

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/23/2014 10:49 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M140013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	50
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	5
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Low Income Demographic</b>		
1. CPP 1	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>School Improvement</b>		
1. CPP 2	4	4
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 3	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Promise Zones</b>		
1. CPP 4	2	2
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

**Total**

121

116

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

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

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M140013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

#### 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

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

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

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 (20 points).

#### Strengths:

KIPP provides extensive empirical evidence describing their success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment (three years of K-8 data is found in Figure A.3 on pages 11-12, as well as in the Appendices). Data is provided for the percentage of educationally disadvantaged students (including low income, African American, and Hispanic) in the school population, and the percentage of KIPP schools that are outperforming the local district and state averages in Reading and Math, grades 3-8, for the past three school years. In several cases, KIPP schools were among the highest performing schools in the district and/or state. End of Course exam data is provided for students who are in high school and who have graduated. Norm-referenced test results (NWEA/MAP results) show that KIPP students are outperforming the national average on the amount of academic growth students attain in a school year.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

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

#### Sub Question

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

#### **Strengths:**

The disaggregation of data in Appendix 5.6 provides evidence that KIPP has been consistent in closing historic achievement gaps for three years. Most subgroups at KIPP sites are outperforming local district and state averages by large percentage points. Research performed by Mathematica empirically prove that KIPP school have closed 40% of the black-white test score gap in math and 26% of the gap in reading (page 9).

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**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:**

The student performance data clearly shows that KIPP students are scoring significantly above the average academic achievement results for similar students consistently for three years. High school graduation, college matriculation and college persistence rates are provided in Figure A.7. (page 17). Data is provided for students finishing 8th grade as far back as 1998. Three year student attendance and attrition data by subgroup is found in Appendix 5.3 and 5.4. KIPP's attendance data outperforms district and state data on the vast majority of instances. Research performed by Mathematica found that retention rates at KIPP schools were no different that surrounding district schools, and lower comparative attrition rates were found for African American and Latino students (page 15).

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 15**

#### **Selection Criteria - Significance**

##### **1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)**

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

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant explains the purposeful selection of school locations based on student need (and with partnerships for assisting chronically low-performing schools). The applicant provides the location of all proposed new or expanding schools. The applicant provides sufficient data proving that the student learning, graduation, college start and college completion rate of KIPP students far exceed the US and low-income averages. Data provided prove that the expanded and newly opened schools will continue to serve a high level of economically disadvantaged students and serve them at levels higher than what is currently available. Student performance data for students with disabilities and English language learners is provided in the Appendices. Practices and programs for eligible students with disabilities and English language learners are addressed on page 21.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design****1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)**

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

**(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub Question**

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

**Strengths:**

The applicant clearly states the overall goal to open and expand 41 new schools, enabling 20,000 more students in educationally-disadvantaged communities to have access to high quality educational programming that will help them graduate high school and successfully matriculate to and through college. Performance and Project measures are clearly stated in Figures C1 and C2. The measures are clearly specified, measurable, and attainable. The proposed schools have demographics similar to existing KIPP schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).**

**Sub Question**

**Strengths:**

Evidence of promise is provided through the rigorous research conducted by Mathematica. This longitudinal research used quasi-experimental design and randomized control trials to measure student achievement, and met What Works Clearinghouse standards. Data from 44 KIPP middle schools was collected and analyzed. A Logic Model is provided on page 34.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)**

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

**(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)**

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub Question**

- 1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a table with responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing tasks. The KIPP network has proven that they can successfully manage high caliber replications. This is due to strong screening, training, mentoring and supports. The careful selection of regions assures that there is a talent pipeline, and local support of government, business and community.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes their skill and experience with facilities and financial management. A Business Plan that addresses key resource needs for implementation and ongoing sustainability is provided. There is broad support

**Sub Question**

from stakeholders - including the KIPP Foundation and other philanthropic partners. The organization demonstrates a deep understanding of state and federal education funding, and how to leverage philanthropic and grant funding initially, so that schools will be able to maintain high levels of achievement after the grant period. Efficiencies occur due to shared central office services, which include financial management, governance, oversight, human resources.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:** 4

