

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 07/06/2010 9:29 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Reader #1:

| | POINTS POSSIBLE | POINTS SCORED |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Summary Statement | | |
| 1. Summary Statement | N/A | N/A |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points) | 20 | 12 |
| 3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 14 |
| 5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points) | 10 | _____ |
| 7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points) | 10 | _____ |
| Competitive Preference | | |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | _____ |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | _____ |
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address | 1 | _____ |

the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

| | | |
|---|-----|-------|
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | _____ |
| TOTAL | 105 | 26 |

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #1:

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

The application provides strong evidence, with multiple studies using either experimental design or quasi-experimental research designs using matched comparison groups in conformity to the criteria defined in the Notice Inviting Application. The studies demonstrate statistically significant effects of KIPP middle schools in comparison with control middle schools. Although most of the studies are on a small number of schools, the most recent study included 22 KIPP middle schools nationwide -- thus enhancing the external validity of the studies included with respect to middle schools.

The effect sizes in mathematics and reading were generally moderate to large across studies, providing evidence that the KIPP program significantly increases student achievement at the middle school level.

Weaknesses

The studies included did not address student dropout or graduation/completion rates in KIPP programs, which is an important consideration in assessing the overall effectiveness of the KIPP program.

The three research studies discussed in detail and virtually all of the other experimental and quasi-experimental studies listed in the table on p. 23 focus only on middle schools. The proposed scale-up is intended for elementary, middle, and high schools, however. This threatens the external validity of the studies cited as evidence.

Most importantly, however, is the fact that the proposed project focuses on the expansion of KIPP's leadership development model, and although it might be supposed that KIPP's school leaders contribute importantly to the success of KIPP's program, there is no specific research cited on the superiority or impact of KIPP's school leaders in comparison with others. This is all the more important given the applicant's statement (p. 5) that its leadership development model should prepare principals to succeed both in KIPP schools and others -- implying that the leadership development model should demonstrate positive results independent of the results of the KIPP schools themselves. And it becomes more of a concern in light of the absence of research on the success of the KIPP model at the elementary and high school levels, where the responsibilities of the principal -- especially at the elementary level -- may be substantially different than those at the middle school level.

Reader's Score: 12

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

- (1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.**
- (2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that**
 - (a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -**
 - (i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and**

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Weaknesses

4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

Strengths

The evaluation is to be undertaken by a credible, independent organization with a national reputation for solid work. The research questions are appropriate to the proposed project, and they are concerned with KIPP as implemented at scale and with specific features of the school leadership model being scaled up in the proposal. The evaluation includes both

experimental and quasi-experimental studies of the program's impact on students' academic performance employing longitudinal data. The sample is representative of the population of schools in the scale-up study. And it asks the right kinds of questions about the indirect impact of KIPP's school leaders on student achievement. Finally, the evaluation seeks to identify key factors in the model that seem important to its success and scale-up (such as seamless leadership transition in individual KIPP schools).

The \$5.6 million allocated for the evaluation is almost 10% of the total project budget and seems adequate for the evaluation described.

This is the right kind of evaluation to provide strong evidence for the effectiveness of the leadership model -- precisely the kind of study that one would have wished already to exist in order to justify the further expansion of the leadership program.

Weaknesses

One opportunity it is not clear that the evaluation study design takes advantage of is to compare the differential impact of KIPP-trained principals not only in different KIPP schools but in non-KIPP schools (in comparison with both KIPP schools and non-KIPP trained principals in non-KIPP schools).

Reader's Score: 14

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, the availability of

resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support replication.

