported the growth of the central and regional offices, and how it will impact this project. The statement is made on page 47 that "the KIPP name has had to terminate its license less than a dozen times" and should include the exact number.

Reader's Score: 23

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:

A plan for evaluation data sources and measures is provided on pages 52-53. It includes project outcomes, essential questions, data to be collected, and frequency of collection. All schools will also be evaluated using the Healthy Schools and Regions framework that measures both academic and non-academic factors. Surveys will be used to gather data from stakeholders. Periodic structured site visits will be conducted to provide qualitative data.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were noted.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2012 02:41 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2012 05:29 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP regions (U282M120012)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Eligible Applicant		
1. Applicant Quality	50	48
Educationally Disadvantaged Students		
1. Assisting Students	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	10	7
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel		
1. Management Plan	25	25
Selection Criteria		
Quality of the Evaluation Plan		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	5
Total	100	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - Panel - 3: 84.282M

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in consortium with KIPP regions (U282M120012)

Questions

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:

KIPP's target and served population is primarily economically and educationally disadvantaged students across the country. With that said, KIPP has been able to get the majority of KIPP high school classes to outperform their local districts and states on state mandated end-of-year course exams. For example, 100% of KIPP third and fourth grade classes outperformed their districts in reading, while 75% outperformed their states. 100% of those students outperformed their districts and states in math. In Texas, KIPP schools are approaching the academic performance levels of those in most affluent districts. Overall, the majority of KIPP high school classes outperformed their local districts and states on state mandated end-of-course exams.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 48

Sub Question

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

Sub Question

Strengths:

- a) KIPP's target and served population is primarily economically and educationally disadvantaged students across the country. With that said, KIPP has been able to get the majority of KIPP high school classes to outperform their local districts and states on state end-of-year course exams. 100% of KIPP third and fourth grade classes outperformed their districts in reading, while 75% outperformed their states. 100% of those students outperformed their districts and states in math. Pg. e-30
- b) KIPP schools in Texas, which enroll significant numbers of low-income and ELL, are approaching academic performance levels of those in the most affluent districts in Texas. 94% of KIPP 8th grade classes outperformed the local district in reading, while 96% of these students outperformed their counterparts in math. Pg. e30
- c) The majority of KIPP high school classes outperformed their local districts and states on state end-of-course exams. Appendix 5.5; pg. e33

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted with respect to KIPP's ability to significantly increase student academic achievement and attainment for all students.

Reader's Score: 20

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.

Strengths:

- a) KIPP has demonstrated notable success in closing the achievement gap as evidenced in test scores and related research of its model. As such, data indicates that estimated impacts [of attending a KIPP School] are frequently large enough to substantially reduce race-and income-based achievement gaps. Page e27
- b) Data and studies from 2002 through 2011 suggest that KIPP's model generates positive and statistically significant increases in student performance in reading and math for SPED, LEP, and low-income students. Appendix 6.1
- c) 50% of KIPP schools in the 2010 Mathematica Policy Research Study reduced the black-white achievement gap in math by one-half or more within a three-year period. Likewise, 50% of KIPP schools reduced the black-white achievement gap in reading by one-third or more over a three-year period. Page e28
- d) KIPP schools in Texas, which enroll significant numbers of low-income and ELL, are approaching academic performance of the most affluent districts in Texas. 94% of KIPP 8th grade classes outperform the local district in reading, while 96% of these students outperform their counterparts in math. Page e30

Sub Question

Weaknesses:

The summary of student performance did not address schools that were not high performing nor was there a discussion about what strategies were implemented to close the achievement gap at those schools. For example, African America, Hispanic, ELL and special education students attending KIPP schools in Missouri, California, North Carolina, and Indiana have not consistently closed the achievement gap in reading and math. Pages e305;307;309; 310

Reader's Score: 13

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.

Strengths:

- a) Across all districts and states, KIPP has demonstrated consistent success on performance indicators related to attendance and retention rates. KIPP's attendance rates exceeds Texas' average daily attendance rate (KIPP=96% and State=93%). African American and Latino attrition rates are lower than the district schools as indicated in Appendix 5.4.
- b) KIPP students exceeded high school graduation, college acceptance and college completion expectations. 94% of students who completed 8th grade at KIPP have graduated from high school and 84 % have matriculated to college. Pages e 36-37

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted with respect to KIPP's consistency in achieving results.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Educationally Disadvantaged Students

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

Strengths:

KIPP has a long-standing history of contributing in assisting educationally disadvantaged students by opening new partnership with their surrounding school districts.