- 3. 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 projects long-term success (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The multi-year financial model is provided in Figure D.4 (page 48). There is an extensive list of commitment from current and future partners on page 48. Letters of Support in Appendix 2.2 demonstrate broad support from a variety of stakeholders, including the local areas where the schools are proposed.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:** 4

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

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides a plan for supporting struggling schools with their network resources and for making determinations if a school is not meeting standards. An license agreement is signed with each school outlining the quality control expectations. This is done to protect the KIPP brand. In ten years, KIPP has terminated its license agreement less than a dozen times (page 49), and explains the circumstances why this has happened (fiscal instability, low enrollment, inhospitable local operating conditions). The applicant describes the process by which a school is notified and has 90 days to demonstrate viability, else is closed.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score:** 4

- 5. 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 (4 points).**

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The applicant provides extensive and convincing information on the relevant training and experience of key personnel - including the Chief Program Officer, the Chief Network Growth Officer, the Chief of Research, the Design & Innovation Officer, the Chief Executive Officer, the Board of Directors, and the Director of Network Grants. The resumes of key project personnel demonstrate appropriate education and experience for the roles and responsibilities of this project. The human capacity needs to successfully manage the scope and size of this project are provided for.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 4

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

### 1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

**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 covers academic and nonacademic measures. The Healthy Schools & Regions framework contains six essential questions that focus efforts on the overall mission. The applicant provides the type of data to be collected and the frequency of data collection. The KIPP Foundation annually surveys students, parents and staff. Evaluation includes assessments of school culture, satisfaction, and communication processes. Data is used for decision making throughout the KIPP organization, including with teachers, principals and regional leaders.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 5

## Priority 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 (as defined in this notice).**

**Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.**

**Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income**

**families to meet this priority.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant provides clear and convincing evidence that at least 60 percent of all students in the charter schools currently operated are from low-income families. Across the KIPP network, 88% of students are eligible for free or reduced lunch (page 4). 89 percent (or 126 of the existing KIPP schools) serve a higher percentage of low income students than the district where the school is located (page 5). Free and reduced lunch percentages for new KIPP schools opening in 2015 are provided in Figure B.1. Figure B.2 provided data for the new KIPP schools opening in 2016. All percentages clearly exceed 60%.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**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 (as defined in this notice) 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).**

**Note: Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at [www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility](http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility)). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.**

**Strengths:**

The applicant describes the nature of the partnership with public district schools and city education collaborations/partnerships in Chicago, San Francisco, Houston, Nashville, Newark, St. Louis and DC (Figure B.5 pages 26-27). KIPP has been involved with professional development workshops for both charter and district teachers, sharing blended learning models, school redesign and restarts. In addition, the KIPP Leadership Design Fellowship helps develop and support new leaders for both district and charter schools.

The applicant describes how the proposed expansion of KIPP Bay Area Elementary is being done in partnership with Franklin-McKinley School District. KIPP Nashville, opening in 2015, is a restart of a failing school under partnership with Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools. KIPP New Jersey will open Life Academy in Newark, a conversion of a failing district school, in 2014, in partnership with Newark Public Schools. In Washington, DC, KIPP was selected as a restart operator to revitalize a failing charter school

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

Reader's Score: 4

### 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 1:** An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would 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, or to avoid racial isolation.

**Note 2:** For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, " Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

#### Strengths:

Strengths were outweighed by the items that were not fully addressed within the application.

#### Weaknesses:

The applicant describes how recruitment strategies, such as canvassing neighborhoods, partnering with community agencies, and using spanish-language materials, will help assure that typically under-represented populations will become knowledgeable of and enroll in KIPP schools. Data on the rate of students with disabilities and the rate of ELL students served at KIPP schools is provided in the appendix, but comparison to the rates at schools in the surrounding area was not clear. The proposed design did not fully address how students of different backgrounds would be brought together and racial isolation avoided.

Reader's Score: 0

### Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones

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

**Note:** Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at [www.hud.gov/promisezones](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones).

