

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

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/28/2015 10:22 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U367D150018)

Reader #1: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	10
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	31
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	19
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	13
Sub Total	100	88
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Total	107	95

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 5: 84.367D

Reader #1: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U367D150018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

The applicant clearly defines the national significance of the proposed project. Selection, preparation and support for principals that will lead their schools to achieve college-ready standards will expand throughout the United States. (Pages1-7)

By defining practices, creating toolkits for principals and senior leaders the potential contribution of this project is to develop and advance knowledge and practices. These practices are based on expansion of the KIPP foundation programs that have been established through previous years. (Page 9)

The focus of the proposed project is to provide more highly qualified leaders in schools throughout the United States with the focus on improved academic success within those schools. (Page 11-12)

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 10

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.
- (4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

The applicant has identified three clearly developed goals that will be addressed by the proposed project. These three goals are supported by objectives and measureable objectives. In the chart, Figure B.1, each of those goals is clearly linked to the objectives, outcomes, and targets. (Pages 13-14)

The professional development and training that is supported by this proposed project is extensive. The training begins with support for senior regional leaders and then expands to address the needs of cohorts of principals and leaders. These efforts are sufficient in quality, intensity and duration and should lead to improvements in practice. Page 15)

Through the use of more deeply integrated instructional leadership in the principal preparation program and the training and support for established principals, the proposed project will be supporting rigorous academic standards for students. (Pages 18-20)

The applicant clearly defines in the goals and objectives that the proposed training is developed to provide more effective instructional leadership to schools that serve the needs of disadvantaged students, (Page 28)

Weaknesses:

Although the applicant mentions the areas of principal shortages will need to be addressed by the proposed program, the type of shortage and location of shortages is not clearly defined. (Page 14)

Reader's Score: 31

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

Strengths:

The qualifications of the key project personnel and project consultants have relevant training and experience in the leadership roles and grant management. (Pages 30-36)

The management plan includes clearly defined responsibilities, timelines and milestones for accomplishing project task. These elements are linked to the goals and objectives of the proposed project and will give appropriate guidelines to accomplishing the tasks in a timely manner and within budget. (Page 33)

The proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable human resources to effectively carry out the proposed project. These include accounting, leadership and management teams (Pages 35-37)

Weaknesses:

It is not clear as to the FTE of the Project Director. Without that information it is difficult to determine the success of that role in accomplishing the tasks.

Reader's Score: 19

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.
- (3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The use of the leadership instructional training and the tool kits that will be developed will help to assure that capacity will be built into those selected for the leadership roles. These experiences will extend well beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. (Page 37)

The course work and toolkits developed throughout this project to train principals are easily replicable in other school districts and applicable to other training programs as well. (Page39)

The methods outlined by the applicant to disseminate the information about the results and outcomes include a Leadership Design Fellowship, use of the KIPP website and national conferences and forums. These elements are appropriate to guide others to use the information and strategies. (Page 40)

Weaknesses:

There were no weaknesses identified.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are

clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.

(3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project's effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:
(1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and
(2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The evaluation methods outlined by the applicant are thorough, feasible and appropriate. These methods include a variety of methods and are clearly aligned to the project goals. These methods include both quantitative and qualitative measures. (Pages 42-44)

The applicant provides clearly defined timing of data collection and reporting of summative data on an annual and end of the project basis.

Weaknesses:

The applicant identifies a project measure as "80% of the student population qualifies for free or reduced-price lunch." This measure only gives demographic information and does not directly relate to the intended outcomes of the project.

The applicant does not provide specific data on formative measures that will be used and feedback processes that will be recommended for those types of measures throughout the project.

The applicant does not clearly develop a plan to provide for a random sample for comparison purposes; therefore the project effectiveness measurement would not meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservation. (Page 48)

Reader's Score: 13

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant identifies the effective use of enhanced technology to provide for virtual delivery of the principal preparation programs. This is an example of a method to improve efficiency for the proposed project.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The previously addressed math focus was defined in this project. The results of that project will be integrated into the principal training for instructional leadership.

Weaknesses:

none

Reader's Score: 2

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;**
- (b) Learning environments; or**
- (c) Both,**

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.**
- (ii) Students with disabilities.**
- (iii) English learners.**
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.**
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.**
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.**
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.**

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

One of the major goals for this project is addressing the improvement of academic outcomes for high needs students. (Page 33)

The students served include students living in poverty, English Learners, and Students with disabilities.

