

KIPP:Chicago

COLLEGE PREP PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Tier 2 Narrative

August 10, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS	
SECTION 1: PARENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & SUPPORT	
1.1 Understanding the Community a. Targeted Communities b. Community Fit	3
1.2 Notifying the Community a. Evidence of Notifying Key Community Stakeholders b. Seeking Community Feedback	17
1.3 Parent and Community Support a. Evidence of Support from Key Community Stakeholders b. Risk Factors	26
1.4 Continued Parent and Community Engagement a. Continued Outreach Prior to School Opening b. Vision for Long-Term Collaboration with Parents and the Community	29
SECTION 4: ECONOMIC SOUNDNESS	
4.1 School Budget a. Financial Forms and Budget Narrative b. Development Plan	32
4.2 Financial Controls and Monitoring a. Financial Controls and Monitoring	36
4.3 Facilities a. Facility Options	41

DIMENSION 1.1: UNDERSTANDING THE COMMUNITY

1.1.a. Question #1. What are the possible locations of the proposed schools? What is the student recruitment boundary for each of the proposed schools and the targeted communities within it?

KIPP Chicago proposes the expansion of KIPP Create College Prep middle school to serve primary grades K-4 (KIPP Create Primary, formerly KIPP Primary Expansion) and two new K-8 schools (KIPP #4 and KIPP #5).

The communities that we have proposed were heavily determined by facility availability, early demonstration of community support, and overall community need. We believe that KIPP schools should open in neighborhoods where parents have demonstrated a desire for a high-quality school option for their child(ren) and show strong support for our school model. Furthermore, it is of critical importance for us to be fiscally lean, especially in a time with such limited resources. For KIPP Chicago, the preference is always to repurpose existing schools wherever possible. Three of our four existing campuses are CPS co-shares, a model we believe is not only responsible and prudent, but also embodies our spirit of collaboration. Chicago clearly has enough schools; the district has more capacity than it needs. What Chicago needs are more *high-quality* seats within those buildings and efficient utilization of existing city resources. For this reason, we are strongly advocating for co-location options for each of our proposed schools and we are committed to working with CPS and local leaders to identify the best possible home for the proposed schools. We are also especially committed to finding meaningful ways for even greater collaboration and partnership with those co-location options.

After careful consideration and tremendous work during the summer months, KIPP Chicago is proposing the following:

KIPP Create Primary (K-4): Currently, KIPP Chicago has two high-performing middle schools that do not yet have primary grades (KIPP Bloom in Englewood and KIPP Create in Austin). Through this proposal, we hope to add a primary expansion to KIPP Create in Austin. The recruitment boundaries we set for this expansion build on the student recruitment efforts we have already undertaken for the existing school, and overlap with the proposed neighborhoods for KIPP #5. As a result, we have one larger recruitment boundary for the West Side (although we honor an agreement to not recruit with the attendance boundary of Nash Elementary, with whom we co-locate). Our current proposed recruitment boundaries for the West Side are W. Division Street, N. Avers Avenue, W. Lake Street, N. Laramie Avenue; these boundaries include the communities of Austin, West Garfield Park, and West Humboldt Park.

KIPP #4 (K-8): We hope to locate KIPP #4 on Chicago's South Side where the need for high-quality seats is tremendous. Through the community engagement process this summer, we believe that KIPP #4 could be a great asset to the West Side of the Woodlawn neighborhood. The proposed recruitment boundaries are E. 59th Street, S. Cottage Grove Avenue, and the 90/94 Expressway.

KIPP #5 (K-8): We hope to locate KIPP #5 on Chicago's West Side where trends with current and hopeful KIPP families demonstrate there is a desire for us to expand. Through the work we have conducted to date, we have identified the community of W. Humboldt Park as a potential new home for KIPP #5. The proposed boundaries are the same as KIPP Create Primary: W. Division Street, N. Avers Avenue, W. Lake Street, N. Laramie Avenue; these boundaries incorporate the greater W. Humboldt, W. Garfield, and Austin communities.

1.1.a. Question #2. Please provide the following information about the neighborhoods within the recruitment boundary: a. Total # of residents; b. Number of school-aged children; c. Demographics; d. Average level of educational attainment; e. Median or average family income; f. Median or average housing cost; g. Unemployment rate

KIPP Chicago has finalized the communities in which we hope to locate schools and from which we would recruit students: Austin, West Garfield Park, Woodlawn (specifically West Woodlawn), and West Humboldt Park. They are located on the South (Woodlawn only) and West Sides of Chicago.

The unemployment rates for these communities are *all* above the average for the City of Chicago (7.9%) and range as high as 25.8%. The percentage of people over the age of 25 without a high school diploma ranges from 31%-46%. All communities have percentages of students receiving free and reduced price lunch higher than 90%.

KIPP Chicago has selected these neighborhoods because each has high concentrations of our target population—students from low-income households within under-resourced communities who face multiple barriers to a quality education. All communities under consideration are home to primarily African American, with some Latino, students (except Humboldt Park, which has relatively equal African American and Latino populations).