**Strengths:**

Three KIPP schools opening in 2015 are located in two Promise Zones - Los Angeles and San Antonio. One KIPP school opening in 2016 will be located in Philadelphia, another Promise Zone city (page 20). A Letter of Support from San Antonio referencing the Promise Zone partnership is included in Appendix 2.1.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses were found.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Overall Comments - Overall Comments****1. Overall/additional comments****General:**

This proposal is to open or expand 41 KIPP schools to be opened in twenty-nine communities across the nation, ultimately serving 20,000 students. All schools will serve low-income students. Each school will have close geographic access to a system of supports, including shared local and regional leadership and central office functions. Extensive attention to human capital, including leadership development, professional development, and substantial partnerships. The applicant provides clear and convincing data in answer to questions regarding student achievement and closing historic achievement gaps. The organization has a strong grasp on the needed skills and competencies to manage a project of this scope and size. The attention to effective leadership is particularly strong.

**Reader's Score: 0**

---

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 08/23/2014 10:49 AM

Status: Draft

Last Updated: 08/20/2014 11:04 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M140013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	50
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	4
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Low Income Demographic</b>		
1. CPP 1	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>School Improvement</b>		
1. CPP 2	4	4
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 3	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Promise Zones</b>		
1. CPP 4	2	2
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

1. Overall Comments

0

**Total**

121

115

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

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

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M140013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

#### 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

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

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

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 (20 points).

#### Strengths:

A Mathematica Policy research study of the effects of KIPP on middle schools showed that after three years, KIPP middle schools produce approximately 11 months of additional learning growth in math. This is equivalent to about 40% of the local black-white test score gap. In reading, the three-year impact is approximately 6 months and about 26% of the black-white test gap.

In 2012-13, 80-100 percent of KIPP high school (depending on the subject) outperformed local district peers (p.12).

Figure A5 shows that a significant portion of economically disadvantaged students outperform their peers at the district and state levels. Statistics are highest in 2nd grade, dip slightly in 3rd-5th grades and rise again in 6th-8th grade (p.14).

#### Weaknesses:

The quasi-experimental design of the study met What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations.

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

### Sub Question

**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:**

Figure A5 shows that a significant portion of economically disadvantaged students outperform their peers in ELA and Math at the district and state levels. Statistics are highest in 2nd grade, dip slightly in 3rd-5th grades and rise again in 6th-8th grade (p.14).

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**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:**

KIPP's schools have higher average daily attendance rates across all districts and state than their peers. In 2012-13, KIPP's attendance rate was 97% as compared to 93% for the district and 97% for the state (p.14-15).

KIPP's retention/attrition rates are on par with their peers (Mathematica study); however, KIPP has lower middle school attrition for African American and Latino students as compared to their district peers. In 2013, KIPP launched a national campaign focusing on student retention.

KIPP's low-income graduates finished college at over four times the average rate for low-income students. 93% of students who completed 8th grade at KIPP five or more years ago have graduated from high school and 82% have matriculated to college (p.16).

#### **Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified

**Reader's Score: 15**

### Selection Criteria - Significance

#### **1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)**

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

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

**how the proposed project will assist educationally disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English learners, in mastering State academic content standards and State student academic achievement standards.**

**Strengths:**

With the CSP funds, KIPP plans to open and expand 41 new high-quality schools in up to 29 unique communities to serve nearly 20,000 low-income students. KIPP has a history of helping low-income students meet or exceed state academic achievement standards. Figure A5 shows that a significant portion of economically disadvantaged students at KIPP outperform their peers in ELA and Math at the district and state levels. Statistics are highest in 2nd grade, dip slightly in 3rd-5th grades and rise again in 6th-8th grade (p.14). Figure B.3 on p.21 speaks to KIPP's strategies to increase their ELL and Special Education populations.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design**

**1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)**

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

**(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub Question**

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

**Strengths:**

Objectives: 1) Grow the network of KIPP schools by doubling enrollment over the next six years and serving a student population in which at least 80% of students qualify for FRL; 2) continue to get better as we get bigger by codifying best practices and disseminating learnings.