Strengths

Weaknesses

6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

Weaknesses

7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and

rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

Weaknesses

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 9:29 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2010 0:55 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Reader #2:

| | POINTS POSSIBLE | POINTS SCORED |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Summary Statement | | |
| 1. Summary Statement | N/A | N/A |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 14 |
| 2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points) | 20 | _____ |
| 3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 13 |
| 4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 10 |
| 6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 10 |
| 7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 7 |
| Competitive Preference | | |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 105 | 56 |

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #2:

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

KIPP demonstrates that it has a model of success for educationally underserved populations but has not had the funding necessary to take the next step to a larger scale(p.2).
Research that less than 10% of low income students graduate from college is a staggering number that supports a need for this project.
The students KIPP currently serves are primarily African- American or Latino performing below grade level by one or two years.
KIPP addresses the training of principals as well as providing additional seats for students in new KIPP schools to be adopted if the project is funded.
The project design is based on the premise that quality leaders are the key to successful schools. This premise was what prompted KIPP to apply for this grant so that it could bring the training and development to a larger scale.
The goals and strategies to accomplish the 3 goals are specific and align to the proposed project. The training of principals outside of the KIPP network strengthens the application as it is more than an internal growth model.
KIPP is addressing a key issue in school improvement;quality principal training that is concentrated and follows a prescribed skill set. This training has proved to be successful where other programs do not have a consistent framework and do not require an intensive internship in a high performing school.
The focus on high need students is evident from the past work of KIPP where the students are primarily minority and from urban or rural settings that are low income.
KIPP utilizes a national cohort that provides dialogue among a diverse group of professionals addressing the same issues in different locations.

Weaknesses

The application is unclear as to how the rural schools will be selected and supported when the primary focus of the KIPP projects has been in urban settings. The number of schools in rural areas is limited to North Carolina and the Arkansas Delta. These areas may not be similar to rural areas across the U.S.

Reader's Score: 14

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate

success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment,

or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The KIPP Foundation has been involved in large scale development of the KIPP schools throughout the past ten years. Its ability to expand from two schools to 82 schools is evidence of its ability to be successful in the scale-up project. While doing the expansion of the schools, KIPP expanded to 20 states and the District of Columbia. In addition, KIPP moved from a middle school model to a preK-12 model and continued the quality of the principal development.

Student achievement in the LEAs has shown consistent increase in KIPP schools as compared to the local district in mathematics, ELA, and science. Middle School data show that 92% of KIPP middle schools outperformed the districts' schools in mathematics and ELA; 88% outperformed the districts' schools in science.

One of the primary schools started in 2004 scored as well as a wealthy district in Texas when the school has 96% low income students compared to 0% in the comparison school.

It is not just primary and middle schools that show strong performance against the LEAs; 100% of KIPP high school classes showed higher performance on the state assessment in ELA, general mathematics, Algebra I, algebra II, Geometry, general science and history/social science(p.29).

Weaknesses

Listing of science courses beyond general science would strengthen the case that the comparison is to higher level courses versus lower level science courses.

The inclusion of how KIPP students who matriculate to college compares to the LEA would add another layer of support if the data are strong.

Reader's Score: 13

4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support replication.

Strengths

KIPP has a history of support by major philanthropic partners and has raised \$150 million. The charging of fees for principal training as well as monies from philanthropic partners has also supported the expansion of the program. The KIPP schools in 20 states plus the District of Columbia are partners in this endeavor. They will serve as supports for the training and implementation of this proposal.

The ability to continue the project beyond the grant funding is evidenced by the training of the principals and the school expansions. Students will continue to be involved in the KIPP model as they matriculate through the grades. The skills the principals gain will be utilized throughout their careers to impact the achievement of students.

The current locations of KIPP clusters allow for expansions to other areas of the large cities (schools in 17 of the 20 largest cities in the US). Expansion to a larger scale is easily accomplished with support sites throughout U.S. urban areas and two rural areas in the South.

There are three distinct areas that will support the replication of this model successfully. The first area includes the "Five Pillars"; leadership development pipeline; the performance evaluation system; and the Healthy Schools and Regions Framework (p. 39-40). The next two areas involve the ability of schools/regions to capitalize on the currently developed documents and programs to increase the success of replicating this model.