South Side

Woodlawn

Category	Number of Residents	# School Aged Children (0-19) in 2010	% Children Qualify for FRM	Median Family Income	Average Housing Cost	Unemployment Rate	
Data	25,983	10,905	92%	\$27,413	Rent \$1,354 Home \$81K	23.40%	
Source	Census 2010	Ed Fac. Master Plan	Ed Fac. Master Plan	City-Data.com	Realtor.com	City of Chicago HHS	
Demographics			Highest Level of Educational Attainment				
			Education Level				% Total
			Less Than 12th Grade				31%
			African American	87.20%	HS or Equivalent		10%
			Asian	2.20%	Associates or Some College		28%
			Caucasian	6.60%	Bachelor's Degree		13%
			Hispanic	2.10%	Master's Degree		6%
			Source: US Census 2010		Graduate or Prof School Degree		13%
			Source: city-data.com				

West Side

Humboldt Park

Category	Number of Residents	# School Aged Children (0-19) in 2012	% Children Qualify for FRM	Median Family Income	Average Housing Cost	Unemployment Rate	
Data	63,416	15,236	94%	\$34,315	Rent \$1,909 Home \$153K	17.30%	
Source	Census 2010	Ed. Facilities Master Plan	Ed. Facilities Master Plan	Census 2010	Realtor.com	City of Chicago HHS	
Demographics Source: US Census 2010			Highest Level of Educational Attainment				
			Education Level		% Total		
			Less Than 12th Grade		46%		
			African American	40.80%	HS or Equivalent		12%
			Asian	0.39%	Associates or Some College		24%
			Caucasian	4.44%	Bachelor's Degree		9%
			Hispanic	53.30%	Master's Degree		5%
			Graduate or Prof School Degree		3%		
			Source: city-data.com				

West Garfield Park (both the Austin and W. Humboldt Park sites could draw students from WGP)

Category	Number of Residents	# School Aged Children (0-19) in 2010	% Children Qualify for FRM	Median Family Income	Average Housing Cost	Unemployment Rate
Data	18,001	INFO NOT AVAILABLE	95%	\$23,033	Rent \$1,114 Home \$74K	25.80%
Source	Census 2010		ISBE*	Census 2010	Realtor.com	City of Chicago HHS
Demographics African American 96.20% Asian 0.00% Caucasian 0.70% Hispanic 1.90% Source: US Census 2010			Highest Level of Educational Attainment			
			Education Level		% Total	
			Less Than 12th Grade		40%	
			HS or Equivalent		15%	
			Associates or Some College		28%	
			Bachelor's Degree		7%	
			Master's Degree		4%	
			Graduate or Prof School Degree		7%	
			Source: city-data.com			

Austin

Category	Number of Residents	# School Aged Children (0-19) in 2010	% Children Qualify for FRM	Median Family Income	Average Housing Cost	Unemployment Rate
Data	98,514	26,650	95%	\$32,358	Rent \$1,156 Home \$93K	22.60%
Source	Census 2010	Ed Fac. Master Plan	Ed Fac. Master Plan	City-Data.com	Realtor.com	City of Chicago HHS
Demographics African American 85.00% Asian 0.00% Caucasian 4.00% Hispanic 9.00% Source: US Census 2010			Highest Level of Educational Attainment			
			Education Level		% Total	
			Less Than 12th Grade		39%	
			HS or Equivalent		15%	
			Associates or Some College		27%	
			Bachelor's Degree		8%	
			Master's Degree		4%	
			Graduate or Prof School Degree		7%	
			Source: city-data.com			

1.1.a. Question #3. Please provide a brief historical overview of the neighborhoods within the proposed recruitment boundary. Include information that your design team believes is important to understand when seeking to serve the targeted student population and community residents. Please cite the key sources of information consulted, both formal and informal.

South Side General History: From the 1940s through the 1960s, the Robert Taylor Homes and other high rise public housing developments were constructed on the South Side, and represented a place of hope and new beginnings for families migrating to Chicago. Torn down in the 1990s as part of the Chicago Housing Authority's (CHA) Plan for Transformation, five South Side developments are being completely rebuilt. With the destruction of the former projects, there remain large lots of empty land and depressed retail markets, as displaced residents have settled in other neighborhoods. The area has seen no population gains between 2000 and 2010, and in 2013 faced the closing of numerous schools.

At the same time, University of Chicago has leveraged \$1 billion in funding toward surrounding communities (such as Woodlawn), whose transportation choices, lakefront, historic homes, and involved residents have made them attractive to additional investors. Despite heavy investment, however, communities along the South Lakefront still face income inequality and deep poverty, poor school performance, and block by block differences in socio-economic status.

Woodlawn underwent significant development in preparation for the World's Columbian Exposition of 1893. When the Exposition ended, middle-class African Americans bought homes in the newly residential territory. By 1960, however, Woodlawn experienced crowded housing and a lack of commercial attractions, and became a home for displaced families from re-development in other parts of the city.

By the 1950s, a coalition of churches, block clubs, and business owners had come together to combat community violence and protect the neighborhood from external controls. Reverend Arthur Brazier was

a founder of The Woodlawn Organization, or TWO, and protested overcrowding in the schools, exploitation, and the University of Chicago's efforts to expand its territory. Since the middle of the last century, Woodlawn has experienced climbing unemployment, poverty, and crime, and a declining population.

West Side General History: Chicago's West Side communities are primarily African American, with some areas that are also Latino. The area is host to one of the city's original African American communities along Lake and Kinzie Streets—which was established as early as the 1850s. West Side neighborhoods developed around massive job centers, such as Brach's Confectionary in Austin, which provided employment for generations of families. Post-World War II, industry began moving out of Illinois and employment became scarce. Housing stock deteriorated, and construction of the Eisenhower Expressway cut through the West Side—displacing thousands of people and separating neighborhoods. As the job market has changed, the West Side has suffered from decades of disinvestment dating back to the 1960s.