The applicant clearly supports this Competitive Preference Priority throughout the application.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 05/28/2015 10:22 AM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/27/2015 12:22 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U367D150018)

Reader #2: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	32
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	16
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	13
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Sub Total	100	84
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Total	107	91

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 5: 84.367D

Reader #2: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U367D150018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

New coursework, new recruiting, new preparation: KIPP already trains through Fisher and Successor – selective cohorts to be increased by 25% (will be selective but also recruiting/doing talent identification)

There are now 162 leaders, and KIPP aspires to 120 more, not just in new schools, in order to promote a “culture of excellence for all.” Page 7.

Weaknesses:

KIPP claims of superior results (p.3-4) do not take into account charter selectivity compared to school districts from which they draw students. Focus is on leadership for newly opened schools – does not identify where those schools would be, and what the level of demand for KIPP would be in those places.

“Leadership Design Fellowship” – there is limited evidence that people (school leaders) outside of KIPP want this fellowship or that it would be appropriate for those not in a KIPP academy.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.
- (3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the

proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

There is a clear plan for a leadership cohort p. 23 that will support the goals of the project.

This proposal is of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning: rubrics, templates, playbooks – lots of good tools for Talent Development p. 20 create/reform coursework

The proposal supports multimodal methods for delivering training (p. 17) that should be of sufficient quality and intensity to lead to improved practice.

Another indicator or a design with sufficient quality, intensity, and duration of intervention is the proposal to pilot a new virtual program and overstaff administrators early for good transitions p. 17. On p. 18 the “short term staffing model” is very smart for creating managed change in leadership.

Addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals are the explicit focus of KIPP p. 28

Weaknesses:

In looking at goal #2 page 13, there is a question of which assessments and measures would be in play to appropriately evaluate these activities.

It is not clear what is known about the impact of the current programs on those that it trains, for instance, what is going on with established principals (p. 20) as a result of on going support and PD. For activity 2c (to train and support established principals and give them enhanced coursework and development) it would be helpful to know about the content of this support and to understand the program's capacity to give these principals time to think about improvements as well as implement them.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to

effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

Strengths:

The management teams described on p. 34-35 are established and have clear work (responsibilities and tasks) established for them.

National foundations have already greatly supported KIPP work (p.36-37), indicating that the key project personnel have made a compelling case for their expertise.

Weaknesses:

Only 30% of budget (p. 36) will impact actual leadership development work; more information is needed about how resources will be deployed to meet the stated needs of the proposal while also funding

Reader's Score: 16

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.**
- (2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.**
- (3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.**

Strengths:

The proposal establishes a Talent ID pipeline that will create 60 new principals/new schools. P. 37, building capacity to serve KIPP schools.

Weaknesses:

In terms of dissemination – The leadership academy. p. 38 “Exchange of materials, etc.” is framed as what the group “hopes” will continue to be shared and impactful. This does not suggest that the applicant has strategies for ensuring then

new findings and products will be utilized by those outside the project.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project s effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:

- (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/iddocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and**
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.**

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The Healthy Schools and Regions framework is very appropriate to support evaluation processes. p. 41. Essential questions are all within the purview of the newly trained leader.

Weaknesses:

KIPP/Mathematica study suggests the impact of overall KIPP programming but is not specifically measuring leadership development? P. 48

It is difficult to separate out what parts of the proposal are KIPP programming in general and what are specific leadership components addressed by this proposal.

The proposal does not offer sufficient evidence that the organization is capable of carrying out the planned evaluation without external guidance/perspectives.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant has a plan in place for increased online material dissemination to save costs, which suggests that it will improve efficiency of delivery.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

The KIPP curriculum is already being revised to enhance its math focus (a significant overhaul of curriculum) and the proposal indicates planning to integrate the new math work into leadership p. 21.

Weaknesses:

None

Reader's Score: 2

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;
- (b) Learning environments; or
- (c) Both,

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.
- (ii) Students with disabilities.
- (iii) English learners.
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

Serving students described in this priority is central to KIPP's mission.

Weaknesses:

None.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/27/2015 12:22 PM

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 02:57 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U367D150018)

Reader #3: *****

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Significance	10	8
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design & Services	35	32
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Management Plan/Personnel	20	15
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Sustainability	15	15
Quality of the Project Evaluation		
1. Project Evaluation	20	15
Sub Total	100	85
Priority Questions		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness		
1. CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
CPP3: Promoting STEM Education		
1. CPP3: Promoting STEM ED	2	2
Sub Total	2	2
CPP4: High-Need Students		
CPP4: High-Need Students		
1. CPP4: High-Need Students	4	4
Sub Total	4	4
Total	107	92

Technical Review Form

Panel #5 - 2015 SEED Peer Review - 5: 84.367D

Reader #3: *****

Applicant: KIPP Foundation (U367D150018)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. The Secretary considers the significance of the proposed project. In determining the significance of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The significance of the proposed project on a National Level.
- (2) The potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices.
- (3) The importance or magnitude of the results or outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project, especially improvements in teaching and student achievement.