The cost per student declines from year 1 to year 5; the cost is almost 50% less during the final year of the grant. This amount would be lower but KIPP is training principals outside of the KIPP authorized schools.

The dissemination mechanisms include sharing lessons learned through a principal portal available to principals and teachers at no cost to the users. Superintendents from across the country will be invited to three symposiums over the life of the grant utilizing current KIPP district leaders in the process. Allowing individuals to visit the KIPP sites and sharing the "school climate surveys" with state level officials will provide additional information for replication.

The KIPP Foundation will not be requesting any indirect costs in an effort to place the funding at the site development level.

Weaknesses

The cost to reach the various levels of students was not clear as the amounts listed were for principal training and it was difficult to relate this to the cost estimates listed for students over the life of the grant.

There was no direct evidence of the project's relative ease of use or satisfaction. Although one could derive this information from the

documents, it was not explicit.
The cost for leadership training is high and for this reason the leadership training would be difficult to replicate in most districts with funding issues.

Reader's Score: 10

6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

The KIPP Foundation has committed resources from philanthropic groups to continue the project beyond the three years of the grant. The only change will be that the acceleration of growth will not be as great as that afforded by the I3 funding.

The letters from the consortium of KIPP schools indicate a commitment to continue to implement the items in the proposal beyond the grant timeline(p. 47).

KIPP will have completed a trainer of trainers model for the Directors of Leadership Development in the consortium of KIPP schools that will continue to offer these trainings as a supplement to those offered by KIPP.

Weaknesses

None Found.

Reader's Score: 10

7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

The quality of the management plan is evident in the specificity of the milestones with years and months specified. The plan includes dissemination timelines and milestones and builds project sustainability into the implementation plan.

The CEO will serve as the dissemination point person which will cause this action step to have top priority. The rationale given is that the dissemination plan aligns with the strategic plan for 2015.

A full time Project Director on this grant will provide the needed support and focus that only someone dedicated to this project can provide. His expertise in leading change in business ventures as well as leading large scale reform in school districts provides the experience needed in this grant.

The KIPP Foundation Board will provide oversight at a different level to ensure success of this project.

Mathematica is the organization that will conduct the evaluation for this project. It has experience in educational research.

The team from Mathematica that will be responsible for the independent evaluation includes a Principal Investigator (PI); a project director, and a survey director. The PI has extensive experience in evaluation and educational research studies.

The Survey Researcher has extensive background in this area and is currently only involved in two other studies where she serves in this role.

Weaknesses

The PI for this project is currently the PI on six ongoing studies and it would be helpful to explain how he will be able to devote the necessary time to this project. The Project Director is also involved in four ongoing studies and the same issue comes to light for her work.

Reader's Score: 7

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

KIPP provides principal development for 35-50 primary schools that directly relate to the needs of primary school students.

Weaknesses

The applicant did not mention transitions in the proposal to deal with movement from developmental stages of students. Specifics on how school readiness will be addressed is lacking and needs to be addressed to meet this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and

college application processes; and
(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

The project plan addresses preparing students to be successful in college and tracks student completion of college.

Weaknesses

The proposal does not address providing support or access to college other than providing the skills necessary to be successful in college. A statement regarding how the proposal would support students applying for college and finding funding would have strengthened the proposal in this area.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

Current KIPP schools have a substantial number of limited English proficient students who perform well in this model.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the

unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The proposal for this KIPP initiative is to expand the number of rural schools in North Carolina and the Arkansas Delta.

Weaknesses

The narrow areas of rural America being targeted may not provide replication of this model in rural regions in the Southwest, etc. A plan to move beyond these two areas would strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2010 0:55 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2010 8:56 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Reader #3:

| | POINTS POSSIBLE | POINTS SCORED |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Summary Statement | | |
| 1. Summary Statement | N/A | N/A |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 15 |
| 2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points) | 20 | _____ |
| 3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 15 |
| 4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 10 |
| 6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 8 |
| 7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 8 |
| Competitive Preference | | |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 105 | 59 |

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #3:

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

(1): A principal leadership training process for free open-enrollment college preparatory public charter schools that serve urban and rural communities in preK-12 to help students develop knowledge skills, character, and habits to succeed in college and beyond.