Humboldt Park is a mixed African American and Latino neighborhood (particularly Puerto Rican, with some Mexican) that is often thought of in terms of East and West Sides (divided by Sacramento Blvd). While East Humboldt Park (also called West Town) has gentrified significantly in recent decades, West Humboldt Park has gentrified less, and even the East side's gentrification has slowed since the recent housing market crash.

Most housing in the area is between 80-120 years old, especially in West Humboldt Park. Bickerdike Redevelopment Corporation, a lead agency in the LISC Chicago network, has played a leadership role in keeping the area affordable for long time residents, despite gentrification pressures.

Although income levels have remained below average, particularly West Humboldt Park, the population density has led to substantial retail districts, including 1,500 small businesses, with some market strength and reinvestment along all the major business corridors (though vacancies and business deserts still exist as well). Humboldt Park itself is a 207-acre boulevard park within the Chicago Park District.

West Garfield Park became a substantial commercial district in the early decades of the 20th century. Racial tensions in West Garfield Park developed in the 1950s as African-American families were welcomed by the Garfield Park Good Neighbors Council, but faced opposition from the United Property Group. Middle class African-American families moved in, but absentee landlords increasingly neglected apartment buildings and allowed overcrowding.

While West Garfield Park is the smallest community on the West Side, it is a major retail center, with active industrial and commercial businesses, and a major greening effort underway—including the launch of a farmer's market. Growing artistic communities have developed out of the West Carroll Art Studios and Switching Station Artists Lofts.

Austin grew into a dense urban neighborhood between 1870 and 1920, in part thanks to excellent transit and commuter access. By 1950, Austin was a primarily residential middle class community of over 100,000 residents. Massive changes to the neighborhood have occurred over time and, by 1980, Austin was primarily an African American community (in S. Austin more than 96%).

More recently, housing disinvestment, vacancy, and demolition have been exacerbated by a loss of jobs and commerce. Still, Austin has 34% homeownership, some strong housing values, three mixed-industrial commercial centers, and multi-tenant facilities.

The Austin community has myriad assets. Two community news outlets, *Austin Talks* and *The Austin Weekly News* keep residents informed. Community organizations including Central Austin Neighborhood Association and Greater Austin Development Association are focused on revitalization. Groups such as Austin Coming Together host community events at gorgeous neighborhood parks, keeping residents active. Finally, groups such as Austin Peace Builders, PEACE Corner Youth Center, and BUILD positively engage youth.

Key sources consulted include the 2010 Census, American Community Survey, ISBE school data and CPS 2013 Educational Master Facilities Plan, City of Chicago Health and Human Services, Social Impact Research Center Illinois Poverty Reports, Chicago Community Trust Chicago Neighborhoods 2015: Assets, Plans, and Trends, LISC Chicago data, and the Encyclopedia of Chicago History.

1.1.a. Question #4. Which members of the design team and/or proposed founding Board members have ties to the targeted communities within the recruitment boundary? When first planning to conduct outreach in the targeted communities, with whom did the design team connect to enhance its understanding of the communities and develop an outreach plan? What existing community meetings, events, or volunteer opportunities have members of the design team attended to make additional connections and enhance members' understanding of the targeted communities?

Community outreach approach: All community engagement efforts at KIPP Chicago are built upon the belief that promises to families are sacred. Accordingly, we are careful to not overpromise and under deliver, and we take a very intentional approach to engaging stakeholders as we pursue growth. Through our experience opening other campuses, as well as having to move schools to new locations, we have learned that conversations with parents about educational options for their child(ren) are incredibly important; we do not want to raise families' hopes and expectations if circumstances beyond our control affect the opening or location of a school.

During this particular proposal process, our philosophy was underscored by the labor-intensive facility review and necessity to explore numerous communities in order to support the scale of growth that we are prepared to undertake. More than ever, we felt it especially prudent to take a deliberate and scaffolded approach to community engagement—one that builds on itself and allows us to smartly narrow our efforts.

Even at this time of Tier 2 submission, we are still committed to and actively undertaking community engagement. Our broad approach to understanding the communities and building relationships has been as follows (efforts have mostly occurred sequentially, with some overlap): comprehensive review of facility options; data analysis of community need; conversations with current parents; securing the school leadership; continued review of facilities and financial capacity; targeted discussions with parents and staff members; outreach to local Aldermen; conversations with community stakeholders; on-the-ground parent outreach as neighborhoods are further defined. We also recognize that the community engagement approach is different for the primary expansion and that our approaches continue to become more tailored as we gather additional insights about each community. Below is a table that captures our approach throughout this process.