To measure progress towards these objectives, KIPP has two program measures and 5 project measures. Each project measure has baseline data associated with it (p. 31-32).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**Sub Question**

**2. 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).**

**Strengths:**

In 2009, Mathematica Policy Research conducted a longitudinal study of the effect of the KIPP model on student academic performance. The study examined 41 schools and found that the magnitude of KIPP's achievement impacts is substantial across all grade levels and subjects studied. The study used quasi-experimental and randomized control trial student methods that meets What Works Clearinghouse standards with and without reservations. All KIPP schools have and will be based on proven practices including a) being rooted in the Five Pillar Operating Model, b) maintaining a relentless focus on continuous improvement, c) providing college preparation support beyond the classroom through the "KIPP through college" program.

The application includes a logic model (Figure C.3 on p.33).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)**

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

**(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)**

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub Question**

**1. 1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The KIPP Foundation will oversee the expansion of the network to ensure that growth is strategic, sustainable, and well-executed. The Foundation will partner with local leadership who will manage capacity, human capital, and the financial and operational aspects. (Responsibilities, timelines, and milestones are listed on p.38.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**2. 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**

**Sub Question**

**office, student academic achievement, governance, oversight, and human resources of the charter schools (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

KIPP's business plan focuses on three main components: 1) determining regions eligible for new school openings; 2) selecting and training principals; 3) providing direct support to ensure ongoing quality. Each component is detailed on pages 39-46.

Figure D.3 on p.46 summarizes past examples of successful KIPP expansions into rural and urban districts.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**3. 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 projects long-term success (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

KIPP schools are organized into regions. 95% of new schools proposed to be funded by this grant will open within established regions and benefit from a talent pool, as well as financial and operational economies of scale(p.39-46). 80% of the funds requested in this application will go directly to regions; the remaining 20% will be used by the Foundation to support the work of the regions. Figure D.4 on page 48 details the projected sources and uses of funds over the next 5 years. After the expansion period, KIPP projects that their revenue will be a mix of public and private funds, as it has been in the past. The network benefits from broad financial support from private partnerships at both the national and regional levels. A selection of philanthropic partnerships is listed on p.48.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

KIPP uses a formal process to determine when and if schools should close. Each school ED is assigned a Relationship Manager at the Foundation who provides support and resources. Individual schools are also assigned communities of practice organized and managed by the Foundation.

At the outset, each school within the KIPP network enters a trademark license agreement with the KIPP Foundation. Though support and coaching are the first response to support a failing school, if a school is not meeting the conditions, the Foundation will exercise it's right to terminate the licensing. The KIPP Foundation has only done this less than a dozen times.

**Weaknesses:**

**Reader's Score: 4**

## Sub Question

5. 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 (4 points).

### Strengths:

Key project personnel include five members of the KIPP Foundations, regional Executive Directors and Fisher Fellows, as well as a KIPP Foundation Board of Directors (p.50-52). The Director of Network Grants who will serve as the project director have four years of experience managing federal grants for KIPP including a previous CSP Replication and Expansion grant. Collectively, the key personnel appear well-equipped to manage a project of this size and scope.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 4

## Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

### 1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

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 uses a Healthy Schools and Regions Framework to evaluate the effectiveness of its model. The framework examines six key questions regarding school performance (listed on page 53). Figure E.1 listed the project measure, corresponding essential question, data to be collected, and frequency. In addition, the network uses staff, parent, and student surveys.

### Weaknesses:

The evaluation does not identify who will be responsible for the evaluation at the regional or school level, nor does it address how the information is disseminated throughout the regional or network as a whole.

Reader's Score: 4

## Priority 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 (as defined in this notice).

**Note 1:** The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.

**Note 2:** For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State's definition of "elementary education" or "secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income

families to meet this priority.

**Strengths:**

In 2013-14, 88% of KIPP's over 50,000 students qualified for FRL. Across the 141 KIPP schools, 89% of KIPP's schools serve low-income students at a rate higher than that of their surrounding district.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified

**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 (as defined in this notice) 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).

**Note:** Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at [www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility](http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility)). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

**Strengths:**

KIPP is planning to open schools in partnership with the following schools improvement efforts: Chicago, IL; San Francisco, CA; Houston, TX; Nashville, TN; Newark, NJ; St. Louis, MO; and Washington, DC (Figure B.5 on p.26).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified.