(2): There is a clear focus on developing principal leadership skills to ensure the school is lead by someone who has demonstrated leadership ability. The program is built upon five core principles: high expectations, choice & commitment, more time, power to lead, and a focus on results. The KIPP schools serve 69.9% of students qualifying for free meals and 95% of students are African-American or Latino performing at least two grades below level but graduate students performing at higher rates than the communities in which they live.

Weaknesses

None Found

Reader's Score: 15

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase

college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

(1): There are 82 KIPP Schools serving over 21,000 underserved students in less than ten years.

(2b): The schools' data indicates significant increases in student achievement. There is a defined framework for defining school quality and design tools for collecting data. 100% of KIPP schools outperformed their local districts.

Weaknesses

No weaknesses identified

Reader's Score: 15

4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

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

- (1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.**
- (2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.**
- (3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.**
- (4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.**
- (5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.**
- (6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, the Secretary considers:

- (1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.**
- (2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.**
- (3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive**

results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support replication.

Strengths

(1): The KIPP Foundation seeks private donations and expects a match of up to 10 million dollars for this proposal. KIPP Schools will serve 50,000 students by 2015.

(2): As a network of public charter schools, KIPP's capacity and organizational structure was evident to bring the project to the proposed Scale-Up level.

(3): KIPP Charter Schools presented evidence on p. e39-40 as to its ability to replicate the model in multiple settings.

Weaknesses

(1): Opening 2,000 schools is very aggressive and would be very difficult to manage in the time identified.

(2): The training cost per principal is \$150,000 (chart page 42) is high. As a charter school initiative, there may be local barriers. States must have charter legislation in place that allows for charter schools.

(3): There does not appear to be a plan to build the understanding of local communities about the KIPP schools so that they will support the concepts.

(4): Looking at the overall costs of the scale-up, even with private donations, it does not seem to be sustainable over time.

(5): The dissemination strategies do not include the grass roots efforts

needed to ensure local support. Also, the approaches listed were limited to national symposiums, case studies, speaking at national forums.

Reader's Score: 10

6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

(1): A combination of funding presents an opportunity to sustain the program over time. Private funding comes from significant private foundations such as the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation. The applicant has raised over 150 million dollars in private funds.

(2): Once principals have been trained, their capacity continues without the ongoing training expense. The incorporation of the schools has strong potential with the training identified as well as significant support from partnerships and foundations.

Weaknesses

(1): Building local capacity to sustain the schools over time will be necessary as will the need to build public support so that the schools can be sustained and supported by SEAs and other stakeholders.

Reader's Score: 8

7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed

project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

(1): Figure G.1 provides a detailed management plan with timelines, responsibilities for accomplishing project tasks, scalability and sustainability.

(2): The qualifications of the proposed personnel are consistent with the program demands. Key personnel each have training and experience with managing large and complex projects.

(3): Overall, the quality of the plan, the proposed personnel (including the evaluation element) are very good. Mathematica Policy Research is a recognized company that is highly regarded in the field of education.

Weaknesses

(1): The scope of work for the Project Director who is also the Chief Research, Design & Innovation Officer is very extensive (page e49). It calls for enabling local, grassroots innovation to have a broader impact - which is extremely important. The extent of work may not be manageable for one person.

Reader's Score: 8

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement

innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths

Weaknesses

This priority was addressed but the applicant did not meet requirement(c).

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and
- (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Students attending KIPP Schools are better prepared and enter college at high rates.

KIPP certainly contributes to the conditions and knowledge necessary for college readiness.

Weaknesses

The narrative did not discuss the elements of college affordability and the financial aid process in detail for its students.

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

Kipp schools are designed to serve the needs of the identified children and have shown success at high rates. Their efforts show commendable growth.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

KIPP Schools present an exceptional model that applies to urban and rural.