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear details to show the significance of the proposed project on a National Level. For example, the applicant discussed that KIPP's scale, geographic breadth, and strength of impact are due, in significant part, to its two flagship principal preparation programs: the Fisher Fellowship, which trains new principals to open new schools, and Successor Prep, which trains new principals to lead established schools. Both include formal training, coaching, mentoring, and residencies at high-performing KIPP schools. KIPP's principal development programs are recognized for their rigor and effectiveness, and districts and charters increasingly look to KIPP to learn about their practices. In fact, other high performing charter schools send their aspiring principals to be trained by KIPP.

The applicant provides compelling details to show the potential contribution of the proposed project to the development and advancement of teacher and school leadership theory, knowledge, and practices. This can be evidenced by the applicant discussing that KIPP's project aims to demonstrate how a system of schools can create and deploy a more structured, more systematic approach to "recruiting" future-principals from its own ranks. In addition, KIPP will create new coursework and trial new practices to prepare and support principals to drive instructional rigor in their schools and demonstrate how principal preparation and ongoing professional development programs can better train principals to implement those strategies and methods.

The applicant provided sound evidence to show the importance of the results likely to be attained by the proposed project resulting in teaching and student achievement. This can be evidenced by the applicant discussing that KIPP schools have a proven track record of producing markedly better outcomes for students growing up in underserved communities. Ninety-three percent of KIPP's eighth-grade completers have graduated from high school, compared to the national benchmark of 74% for students from low-income families. KIPP's college matriculation rate stands at 82% compared to the national benchmark of 45% for students from low-income families.

(

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide details to show that the leadership design for scholarships involved those employed at KIPP.

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the design and services of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the design and services of the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students.

(3) The extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services.

(4) The extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project will focus on serving or otherwise addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals.

Strengths:

The applicant provided compelling details to show the extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified, aligned, and measurable. (For example, the applicant wrote that to achieve their aims of serving more students, increasing the academic gains of students in their schools so that they are better prepared for the rigors of college, and extending the impact of their work to millions more public school students across their country, KIPP has set three ambitious goals for this project which are to recruit and prepare new principals so that KIPP can serve 95,000 students from high need communities; enhance professional development and supports to increase the number of principals who are highly effective; extend KIPP's impact to over 3 million students in major urban and rural districts across the country. The applicant provided a table to show how these goals are measurable. For example the measurable outcome for recruiting and preparing principals would be the number of individuals recruited, selected, and prepared to become a principal within the project period.

The applicant provided compelling details to show the extent to which the proposed project is part of a comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students. For example, the applicant discussed their goal to recruit and prepare principals so that KIPP can serve 95,000 students from high need communities. To help achieve this goal the applicant plans to create toolkits and provide implementation support to enhance internal talent identification and cultivation systems by drawing from best practices in KIPP regions such as Austin, Los Angeles, Newark, and Washington, D.C., as well as the body of research on talent cultivation.

The applicant provided distinct evidence to show the extent to which the training or professional development services to be provided by the proposed project will be of sufficient quality, intensity, and duration to lead to improvements in practice among the recipients of those services. For example, the applicant wrote that

The applicant provided strong details to show the extent to which the proposed project will prepare personnel for fields in which shortages have been demonstrated. For example the applicant discussed that each year, they face principal shortages when a region or multiple regions do not have the principal talent to allow for growth and/or have too shallow a pool of principal talent ready to take the helm at a school undergoing a principal transition. In order to achieve their aims of growing to serve 95,000 more students by the fall of 2018, all of their KIPP regions must develop robust internal talent pipelines. Furthermore, to contribute to the sector more broadly, they must harness and codify effective practices.

The applicant provided compelling evidence to show extent to which the proposed project will focus on addressing the needs of disadvantaged individuals. For example, the applicant wrote that Explicit in KIPP's mission is a focus on "helping students in educationally underserved communities." Throughout their history and growth from two schools to 162 schools, KIPP has remained committed to serving students with the greatest need. They hold themselves accountable to serving a high-need student population in several ways such as school-level and KIPP-wide evaluation.