**Reader's Score: 4**

**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 1:** An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would 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, or to avoid racial isolation.

**Note 2:** For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, " Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.

**Strengths:**

No strengths identified.

**Weaknesses:**

This application only speaks to KIPP's impact the number of economically disadvantaged students attending college. While those numbers are significant--- 82% of KIPP alumni matriculate verses 45% of their peers--- they do not speak to the racial or ethnic diversity of their KIPP student body. The application also does not address KIPP's students with special needs or ELL population.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones**

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

**Note:** Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at [www.hud.gov/promisezones](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones).

**Strengths:**

Three KIPP schools opening in 2015 are located in two Promise Zone cities (LA and San Antonio) and one finalist city (Boston) (p.20, letter Appendix 2.1).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses identified

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Overall Comments - Overall Comments**

1. Overall/additional comments

**General:**

**Reader's Score:**

---

**Status:** Draft

**Last Updated:** 08/20/2014 11:04 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 08/22/2014 11:55 AM

## Technical Review Coversheet

**Applicant:** KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M140013)

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

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Selection Criteria</b>		
<b>Eligible Applicant</b>		
1. Qual: Eligible Applicant	50	50
<b>Significance</b>		
1. Significance of Project	10	10
<b>Quality of Project Design</b>		
1. Project Design	15	15
<b>Quality of the Management Plan</b>		
1. Management/Personnel Plan	20	20
<b>Quality of the Project Evaluation</b>		
1. Evaluation Plan	5	4
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 1</b>		
<b>Low Income Demographic</b>		
1. CPP 1	10	10
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2</b>		
<b>School Improvement</b>		
1. CPP 2	4	4
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 3</b>		
<b>Promoting Diversity</b>		
1. CPP 3	5	0
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 4</b>		
<b>Promise Zones</b>		
1. CPP 4	2	2
<b>Overall Comments</b>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>		

1. Overall Comments

0

0

**Total**

121

115

# Technical Review Form

Panel #3 - 84.282m - 3: 84.282M

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

Applicant: KIPP Foundation in Consortium with KIPP Regions (U282M140013)

## Questions

### Selection Criteria - Eligible Applicant

#### 1. Quality of the Eligible Applicant (50 points)

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

(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)

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 (20 points).

#### Strengths:

The proposal demonstrates that KIPP has demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement and attainment for all students. For example, on page 6, it states that in the spring of fifth grade, 60% of KIPP students in Dallas scored proficient or higher on state tests of reading. By the spring of eighth grade, 85 percent scored proficient or higher. In math, 59 % scored proficient on state tests of mathematics in fifth grade and by eighth grade, 94% of KIPP students scored proficient or higher. (p. 6). In appendix 5.6, a listing of school performance on state achievement tests over the past three years is provided.

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

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).

## Sub Question

### Strengths:

The proposal demonstrates how KIPP schools have been addressing the achievement gap. For example, the proposal cites a Mathematica Study that looked at over 40 KIPP middle schools. (p. 8). It found that the size of the impact on math performance produced by KIPP schools over three years was the equivalent to addressing 40% of the local black-white test score gap. Similarly, the reading impact was equivalent to 26% of the local black-white test score gap. (p. 9). Moreover, on page 14, the proposal shows that KIPP schools are predominantly outperforming their local school districts as well as the schools in the state with respect to sub-groups such as race, special needs and English Language Learners.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses 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:

The proposal provides extensive data that supports the overall accomplishments of the students at KIPP schools. For example, in appendix 5.6, the data for school performance is provided and compared with the local school district's average performance as well as the state's average performance. The proposal also notes in Figure A.7 on page 17 that KIPP schools have been successful with their students graduating from high school and matriculating to college. The proposal also states on p. 16 that ninety-three percent of students who completed the eighth grade at KIPP five or more years ago have graduated from high school and 82 percent have matriculated to college.

### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 15

## Selection Criteria - Significance

### 1. Contribution in Assisting Educationally Disadvantaged Students (10 points)

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

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal states that KIPP schools will contribute in assisting educationally disadvantaged students in several ways. First, they will ensure that the new schools will serve a similar population (pp. 18-21). Second, they will implement their high quality educational model that has enabled students to overcome previous underperformance (pp. 22-26). Third, they will drive change more broadly in the communities in which the schools will be located (26-29). The proposal also states the location of all proposed schools for this project (p. 19). The proposal also states KIPP actively recruits and hires teachers with experience and success reaching English Language Learners. KIPP schools dedicate professional development time and resources to second-language instructional strategies and techniques.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 10**

**Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design****1. Quality of the Project Design (15 points)**

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

**(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)**

**Reader's Score: 15**

**Sub Question**

- 1) 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 (5 points).**

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides extensive evidence of a high-quality project design. For example, the proposal provides the overall objectives of the project on pages 30-31. One of the objectives is to grow the network of KIPP. On page 31, the proposal provides a table with two program measures as well as five project level measures. These measures are tied to the objectives listed on pages 30-31. Moreover, on page 32, another table provides rationale for the project measures as well as the frequency of data collection with which to assess progress toward the measure. All of these components serve as evidence of a high quality project design.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 5**

- 2) The extent to which the proposed project is supported by evidence of promise (as defined in this notice) (10 points).**

**Sub Question**

**Strengths:**

The proposed project is supported by evidence of promise in several ways. First, the proposal clearly articulates the KIPP model through a logic model on page 34. Second, the proposal notes two Mathematic evaluation reports that relied on rigorous methods to find significant gains for students attending KIPP compared to similar students at nearby schools (pp. 34-35). Third, the Mathematica study demonstrated that KIPP schools do not have higher attrition rates for students than in nearby neighboring schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score: 10**

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

**Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (20 points)**

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

**(Please provide your responses in the sub-questions.)**

**Reader's Score: 20**

**Sub Question**

- 1. 1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The table on page 38 communicates a comprehensive management plan. For example, the major milestones for the project are stated and grouped around common thematic groups of work. The person or people responsible for the milestone are provided as well as the timeline for getting the task accomplished. Finally, this management plan conveys the opening of 21 schools in 2015 and the opening of 20 schools in 2016.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 4**

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal offers evidence for a business plan for improving, sustaining, and ensuring the quality and performance of the KIPP charter schools created. It does this through a process of carefully determining which regions are eligible for new school openings (pp. 39-40), selecting and training founding school principals through a

**Sub Question**

rigorous process and program (pp. 40-41) and providing direct support to schools to ensure ongoing quality and performance (pp. 41-46).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 4

- 3. 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 projects long-term success (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The proposal presents a multi-year financial and operating model for the organization. (p. 48). This is shown through the public funds to run the schools augmented by significant philanthropic dollars through such foundations as the Dell Foundation, Walton Foundation and the Broad Foundation. The proposal also includes letters of support from national funders that further demonstrates their commitment to KIPP schools.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 4

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

**Strengths:**

The proposal states that there is a plan to close schools that do not meet the high expectations of performance. The proposal mentions that the KIPP foundation enters a trademark license agreement with each school. The KIPP Foundation will terminate the license agreement with any school that is not meeting the commitments of serving the students and their communities. (p. 49). The proposal makes clear that before terminating the license agreement with a school, KIPP will make every effort to support and monitor the school and then work to improve the struggling school before moving to terminate the agreement. (p. 49).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

**Reader's Score:** 4

- 5. 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 (4 points).**

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides brief bios of the key personnel that will be involved in the project. These staff members have experience in both teaching and education as well as management practices. In addition, appendix 1 contains the CVs of key project personnel to further demonstrate their past experience and training as being aligned to the work.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses found.

Sub Question

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

1. Quality of the Evaluation Plan (5 points)

**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 proposal provides substantial evidence for a high quality evaluation plan. For example, the proposal states that the evaluation will be guided by six essential questions about the overall health of the school. (p. 53). One of these questions is: Are we serving the children who need us? In addition, the proposal provides a table aligns the evaluation plan to the five project measures. The data source that will inform each measure is provided in the table. The proposal states that qualitative and quantitative data will be used for the evaluation, which is evidence of comprehensive data that may inform the evaluation process.