KIPP Schools close the achievement gap, decrease drop out rates, increase graduation rates, and specifically are geared to principal leadership of the highest quality.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 2

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/02/2010 8:56 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 11:57 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Reader #4:

| | POINTS POSSIBLE | POINTS SCORED |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Summary Statement | | |
| 1. Summary Statement | N/A | N/A |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points) | 20 | 13 |
| 3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 15 |
| 5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points) | 10 | _____ |
| 7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points) | 10 | _____ |
| Competitive Preference | | |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | _____ |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | _____ |

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | _____ |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | _____ |
| TOTAL | 105 | 28 |

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #4:

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

This proposal presents extremely strong research about the KIPP program which includes strong effect sizes from experimental and quasi-experimental studies. The effect sizes for the most part are moderate to strong. These studies show strong evidence that the program will improve student academic achievement, close the achievement gap, and increase high school graduation and college enrollment and completion rates. Two of the studies presented have been given a WWC rating. The first study conducted by Mathematica Policy Research was a national longitudinal study using a quasi-experimental design using matched comparison schools. The findings were statistically significant and had effect sizes in mathematics ranging from .16 to .83 for the third year of the study. The reading effect sizes were greater at .19-.99 (page 17). The second study, a quasi-experimental study

conducted by the National Bureau of Economic Research, also found that a KIPP school in Lynn, Massachusetts shows statistically significant and substantial student achievement gains, particularly for LEP students. This study also had effect sizes ranging from .12 to .35 for mathematics and ELA respectively (page 18). The study found greater effects sizes for SPED and LEP students ranging from .38 to .45. This study used a rigorous, lottery-based approach to create statistically comparable treatment and control groups. This study received the WWC highest rating without reservations. The SRI study of San Francisco Bay Area schools also received a rating from the WWC with reservations. It studied fifth grade students in a matched comparison in three schools. The findings and effects sizes in both mathematics and ELA were statistically significant for the one year results. The effect sizes ranges from .19 to .86 for mathematics and .16 to .54 for ELA. Five other studies' findings were also presented in chart form, indicating their statistical or practical significance that supports the three extremely strong research studies.

Weaknesses

Although the research provided has received WWC ratings, the studies fail to address the proposed focus for scaling up the project, The KIPP leadership development model. Two of the three project goals specifically discuss principal leadership and training. There are no findings presented on the impact of the leadership model on student achievement or teacher success. There may be a relationship between the leadership development model and the KIPP schools' successful academic outcomes, but the studies do not discuss that link or reference the leadership development model. In addition, the focus of the majority of the studies is on middle school populations and do not address the elementary and high school levels which are proposed to be included in the scale up project, which is a threat to the external validity of the cited studies.

Reader's Score: 13

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

Weaknesses

4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

Strengths

A strong project evaluation plan is proposed by the applicant. The evaluation will consist of an experimental design and a quasi-experimental design. The study is a longitudinal study, which will evaluate not only the impact of the KIPP schools but of the project scaling up process. The study will investigate the relationship between the KIPP Leadership model and student achievement based on comparisons of the various implementation strategies, recruitment strategies, and regions. The study will be conducted independently by Mathematica Policy Research, a reputable national company that has conducted one of the studies submitted as research evidence in support of the proposed project. The plan identifies the sources of the data and the tools that will be used for the qualitative component of the study (page 35). The quantitative sources are also identified in that table and on page 33. The resources identified for the study are adequate for fully completing the study with adequate staff to provide feedback and results in a timely manner. The statistical methods for analyzing the data and for ensuring external and internal validity are identified in the presentation on page 33. The evaluation will provide timely feedback about the process of scaling up and the impact of scaling up on the teachers, principals and student achievement. This will produce valuable information for schools that would like to replicate the KIPP model, particularly the leadership development model, because of the possible variations in implementing it at different schools.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 15

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student

populations. Evidence of this ability includes the proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support replication.