Community engagement approach:

	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sep	Oct
Review facility options									
Data analysis of community need									
Broad parent outreach									
Confirm Principals for Fisher Fellowships and engage Principals in community outreach									
Visit and vet numerous private facility options									
Targeted parent outreach by neighborhood									
Conversations with Alderman									
Narrow the neighborhood focus									
Outreach to all elected officials									
Conversations with select stakeholders									
On-the-ground community and parent outreach (enhanced by families transitioning back to school from summer break)									

Existing community ties and early connections: KIPP Chicago already has strong connections in many of the neighborhoods in which we hope to locate or expand schools, with our deepest ties being with the families we already serve. These families continue to voice a desire for KIPP to open additional K-8 schools within their communities, especially those who wish to send their youngest children to a KIPP primary school. To date, KIPP Chicago has reached out over 300 current families in an effort to better understand our families’ desire for KIPP’s expansion, their willingness to demonstrate support, and their understanding of the priorities of the various communities we are considering. We also spoke with dozens of families leading up to the Neighborhood Advisory Council (NAC) launch, to inform them about the opportunity to serve on the NAC. Many parents were interested in serving and they continued to reiterate their hopes for KIPP’s growth. Additionally, during our numerous conversations with families, we also asked about other community stakeholders/organizations with whom we could connect and have developed a comprehensive list that will aid continued community engagement efforts. Through these conversations, as well as discussions with current Principals and staff members, we have begun to develop a list of community meetings and events that are taking place in neighborhoods where we are proposing schools. As we continue to further engage our proposed neighborhoods, we look forward to connecting with these various community networks for ongoing feedback and support.

In tandem with conversations with parents, KIPP Chicago spent the summer focusing a significant amount of energy considering the neighborhoods and facility options that would enable us to grow. We consulted with the Illinois Network of Charter Schools (INCS) and Charter Parents United (CPU) about broader community need, and we worked closely with IFF (formerly the Illinois Facilities Fund) to garner a deeper understanding of community assets and needs as they related to independent facilities. Through our work with IFF, we had identified several closed religious schools that presented as potential homes for KIPP Chicago’s expansion efforts. In June, members of the Design Team toured those facilities with local pastors and/or members of the congregations.

As we considered all of the various facility options, we have had ongoing conversations with Board members and select philanthropists about the financial expectations connected to private facility options. While we are still preparing for potential costs associated with obtaining independent facilities

if absolutely necessary, the sobering news of the District's financial crisis led us to recommit to our core belief that co-location is the right model for our organization. With the recent news of CPS budget reductions and its uncertain fiscal future, we are evermore committed to working with the District to find viable co-share possibilities. To that end, we also conducted a thorough analysis of potential co-share options, knowing that leveraging under-utilized CPS facilities is a win-win scenario for the district and we believe that there are viable opportunities in our proposed communities.

Most recently, and throughout our earnest pursuit of private facility options, we connected with numerous Alderman in the broader community list proposed in Tier 1. All of those conversations as well as diligent internal analysis have enhanced our understanding of each community and helped us further narrow our neighborhood focus. It also allowed us to begin to tailor our community engagement efforts during the late summer, which we will continue throughout the fall. See Dimension 1.2.a Question # 2 for further information about Aldermanic outreach.

Ties and connections to the recently finalized communities: With our neighborhood focus determined, we have been leveraging, strengthening, and building new ties in the communities that will be served by our growth efforts.

Our ties and connections in Woodlawn include dozens of current KIPP Bloom families, newly forged relationships through student recruitment efforts for KIPP Bloom, and presence at local events (with many Design Team Members taking an active lead). Additionally, one Proposed Principal lives in Hyde Park, a neighboring community, and another Design Team Member studied at University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration and spent a year working with students at a west Woodlawn elementary school. We have also connected to a colleague from INCS who grew up in the Woodlawn community and is eager to help us continue to connect with key stakeholders, as well as reconnected with liaisons from SGA Youth and Family Services, which has a large presence in Woodlawn. More on our community connections can be found in Dimension 1.2.a Question #3.

Our ties and connections in the proposed West Side communities include hundreds of current and former KIPP families, as well as hundreds more who are on a waitlist for KIPP Ascend Primary. Many members of our Design Team have worked in school-based roles that served those original KIPP families, and their strong relationships continue today. Our Proposed Principal for KIPP #5 has been teaching and in school leadership on the West Side for the entirety of his career with KIPP Chicago. As community engagement efforts continue, we look forward to continuing to build new relationships with families who desire the KIPP opportunity.

1.1.a. Question #5. What are some of the existing assets within the targeted communities? What do community members identify as educational and support needs in the community? What methods and sources did your design team use to identify existing assets and educational and support needs in the community?

At the time of Tier 2 submission, KIPP Chicago has been able to build on our existing understanding of each community through research, analysis, parent interactions, and most recently, meaningful conversations with neighbors and residents. The Design Team leveraged research to uncover community level data, trends, and needs, then layered in feedback from community members via non-profit survey data, local community foundation data, and hospital needs assessments. Additionally, Design Team members connected early on with staff members of United Way of Metropolitan Chicago and Chicago Community Trust, who provided additional information based on their relationships with community-based organizations within each neighborhood.

Education Needs: Broadly, our analysis of community assets and needs uncovered concerns across each community about the *number* and *quality* of local school options. Residents are calling for a stable, high-performing education system that will foster neighborhood safety, improve perceptions of each community, and demonstrate improved quality ratings and increased high school and college choice. The table below summarizes the number and quality of local school options in the proposed neighborhoods (for sites) and reflects the percentage of students not attending neighborhood schools.