- a) 83% of KIPP schools serve a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced meals than do the surrounding districts. Page e24
- b) In Houston, Tennessee, Washington, DC, New Orleans, LA, Arkansas and San Diego, KIPP has been publicly acknowledge for increasing academic achievement levels in reading and math for minority and educationally disadvantaged students. Pages e17; 20-23
- c) KIPP's overall performance is apparent as it has been granted permission to open and operate 15 new schools

in school year 2013 serving 75- 94% of students eligible for free/reduced lunch. Pages e39-40

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted with respect to KIPP's local and national involvement in assisting educationally disadvantaged students.

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:

KIPP's project design clearly aligns with its national model for replication.

- a) While each KIPP school is expected to be unique and tailored to community needs, replicated schools will be rooted in the Five Pillars Operating Model; practice character building within each classroom; use technology and focus on STEM; and provide college-preparation support beyond the classroom. As well, the applicant's goals are specific, measurable, clear and attainable. Pages e42; 51-52
- b) The objective to maintain an 80% free and reduced student population supports its commitment to close the achievement gap. Page e51
- c) The objective to have 90% or more of their schools outperforming their local districts in their highest grades offered in math and ELA speaks to their commitment to preparing students for college and beyond. Pg. e51

Weaknesses:

- a) While KIPP has sound educational objectives for all tested grade levels, the applicant group failed to include high school performance objectives (end-of-year course exams, SAT scores, AP/Dual enrollment, graduation rates, etc.), which would address its focus on college preparation. Pages e51-52
- b) There are no exit objectives for elementary grade levels. Pages e51-52
- c) There are no exit objectives for middle school grade levels. Pages e51-52

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

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 has the capacity to achieve the objectives on time and on budget with its highly structured replication model and an experienced management team.

a) The KIPP Foundation will manage the project in collaboration with local KIPP leadership. Accordingly, there will be a commitment to support the project through its long-term implementation and future success. Page e53

b) Local KIPP leaders will have the support of personnel who have successfully replicated schools across the country and who will provide ongoing professional development in financial and grant management; new staff professional development, collection of student data, founding principal trainings, etc. Pages e53-55

c) KIPP's Growth Management Process is designed for success. It includes a letter of interest to operate a KIPP school; a sustainability analysis; market analysis and work plan; a strategic plan; and identification and execution of critical growth milestones. This thoughtful and reflective process will be used as "Green Light/Red Light Indicators" to determine whether and when to replicate throughout the five-year project. Pg. e56

d) Each KIPP region will develop its own business plan, which must include discussions around facilities, financial management, central office operations, student academic achievement, governance and oversight, and human resources. Pp. e58-59

e) The proposed operating budget ensures that 80% of grant funds are earmarked for local KIPP schools and the region. The remaining funds will be used to buttress the foundation's capacity to ensure fidelity of the Five Pillar model, staff program expansions, and to oversee implementation and financial management of grant funds. Pg. e63

f) KIPP has a strong relationship with philanthropic entities, including the Fisher Fund, the Walton Family Foundation, Dell Foundation, Gates, and others. As well, the applicant group included letters of support from those interested in KIPP's national growth plans. Pg. e65; Appendix 2

g) KIPP has a functional and fair plan in place to terminate relations with schools with chronic low enrollment levels, academically low-performing, financial insolvency, or are unwanted within the district in which it serves. Pg. e65

h) KIPP regional Executive Directors and Fisher Fellows (new school principals) will be responsible for launching new schools under the grant proposal. However, Lisa Margosian, Chief Program Officer will be responsible for the KIPP's Foundation oversight of the growth network. Ms. Margosian brings 18 years of experience in for-profit management and is poised to implement the expansion process. In addition to the Chief Program Officer, a Chief Learning Officer, a Chief Executive Office, Federal Grants Program Manager, and the KIPP Foundation Board of Directors will all support the project and subsequent expansion plans. Pp. e67-69

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted with respect to the quality of KIPP's management plan.

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:

KIPP will evaluate the goals and implementation of the proposed grant through its Healthy Schools and Regions Framework, which was developed in collaboration with representatives from all existing KIPP schools and regions. Pp. e69-73

- a) The framework allows the network to measure academic and non-academic performance while benchmarking individual schools against a set of robust performance outcomes.
- b) The framework will address the objectives listed in the proposal and has specific data requirements to determine attainment of said objectives.
- c) The foundation will also evaluate the quality of the project through student, and staff and parent surveys.
- d) KIPP's evaluation plan also includes a qualitative component, which consists of a site visit conducted by a team of external consultants to ensure objectivity, subject matter experts from within KIPP, and local leadership from the school, region or both. A school may go through a review if it is new (replication), if it needs help to prioritize for improvement, or if there is a change in leadership.

Weaknesses:

No significant weaknesses noted with respect to the quality of KIPP's evaluation plan.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 06/13/2012 05:29 PM