KIPP collects data from diverse sources to create a comprehensive picture of school, regional, and national health. Among these measures are the percentage of the student population qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch, the percentage of the population that receives special education services, and the percentage designated English Language Learners, and by Annual reporting. KIPP publishes its performance, including the population served, in its Annual Report Card. The Report Card is publicly available throughout the year.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide details to show the content of the Toolkits to determine impact on participants.

Reader's Score: 32

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan for the proposed project and of the personnel who will carry out the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and the project personnel, the Secretary considers:

(1) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors.

(2) 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.

(3) The extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation.

Strengths:

The applicant provides clear details to show the qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director, key project personnel, and project consultants or subcontractors. The applicant discussed that the project will be managed by KIPP's senior leadership team. The KIPP co-founder will lead this work as its Project Director. Key personnel and other critical team members are all seasoned veterans of this work; in fact, among their Project Director and Key Personnel, two were principals and one was a Chief Academic Officer.

The applicant provided compelling details to show 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. (For example, the applicant discussed that KIPP will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget under seasoned management, in close collaboration with KIPP principals and regional leaders throughout the country, and drawing on deep experience running principal preparation and professional development programs as well as managing federal grants. Each partner's roles as well as major activities and milestones related to the proposed project are provided in detail in the table. For example, the table shows that they will create and refine toolkits for internal talent recruitment with responsible parties being the KIPP Foundation staff for each year of the grant.

The applicant provides compelling evidence to show the extent to which the proposed management plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed project, including the project evaluation. The applicant wrote that KIPP has the infrastructure and talent in place to execute the work, as well as the leadership structures in place to guide and monitor the work. For example, the Network Talent team will drive the effort to create toolkits, disseminate content to KIPP principals and senior regional leaders, and provide on-the ground consultative support.

Weaknesses:

The time commitment for the Project Director was not clearly defined therefore it is difficult to determine the importance of this role in the project.

Reader's Score: 15

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. The Secretary considers the adequacy of resources to continue the proposed project after the grant period ends. In determining the adequacy of resources and the potential for utility of the proposed project's activities and products by other organizations, the Secretary considers:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

(2) The extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations.

(3) The extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provided compelling details to show the extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. The applicant wrote that across every activity and measure, this project will create significant capacity and yield results that will extend well beyond the project period. For example, Talent identification and cultivation toolkits will be used throughout the project period, and will have been created, trialed, and refined. Not only will the tools support the work of KIPP and others to identify future-principal talent internally and through external recruitment for years in the future, but we will, by the end of the project period have at least 80 high-potential future principals identified in their internal talent pipeline.

The applicant provides effective details to show the extent to which the proposed project is likely to yield findings and products (such as information, materials, processes, or techniques) that may be used by other agencies and organizations. The applicant discussed that across the country, school systems particularly those that serve high-need students are grappling with difficult questions about how to deploy a more structured, more systematic approach to "recruiting" future principals from their own ranks, as well as how to train principals to drive instructional rigor in their schools to meet college-ready standards. With its established principal training programs, KIPP is uniquely positioned to pilot and innovate new strategies and tools that can be used broadly by others.

The applicant provides compelling details to show the extent to which the applicant will disseminate information about results and outcomes of the proposed project in ways that will enable others, including the public, to use the information or strategies. The applicant wrote that at KIPP, they are relentless in their pursuit to learn what is working and what is not; and they share their results and lessons learned broadly. The KIPP model as well as their tools and frameworks related to leadership development, teacher observation, school health, and college counseling have already been shared broadly. With grant funds, KIPP will bolster efforts to disseminate strategies, tools, innovations, and promising practices. For example, through Host the KIPP Leadership Design Fellowship (KLDF), they will share toolkits, resources and practices with large districts and charter management organizations so that those organizations may implement tools and/or adopt practices to enhance results in their districts or organizations.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Project Evaluation

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:

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.**
- (2) The extent to which the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data.**
- (3) The extent to which the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will, if well-implemented, produce evidence about the project s effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations.**

Note: We encourage applicants to review the following technical assistance resources on evaluation:

- (1) WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>; and**
- (2) IES/NCEE Technical Methods papers: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/tech_methods/.**

In addition, we encourage applicants to participate in an optional Webinar hosted by the Institute of Education Sciences on March 6, 2015. This Webinar will discuss strategies for designing and executing well-designed Quasi-experimental Design Studies. Applicants interested in participating in this Webinar may find more information at the following Web site: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/event.aspx?sid=37>.