Neighborhood	Total # Elem. Schools	Total 1/1+ Schools	% of 1/1+ Schools	% of students not attending
Woodlawn	5	1	20 %	60 %
Austin	17	8	47 %	48 %
West Garfield Park	5	2	40 %	55 %
Humboldt Park	11	4	36 %	50 %

Assets vary across communities, but invariably include strong block clubs, active community members, and an engaged resident population. On the South Side, while income levels are low and neighborhoods primarily rental based, these circumstances are mitigated by a robust network of community organizations, generations old African American owned businesses, and a proud legacy of African American cultural, business, and political leadership. Communities have also benefitted from major community investment, land re-use projects, mixed income housing on the site of former CHA housing developments, and major retail investments. The CTA Red line extension project will benefit many communities along the South Side.

South Side: community assets that continue today include:

- Strong transportation (Metra, CTA Green and Red lines); the CTA's \$240 million 95th Street Terminal Improvement Project will transform and anchor the 95th street corridor
- Active and engaged neighborhood residents—many resident-driven planning processes
- Major redevelopment and large institutional investment (proximity to University of Chicago)
- Lakefront opportunities, historic structures, mixed use developments and mixed income housing
- Two new grocery stores (Mariano's and Whole Foods) opening soon
- A rich network of community institutions including the Quad Communities Center for Working Families run by The Cara Program, Center for New Horizons, Young Women's Leadership Academy, Chicago Urban League
- Cultural destinations including the DuSable Museum of African American History, Museum of Science and Industry, Hyde Park Art Center, and Robie House
- The Theaster Gates Arts + Public Life Program recently opened an arts incubator next to the Garfield Green line station
- New Life Covenant Church is building a new 4,000 seat church and performing arts center, as well as a 350 child daycare center
- Site of hundreds of African American owned businesses, many 2nd and 3rd generation property owners, and home base for many African American civic and community leaders, professionals, academics, and artists
- The Bronzeville Children's Museum is the only children's museum in the country that is focused on African American culture and history

Assets specific to Woodlawn include, but are not limited to:

- The Woodlawn Children's Promise Community is a resident-driven effort to improve the educational trajectory of South Side children, and partners with nine elementary schools and two high schools in Woodlawn to serve as a hub of resources, programs, and supports
- Preservation of Affordable Housing (POAH), through a Choice Neighborhoods Initiative, is working on neighborhood revitalization, in particular the renovation of the Grove Parc apartments to become Woodlawn Park at 6101 S. Evans
- The Obama Presidential Center, run by the Obama Foundation, will be located on the South Side, bringing scholarship, community activism, and collaboration with existing institutions
- University of Chicago's Urban Education Institute is a tremendous neighborhood and city resource for research, practice, policy, and innovation on urban schooling; the University also runs the UChicago Charter Woodlawn Campus, where college acceptance rates have steadily improved since launching
- Apostolic Church of God was led for 48 years by the late Bishop Brazier, who was an outspoken and revered community advocate. With a thriving and active congregation, the church is an anchor for the Woodlawn community, currently led by Bishop Brazier's son
- Reverend Leon Finney, now head of The Woodlawn Organization, worked to fight community violence and gang activity and maintain community driven control of millions of dollars in publicly funded development (sometimes in opposition to control by University of Chicago)

Woodlawn community members have identified the following educational and support needs in the community:

- Boarded-up homes and vacancies have led residents to feel the need for renewal and land and building re-use, for example via urban agriculture zones and community gardens
- Residents have driven planning for increased quality of life via cleanups, street activities, a farmer's market, murals, etc.
- Residents have protested Chicago Public School closings and organized to demand better quality educational options

West Side

On the West Side, visibly healthy retail infrastructure, a strong non-profit backbone, and a history of and openness to collaboration are noted assets. Community assets for West Side neighborhoods in general include:

- Well located along transit lines and railroads—linked to both downtown and suburban job centers by Green, Blue, and Pink CTA lines, bus routes, Metra lines, and the Eisenhower Expressway
- 37,000 local jobs, including 8,200 in health care and social assistance and 6,400 in manufacturing
- Strong block club, church, and family and geographic roots formed by incoming residents to create a rich and strong social fabric
- Incredible non-profit infrastructure from the area's early days, including Midwest Community Council, Organization for a Better Austin, Westside Minister's Coalition, Westside Health Authority, Puerto Rican Cultural Center, Bethel New Life, Inc., Lawndale Christian Development Corporation, Breakthrough Urban Ministries, Mount Sinai Hospital, Organization for a Better

Austin, Bickerdike Redevelopment Corporation, South Shore Bank partnerships with non-profit housing developers, People's Redevelopment and Investment Effort, Alivio Medical Center, and The Resurrection Project

- Land redevelopment has been spurred by substantial new investment in industrial facilities over the last 20 years

Assets specific to Humboldt Park:

- Large new development in Humboldt Park including the Menard's and Walmart stores
- An 80 unit senior building built by the Hispanic Housing Development Corporation
- West Chicago Avenue Rebuild Initiative to increase economic progress, led by Chicago Community Loan Fund and West Humboldt Park Development Council, to transform eight blocks of West Chicago Avenue between Kedzie and Central Park into a vibrant, attractive, inviting, and safe neighborhood retail district (including better goods and services and increased jobs)
- City of Chicago Micro Market Recovery Program has re-occupied 154 units centered around Homan Avenue in Humboldt Park; the Bloomingdale Trail has attracted private sector housing and retail development

Assets specific to West Garfield Park, currently home to many KIPP Chicago students:

- Strong church-based organizing, especially in helping to rebuild parts of West Garfield Park, bring in health resources, rebuild housing units, and stabilize fragile blocks
- Historic structures with distinct architecture and building styles, flagship parks, and the Garfield Park Conservatory

Because KIPP Chicago currently runs a school in Austin, we have developed a deeper understanding of many local communities assets and have worked hard to build relationships with each. They include:

Organization Name	Description
Austin Community Action Council	The Austin Coming Action Council is specifically focused on education in the Austin Community.
Austin Coming Together	The mission of Austin Coming Together (ACT) is to increase the collective impact of our member organizations on improving education and economic development outcomes for the Austin Community.
Austin Town Hall	The Austin Town Hall offers programs for students and families.
Austin Branches of CPL	Each Chicago Public Library branch has a Children's Librarian and offers various programming for students.
Build Chicago	Build's mission is to engage at-risk youth in schools and on the street, so they can realize their educational and career potentials and contribute to the stability and well being of our communities.
Sankofa Cultural Center	The Sankofa Cultural Art Center is the premier place for cultural entertainment, education, and empowerment of African-Americans on Chicago's West Side. Sakofa provides a variety of classes, seminars, forums, workshops, and family-friendly entertainment in a warm, culturally-stimulating atmosphere.
CAPS Meeting (Chicago Police	The monthly CAPS meeting is organized for each police beat. CAPS officers and residents and the other community members come together to

Department)	brainstorm solutions to shared community problems.
Boys and Girls Club	Boys and Girls Club offers after-school programming and camps.
By The Hand	By The Hand Club is an after-school program. It is located on Lake and Laramie. Several KIPPsters attend this program.
Football Clubs	Several KIPP students participate in Austin football clubs.
Friendship Baptist Church	Friendship Baptist Church is one of the largest churches in Austin, at Laramie & Jackson. Reverend Bacchus is active in the community and has been supportive of KIPP, inviting staff members to speak at church gatherings and attend events.
Kidz Express	An after-school club; a dozen KIPP Create students attend.

Additionally, Austin benefits from many coalitions and organizing bodies, including the Central Austin Neighborhood Association, Greater Austin Development Association, Austin Peace Builders, and Austin Coalition for Youth Justice. Community resources also include the Garfield Park Conservatory Music Program, and The Peace Corner, a community center that acts as a safe haven from gang violence and drug activity. Austin communication outlets and community based news resources include the Austin Weekly News, which whom KIPP Create has a good relationship, and Austin Talks.

Community member identified education and support needs for Humboldt Park, West Garfield Park and Austin include:

- There is a shortage of high quality local schools—most neighborhood schools receive low quality ratings from CPS, and high school options are particularly limited
- Assistance for residents to improve education and employment skills
- Interim use of vacant land for community gardens, side yards, and recreation—community gardening and urban farming have expanded and are supported by strong networks of gardeners, including a 2.6 acre farm operated by Heartland Human Care Services; youth organizations have built gardens for fresh produce and to provide communal spaces
- Large community-based efforts to advocate for and build new affordable housing developments

1.1.b. Question #1. How did your design team seek to connect with existing institutions, key community advisors, parents, and residents to get their feedback on the educational vision for the proposed school and/or how to adapt an existing model to the unique community?

As referenced in responses to the questions above, KIPP Chicago worked diligently to hone the target neighborhoods and leveraged conversations with Aldermen to begin connecting to community stakeholders. In recent weeks, we have been meeting with stakeholders through one-on-one conversations, and in each meeting are asking for additional introductions to people with whom we should connect. Additionally, we received feedback through the targeted parent conversations with KIPP Chicago families and recent on-the-ground canvassing in proposed neighborhoods. We also hosted a community meeting and connected with attendees through an interactive handout that allowed for robust discussion and targeted feedback. More on all of these efforts are detailed throughout the remaining section, and we are committed to continued engagement that allows for feedback on our educational vision.

1.1.b. Question #2. Based on the outreach and research that your design team has conducted, why does your team believe that the proposed schools are a good fit for the targeted communities? How will the proposed schools contribute to the existing assets in the targeted communities and help meet educational and support needs?

Our broader perspective on community fit and contribution: The most important indicator of community fit and whether a school is an asset to the community should be the academic and social-emotional outcomes of students in the school. Though we are still early in our community engagement efforts, we feel strongly that KIPP Chicago will be a great fit for all three of the communities we are proposing. This is primarily based on our track record of success with the proposed targeted population (see Dimension 2.2.a. Question #2). In all of our existing communities, KIPP is operating Level 1 or 1+ schools; in North Lawndale and Austin, specifically, KIPP Chicago is operating the only Level 1+ schools. Additionally, through robust data collection and analysis, we began to zero in on the communities where a KIPP Chicago school could maximize impact. Among the data we reviewed were current school ratings (to help determine the need for high-quality seats), current utilization of seats at existing buildings, and the percentage of students attending their neighborhood schools (as an indicator of families wanting more options in their communities). Please see Appendices 1.1.a.4.i and 1.1.a.4.ii (in Tier 1 Appendices) for an example of an SQRP school rating map and a review of school performance in proposed communities (see also Appendix 1.1.b.2 for school performance maps of additional communities not originally included in the Tier 1 Appendices). The table in Dimension 1.1.a Question #5 provides a snapshot of the percentage of students who do not attend their neighborhood schools. These data sets and others were helpful as we considered the potential need in various communities.