**Weaknesses:**

However, there is one weakness related to the proposal's evaluation plan. The proposal does not make clear who will carry out the evaluation work at the school or regional level for the project.

Reader's Score: 4

Priority 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 (as defined in this notice).**

**Note 1: The Secretary encourages an applicant responding to this priority to describe the extent to which the charter schools it currently operates or manages serve individuals from low-income families at rates that are at least comparable to the rates at which these individuals are served by public schools in the surrounding area.**

**Note 2: For charter schools that serve students younger than 5 or older than 17 in accordance with their State s definition of " elementary education" or " secondary education," at least 60 percent of all students in the schools who are between the ages of 5 and 17 must be individuals from low-income families to meet this priority.**

**Strengths:**

The proposal meets the criteria for this competitive preference priority. For example, the proposal states that KIPP serves a low-income population. For example, in the 2013-2014 school year, 88% of the more than 50,000 students enrolled in KIPP Schools nationwide were eligible for free or reduced lunch. Moreover, the proposal mentions that across the 141 KIPP schools, 89% of the schools served low-income students at a proportion higher than the surrounding school districts. (p. e17).

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses 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 (as defined in this notice) 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).

**Note:** Applicants in States operating under ESEA Flexibility that have opted to waive the requirement in ESEA section 1116(b) for LEAs to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, their Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) for two or more consecutive years may partner with LEAs to serve students attending priority or focus schools (see the June 7, 2012, "ESEA Flexibility" guidance at [www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility](http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility)). The Secretary encourages such applicants to describe how their proposed projects complement the efforts to serve students attending priority or focus schools described in States' approved requests for waivers under ESEA Flexibility.

#### Strengths:

The proposal meets the criteria for this competitive preference priority. For example, on pages 26-28 the proposal lists examples of school improvement partnerships that KIPP schools have been involved in. For example, KIPP Bay Areas Schools partnered with a school district to redesign two that school district's schools (p. 27). In addition, in Houston KIPP and YES Prep charter schools are partnering with Spring Branch Independent School District to share resources and ideas. (p. 28).

#### Weaknesses:

No weaknesses noted.

Reader's Score: 4

### 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 1:** An applicant addressing Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Diversity, is invited to discuss how the proposed design of its project would 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, or to avoid racial isolation.

**Note 2: For information on permissible ways to meet this priority, please refer to the joint guidance issued by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice entitled, " Guidance on the Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity and Avoid Racial Isolation in Elementary and Secondary Schools" at <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/guidance-ese-201111.pdf>.**

**Strengths:**

No strengths noted.

**Weaknesses:**

Although the proposal provides several strategies that the project will employ to ensure a diverse student body in the schools that are being opened, such as the staff canvassing low-income neighborhoods, partnering with community organizations, and working to increase the number of special needs students (p. 21), there are some key weaknesses for this criterion. First, it is not clear from the proposal if KIPP schools predominantly serve students with disabilities and students identified as English Language Learners at a rate that is comparable to neighboring school districts. Moreover, it is not clear what strategies will be employed to combat or avoid racial isolation of the schools' populations.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority 4 - Promise Zones**

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

**Note: Applicants should submit a letter from the lead entity of a designated Promise Zone attesting to the contribution that the proposed activities would make, and supporting the application. A list of designated Promise Zones and lead organizations can be found at [www.hud.gov/promisezones](http://www.hud.gov/promisezones).**

**Strengths:**

The proposal provides some evidence for this criterion. For example, the proposal states that three KIPP schools opening in 2015 are located in two Promise Zone cities: Los Angeles and San Antonio. (p. 20). Also, in 2016 KIPP plans to open a new school in Philadelphia, which is another Promise Zone city. Finally, the City of San Antonio, in their support for KIPP stated that KIPP is committed to recruiting students and families from the recently designated Promise Zone (p. 20). In addition, letters in the appendix support the fact that KIPP will be operating in Promise Zones.

**Weaknesses:**

No weaknesses noted.

**Reader's Score: 2**

**Overall Comments - Overall Comments**

- 1. Overall/additional comments**

**General:**

No additional comments.

**Reader's Score:** 0

---

**Status:** Submitted

**Last Updated:** 08/22/2014 11:55 AM