Strengths

Weaknesses

6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

Weaknesses

7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

Weaknesses

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and**

college application processes; and
(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

Weaknesses

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

Weaknesses

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/06/2010 11:57 AM

[show names](#)

[show group subtotals](#)

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2010 6:11 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Reader #5:

| | POINTS POSSIBLE | POINTS SCORED |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Summary Statement | | |
| 1. Summary Statement | N/A | N/A |
| Selection Criteria | | |
| 1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 13 |
| 2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points) | 20 | _____ |
| 3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 15 |
| 4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points) | 15 | _____ |
| 5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points) | 15 | 9 |
| 6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 10 |
| 7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points) | 10 | 10 |
| Competitive Preference | | |
| 1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |
| 2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 0 |

| | | |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point) | 1 | 1 |
| 4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points) | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL | 105 | 59 |

Technical Review Form

Scale Up 1: 84.396A

Reader #5:

Applicant: KIPP Foundation -- Research, Design & Innovation, - Research, Design & Innovation, (U396A100031)

Summary Statement

1. Summary State

The KIPP Foundation's request is to expand the current principal leadership program to additional sites around the country. KIPP has had successful results with leader preparation and is seeking funds to focus on the principalship, bringing KIPP-developed ideas and training to charter, other public and private schools throughout the nation.

The proposal is a solid one, based in part on successful past performance and the demonstrated ability to manage large, complex projects. The applicant also demonstrates significant capability to raise financial support from a variety of foundations and business leaders.

The key factor that hinders this proposal is the cost per participant in the KIPP program- \$150,000 per participant. This figure makes replication and sustainability a cause for concern, especially for many high needs schools around the country.

Selection Criteria

1. A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design (up to 15 Points)

In determining the need for the project and quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet (i.e., addresses a largely unmet need, particularly for high-need students, and is a practice, strategy, or program that has not already been widely adopted).

(2) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are

(a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet,

(b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

Strengths

The proposed project represents an exceptional approach to improve the development and delivery of highly qualified principals to meet student needs across the country. The KIPP leadership development program has an outstanding track record as identified in the proposal, in terms of the connection between KIPP- trained principals and the outstanding student performance results cited on page e 3.

The proposal is focused on Absolute Priority 1- Innovations that support effective teachers and principals. The KIPP approach has demonstrate outstanding progress in addressing the needs associated with this priority.

The proposed project has a clear set of goals and specific strategies to achieve those goals, and is aligned with the priorities (both absolute and competitive) to achieve those goals. The exception to this statement is explained in the weakness section below.

Weaknesses

One of the requirements of this category relates to goals, strategies and outcomes expected from these strategies. Activity 3b (pg e13) does not appear to be sufficient to achieve the dissemination of tools and practices to meet the goals/objectives of the proposal. The establishment of an online portal and an annual conference to share success does not appear to be adequate for a national scale-up project of this size.

Reader's Score: 13

2. B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect (up to 20 Points)

The Secretary considers the strength of the existing research evidence, including the internal validity (strength of causal conclusions) and external validity (generalizability) of the effects reported in prior research, on whether the proposed project will improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. Eligible applicants may also demonstrate success through an intermediate variable that is strongly correlated with improving these outcomes, such as teacher or principal effectiveness.

In determining the strength of the existing research evidence, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that there is strong evidence (as defined in the Notice Inviting Applications) that its implementation of the proposed practice, strategy, or program will have a statistically significant, substantial, and important effect on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

(2) The importance and magnitude of the effect expected to be obtained by the proposed project, including the extent to which the project will substantially and measurably improve student achievement or student growth, close achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or increase college enrollment and completion rates. The evidence in support of the importance and magnitude of the effect would be the research-based evidence provided by the eligible applicant to support the proposed project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

3. C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant (up to 15 Points)

In determining the experience of the eligible applicant, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The past performance of the eligible applicant in implementing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(2) The extent to which an eligible applicant provides information and data demonstrating that

(a) In the case of an eligible applicant that is an LEA, the LEA has -

(i) Significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described

in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, or significantly increased student achievement for all groups of students described in such section; and

(ii) Made significant improvements in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and principals, as demonstrated with meaningful data; or

(b) In the case of an eligible applicant that includes a nonprofit organization, the nonprofit organization has significantly improved student achievement, attainment, or retention through its record of work with an LEA or schools.