Our deep relationships and ongoing conversations with students and families add to our belief that we will be a good community fit and meaningful contributor to the assets of our proposed communities. KIPP parents continuously come out to publicly support our schools and advocate for growth, providing story after story of the significant role that KIPP plays in their families' lives. Further, our long-term relationships with alumni and their families provide continued evidence that KIPP is viewed as a community and family asset.

KIPP Chicago's proposed schools will contribute to the existing assets within proposed communities by operating a safe, vibrant, high-quality school environment for children; establishing strong community-based partnerships; and teaming up with high-quality high schools and providing transition support to alumni. As it relates to co-sharing, KIPP Chicago also contributes to community assets by helping the district offset expenses associated with operating underutilized facilities, and by contributing to the shared professional development of both schools' teaching staffs. For example, after opening KIPP Bloom Academy at John Hope College Prep in Englewood, we hosted 17 high school and elementary school administrators and teachers from CPS Network 11 for an open house and best practice sharing among all schools. Furthermore, throughout the 2014-15 school year, KIPP Chicago teachers worked with teachers from Nash Elementary, one of our co-located schools, to build curricular materials and ensure effective implementation of the Common Core State Standards through a pilot using the Literacy Design Collaborative instructional materials. The pilot was a success, and proved that traditional district and charter schools can work together to the benefit of all students. There is great opportunity for similar approaches to partnership and sharing in our proposed communities, and unlimited potential for innovative new approaches to collaborating together. This could include on academic matters, professional development, and philanthropic investments in the building and resources available to all students.

Community fit for KIPP Create Primary and KIPP #5 on the West Side: The most compelling example of community fit for our proposed schools on the West Side is by looking at the existing data. Currently,

nearly 200 students are crossing the Eisenhower from Austin, W. Garfield Park, and W. Humboldt Park to attend KIPP Ascend Primary in North Lawndale. Additionally, as of August 5, a heartbreaking 400+ students remain of the KIPP Ascend Primary waitlist including more than 150 from the zip codes within our new school boundaries, and another 40 from communities on the South Side. Using this data alone, that totals 350 children who are leaving their West Side community to attend a KIPP Chicago primary school. Families deserve the opportunity to keep their children together in or near one building, and the convenience of not having to travel across the city to ensure their child can attend the school that they choose. And, by opening a primary option on the West Side, it will relieve pressure from the waitlist and enable more students from the N. Lawndale community to attend a great school within their neighborhood.

Additionally, more than 100 students from W. Garfield Park and W. Humboldt Park are leaving their communities to attend KIPP Create in Austin. With an additional KIPP school on the West Side, families will be able to choose the location most convenient for them and will not have to send their children to travel great distances to get to school.

We know that we can contribute to the educational assets of these West Side neighborhoods by enabling more students to stay within their communities to attend school, by relieving the pressure off of a growing waitlist for KIPP Ascend Primary, and by continuing to find innovative ways to collaborate such as the Literacy Design Collaborative with Nash. The parent calls that have been made to date and the support we are already receiving bolsters that belief.

Community fit for KIPP #4 in Woodlawn: Similar to our fit on the West Side, we believe KIPP #4 would be a valuable educational asset to the Woodlawn community based on our existing relationships with families on the South Side, and the trends in student data. Specifically, our Englewood campus currently draws families from all over the South Side and families can often find themselves traveling great distances to get their child to school every day. A new K-8 KIPP school would provide another option for families, specifically ones who reside east of the Dan Ryan to access a more convenient high-quality school. This year's 5th grade enrollment data supports that – to date, 42 5th-grade students from east of the Dan Ryan have enrolled at KIPP Bloom. And, since we decided to delay the expansion of primary grades for KIPP Bloom, a new Woodlawn campus with Kindergarten would give all South Side KIPP families a much desired high quality elementary option.

We believe that KIPP #4 would contribute greatly to the west Woodlawn community, especially since that neighborhood has embraced a laudable spirit of collaboration and wrap-around supports. The approach to a holistic experience for community members ties perfectly with our culture of sharing and *Team and Family*. We would welcome the opportunity to partner with the great organizations in Woodlawn including the Woodlawn Children's Promise Community and Woodlawn Resource Center led by SGA Youth & Family Services. Ultimately, students in west Woodlawn deserve the very best educational opportunity and we know that KIPP can provide exactly that. At a recent community meeting we held, George, a lifelong Woodlawn resident stated, **"I have lived in Woodlawn my whole life. I went to grade school here, even high school here. My question is where were you guys when I was growing up, cause I really could've have used this school."** His statement echoes what we know to be true – children in west Woodlawn can't wait any longer for a great, college-preparatory educational option.

DIMENSION 1.2: NOTIFYING THE COMMUNITY

At KIPP, we believe that promises to children are sacred. As detailed throughout many responses and in previous updates, our work leading up to summer included securing the Proposed Principals, analyzing which underserved communities would benefit the most from having the proposed schools as an option, which community members would support the proposed schools, and which facilities might accommodate the proposed schools. Aside from our own KIPP parents, it was very important to us that we not notify new families of our proposed schools until we further narrowed our list of proposed facilities and recruitment boundaries. In mid- July, KIPP Chicago solidified the specific neighborhoods where we hope to grow.