Strengths:

The applicant provided clear details to show the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. (For example, the applicant discussed that providing best-in-class preparation for principals to open and lead college-preparatory schools for students in educationally underserved communities is only possible with a rigorous evaluation plan based on objective performance measures to assess exactly how they are doing. For example, the applicant wrote about being thorough by detailing that the KIPP Foundation collaborated with representatives from KIPP schools and regions to develop the Healthy Schools & Regions framework to provide a more comprehensive view into school performance; this framework is now implemented across all KIPP schools. The information collected through the Healthy Schools & Regions initiative allows us to measure academic and non-academic factors we believe impact school health.

The applicant provided clear details to show the evaluation includes the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data. The applicant wrote that at its core, the Healthy Schools & Regions framework seeks to answer six essential questions about the performance of the KIPP network and individual schools within it. KIPP collects and analyzes qualitative and quantitative data to address each question. (For example, the applicant wrote about one of their essential questions which asked about serving the children who need them, followed by the data collection and analysis of this question.

The applicant provided clear details to show the evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. For example, the applicant wrote that all data collected and analyzed as part of the project evaluation will provide feedback on performance as we work to achieving their goals. Most of the project goals are to be achieved over the project period: by the end of year three.

The applicant provided well-documented details to show the extent to which the methods of evaluation will produce evidence about the projects effectiveness that would meet What Works Clearinghouse Evidence Standards without reservations. For example, the applicant wrote that KIPP is deeply committed to learning from evidence-backed work in education. The applicant wrote that they appreciate deeply the body of research on what works in education, and are glad to have contributed to this growing body over the years.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not provide details regarding the actual evaluation instrument and process. It is unclear how and when the evaluation would take place.

Reader's Score: 15

Priority Questions

CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness - CPP2: Cost-Effectiveness

1. Competitive Preference Priority 2: Improving Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

This priority funds projects that will identify strategies for providing cost-effective, high-quality services at the State, regional, or local level by making better use of available resources. Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of Open Educational Resources (as defined in the notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provided some details to show increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects. The applicant discussed that they have individuals with significant math instruction expertise on their team at KIPP Foundation; their schools across the country are adopting a common math curriculum, and they have launched teacher professional development on math instruction.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 1

CPP3: Promoting STEM Education - CPP3: Promoting STEM Education

1. Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

(Please only assign a score of either 0 or 2 for this question.)

This priority funds projects that address one or both of the following priority areas:

(a) Increasing the opportunities for high-quality preparation of, or professional development for, teachers of STEM subjects.

(b) Increasing the number of individuals from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM, including minorities, individuals with disabilities, and women, who are teachers of STEM subjects and have increased opportunities for high-quality preparation or professional development.

In addition, applicants must describe how they plan to measure the impact the proposed project activities have on teacher effectiveness. Applicants must determine teacher effectiveness through a rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation in which performance is differentiated using multiple measures of effectiveness and based in significant part on student growth (as defined in this notice).

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 3 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

To show alignment to priority project the applicant provided details to show that explicit in KIPP's mission is a focus on "helping students in educationally under-served communities." Across KIPP 87% of students qualify for free and reduced-price lunch, 10% receive special education services, and 17% are designated English Language Learners, while 96% are African American or Latino.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 2

CPP4: High-Need Students - CPP4: High-Need Students

1. Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students

This priority funds projects that are designed to improve:

- (a) Academic outcomes;**
- (b) Learning environments; or**
- (c) Both,**

For one or more of the following groups of students:

- (i) Students served by Rural Local Educational Agencies.**
- (ii) Students with disabilities.**
- (iii) English learners.**
- (iv) Students in Lowest-performing Schools.**
- (v) Students who are living in poverty and are served by schools with high concentrations of students living in poverty.**
- (vi) Disconnected Youth or migrant youth.**
- (vii) Students who are members of federally recognized Indian tribes.**

Note: The Department encourages applicants to provide a thoughtful, in-depth response to the priority area(s) under Competitive Preference Priority 4 to which they are well-suited to respond. Applicants may choose to respond to one or more of the priority areas and are not required to respond to each priority area in order to receive the maximum available points under this competitive preference priority.

Strengths:

To show alignment to priority 4 the applicant provided clear details to show that explicitly written in KIPP's mission is the focus on "helping students in educationally underserved communities." The applicant wrote that across KIPP 87% of students qualify for free and reduced-price lunch, 10% receive special education services, and 17% are designated

English Language Learners, while 96% are African American or Latino.

Weaknesses:

None noted.

Reader's Score: 4

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 05/29/2015 02:57 PM