Strengths

The past performance of the applicant in managing large, complex and rapidly growing projects is impressive as noted below;

- * Growth of KIPP schools from two to six hundred.
- * Focus on the needs of subgroups while growing substantially.
- * Expansion geographically across the nation.
- * Fisher Fellowship effort to train KIPP leaders through a leadership development program.

The performance of the applicant related to student achievement trends is impressive as noted below;

- * After four years at a KIPP school (many students of whom are high-needs) gains of statistically significant improvement in student achievement are made.
- * The vast majority of KIPP eighth graders outperform local district counterparts- Figures by subject range from 88% to 92% of students outperforming counterparts.
- * 100% of KIPP high school classes outperform their local districts on state exams in all major content areas.
- * College attendance and high school graduation attainment is significantly higher for KIPP students than the general student population.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 15

4. D. Quality of the Project Evaluation (up to 15 Points)

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

(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well designed experimental study or, if a well-designed experimental study of the project is not

possible, the extent to which the methods of evaluation will include a well-designed quasi-experimental study.

(2) The extent to which, for either an experimental study or a quasi-experimental study, the study will be conducted of the practice, strategy, or program as implemented at scale.

(3) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

(4) The extent to which the evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings.

(5) The extent to which the proposed project plan includes sufficient resources to carry out the project evaluation effectively.

(6) The extent to which the proposed evaluation is rigorous, independent, and neither the program developer nor the project implementer will evaluate the impact of the project.

Strengths

Weaknesses

5. E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale (up to 15 Points)

In determining the quality of the strategy and capacity to bring the proposed project to scale, the Secretary considers:

(1) The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project and the capacity of the eligible applicant and any other partners to reach the proposed number of students during the course of the grant period.

(2) The eligible applicant's capacity (e.g., in terms of qualified personnel, financial resources, or management capacity) to bring the proposed project to scale on a national, regional, or State level working directly, or through partners, either during or following the end of the grant period.

(3) The feasibility of the proposed project to be replicated successfully, if positive results are obtained, in a variety of settings and with a variety of student populations. Evidence of this ability includes the proposed project's demonstrated success in multiple settings and with different types of students, the availability of resources and expertise required for implementing the project with fidelity, and the proposed project's evidence of relative ease of use or user satisfaction.

(4) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which

includes the start-up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 500,000, and 1,000,000 students.

(5) The mechanisms the eligible applicant will use to broadly disseminate information on its project so as to support replication.

Strengths

The capacity of the applicant and other partners to reach the proposed number of students is exceptional, especially given the past performance and the number of partners and foundations that support the KIPP concept.

The applicant's financial, personnel and management infrastructure is very positive to bring the proposed project to scale. As pointed out in the proposal, the KIPP management structure and the implementation plan (regional sites, etc.) provide a well defined and successful method of creating capacity.

Weaknesses

The number of students proposed to be reached by the proposed project totals 50,000. However, it is difficult to ascertain the direct correlation between newly KIPP-trained principals and the connection with KIPP schools and traditional schools. There appears to be an ancillary connection of principals trained and the total number of students eventually reached.

In terms of replication, questions must be raised about how the KIPP curriculum and practices around leadership development would be replicated successfully. There is little discussion of concrete, specific replication of the content other than traditional sharing and disseminating practices. Furthermore, given the current structure of traditional public schools, ample evidence needs to be provided that the replication of this non-traditional approach to leadership can be implemented in traditional K16 structures. The applicant has not provided evidence in its application.

The estimated cost is a real concern- \$150,000 per participant raises question as to whether or not this is an unrealistic figure for replication and capacity issues. The student cost is extremely low, yet the direct connection between the individual leader's training and students is difficult to assess. Sustainability at a cost of \$150,000 per educator has not been adequately addressed in this application.

The dissemination strategies appear to be limited and very traditional

approaches including;

- * Hosting an Leadership Symposium three times during the grant cycle.
- * Capturing best practice and creating tools to share those practices.
- * Speaking at National Forums
- * Sharing with policymakers
- * Operating an Open Book

The strategies outlined for dissemination are inadequate to meet the ambitious goals of the proposed project.

Reader's Score: 9

6. F. Sustainability (up to 10 Points)

In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that it has the resources to operate the project beyond the length of the Scale-up grant, including a multi-year financial and operating model and accompanying plan; the demonstrated commitment of any other partners; and evidence of broad support from stakeholders (e.g., State educational agencies, teachers' unions) critical to the project's long-term success.

(2) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Scale-Up grant.

Strengths

The applicant has clearly articulated a strong set of partners and financial resources to operate the project after grant funding ends. The combination of participant fees and private funding is an impressive set of figures to support the resource item.

The strength of the KIPP effort with state and local education agencies is demonstrated by the fact that they are working in 17 of the 20 largest districts in the nation, as well as numerous other education organizations, such as charter schools and other non-traditional schools.

The evidence of planning to incorporate the project's purposes after grant funds end is clear and substantial. Since this is an effort to grow current leadership programs, the grant's purpose is appears appropriate for inclusion of best practices and lessons learned as the KIPP effort continues to evolve after the grant period has ended.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 10

7. G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel (up to 10 Points)

In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing large, complex, and rapidly growing projects.

(3) The qualifications, including relevant expertise and experience, of the project director and key personnel of the independent evaluator, especially in designing and conducting large-scale experimental and quasi-experimental studies of educational initiatives.

Strengths

The proposal has a management plan that appears well developed and has a set of milestones responsible parties and timelines to support this conclusion. While dissemination has been raised repeatedly as a concern for this grant proposal, the dissemination part of the management plan is consistent with the grant proposal's plans in this area.

The project director's qualifications appear to be well grounded and more than adequate. The background in KIPP, research and other management related responsibilities appear to clearly qualify him for this role. This is also true of key personnel, based on the information about the respective backgrounds of each in the proposal.

The external evaluator (Mathematica) will receive over \$5 million to conduct extensive, large scale studies of this educational initiative. The organization has credibility for the quality of their work evaluating projects of similar scope.

Weaknesses

None found.

Reader's Score: 10

Competitive Preference

1. Competitive Preference 5: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on:

- (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);**
- (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and**
- (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.**

Strengths

This competitive preference was not a focus of the grant proposal.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

2. Competitive Preference 6: Innovations That Support College Access and Success (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

- (a) address students' preparedness and expectations related to college;**
- (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and**

(c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

Strengths

This competitive preference was not a focus of the proposal.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 0

3. Competitive Preference 7: Innovations To Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students With Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (0 or 1 Point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths

The applicant has demonstrated a successful focus on addressing the unique learning needs of special education students and has met this preference.

Weaknesses

Reader's Score: 1

4. Competitive Preference 8: Innovations That Serve Schools in Rural LEAs (0, 1, or 2 Points)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to focus on the unique challenges of high-need students in schools within a rural LEA (as defined in this notice) and address the particular challenges faced by students in these schools. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve student achievement or student growth, close

achievement gaps, decrease dropout rates, increase high school graduation rates, or improve teacher and principal effectiveness in one or more rural LEAs.

Strengths

The proposal as presented is transportable to rural areas and is mentioned in the proposal. The requirements of this competitive preference are partially met.

Weaknesses

While there is some degree of transportability and support for rural areas through the application, a depth and broad reach into rural America is not presented.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 07/03/2010 6:11 PM