KIPP Chicago has a long history of demonstrating authentic community engagement. This is evidenced by the significant face-to-face canvassing we do at the start of each school year, and is anchored by the amount of time we dedicate to every single new KIPP Chicago family during the Commitment to Excellence portion of their enrollment. Teachers and school leaders sit with each family in their home and begin important relationships built on trust, partnership, and passion for seeing their child succeed. This work is time intensive, but not only is it critical to ensuring our Team and Family culture, it is also incredibly rewarding.

We appreciate the community engagement aspects of this RFP, and understand deeply how important it is. Our Design Team Members have all worked hard and thoughtfully to help us narrow our neighborhood list and begin to work in earnest toward the goals of the RFP. We recognize that there is no timeline for real community engagement and we are fully committed to continuing the work we've started throughout the fall and beyond. Our ongoing engagement plans will include continued notification of community members, additional KIPP-hosted events, and relentless pursuit of critical stakeholder meetings. We also know that parents will be in an ever better place to engage with us once their families are in back-to-school routines.

1.2.a Question #1. Please provide quantifiable evidence of having notified at least 10% of the individuals residing in the intended recruitment boundary of the proposed new school, as well as 50% of residents, organizations, and businesses located within a 4 block radius of the proposed facility.

Over the summer, the Design Team continued to refine the list of viable facilities and became ever committed to the promise of co-location after financial crisis befell the district in July and August. Once we finalized our communities in late July, we began notifying individuals in the various communities. In particular, many of our early conversations happened in tandem with existing student recruitment efforts for Bloom (South Side) and Create (West Side). Recruitment volunteers which included staff, parents, and college-age alumni informed families of KIPP's potential growth as they talked with residents while canvassing. In particular, if families do not have age-eligible children for existing schools, or if they live in or near our proposed recruitment boundaries, they were given a flyer with additional information about the new school proposal. During this time, 1,300 flyers were distributed to families, primarily on the South Side for KIPP #4 in Woodlawn. (See Appendix 1.2.a.1.i for a copy of the flyer.)

Growth teams primarily composed of KIPP Chicago parents also began intensive canvassing in the Woodlawn and W. Humboldt Park neighborhoods during the week of August 3rd. A modified flyer which included the NAC community forum meeting was distributed during one-on-one conversations and at businesses. A team of five parents and two staff members conducted outreach in Woodlawn and

distributed 300 flyers; a team of four parents and two staff members conducted outreach in W. Humboldt Park and distributed 300 flyers (See Appendix 1.2.a.1.ii for a copy of the updated flyers). An additional 100 flyers were distributed in Woodlawn informing residents of a KIPP-hosted community meeting on August 6, 2015 (see Appendix 1.2.a.1.iii).

Additionally, in early August, KIPP Chicago reached out to Accurate Leads to purchase addresses in order to mail notification postcards to families within the recruitment boundaries. Specifically, while we know that the notification request asks for 10% of residents, we want to be thoughtful and targeted, and have therefore asked to purchase addresses of households with school-aged children. At the time of submission, KIPP Chicago is still working to obtain the addresses and has plans to mail the postcard in the coming weeks with the most up to date information on public hearings and other ways to learn more about our proposal. (See Appendix 1.2.a.1.iv for a copy of the postcards).

To ensure that residences within the recruitment boundaries were notified, volunteer teams canvassed each of the three neighborhoods in our proposal – W. Humboldt Park, Austin, and Woodlawn – to distribute notification flyers and inform the community of the upcoming NAC meetings. Twelve volunteers distributed 6,000 flyers (2,000 per community) within a 4-block radius and beyond in each neighborhoods' central location during the weekend of August 8 & 9 (see Appendix 1.2.a.1.v for flyers). With this canvassing, close to 100% of households within the requested 4-block radius were notified. Additionally, as stated above, we still plan to mail a notification postcard in the coming weeks and intend to promote the NAC public hearing as well as available KIPP-sponsored meetings to learn more about our proposal.

1.2.a Question #2. Please provide evidence of having conducted (or described plans to conduct) three methods of outreach to all aldermen, state representatives, and state senators within the proposed recruitment boundary: a. Requesting a meeting (if meetings have already taken place, please list the dates, times, and individuals with whom the design team met); b. Attending the elected officials' Ward or district meetings; c. Sending formal notification of the proposed school either by mail or letter.

State Outreach: KIPP Chicago Design Team members used the following methods to engage State Senator Mattie Hunter (3rd District, incl. Woodlawn), State Representative Ken Dunkin (5th District, incl. Woodlawn), State Senator Patricia Van Pelt (5th District incl. Austin and Humboldt Park) and Representative Pamela Reaves-Harris (10th District, incl. Austin and Humboldt Park):

- Emailed Senators and Representatives on August 8th, 2015 regarding our intention to open new schools
- Requested a meeting with each state representative in that correspondence; we plan to follow-up shortly with hopes to connect in August or September
- Attended Lobby Day hosted by Illinois Network of Charter Schools (INCS) on Thursday, May 21st, 2015. KIPP Design Team members left notification of our intention to open schools with each of their offices and offered to meet or host members on a tour of our schools

Please note that State Senator Patricia Van Pelt and Representative Pamela Reaves-Harris are also the legislators for an existing KIPP school in Austin, KIPP Create College Preparatory at 4818 W. Ohio St.

See appendix 1.2.a.2.i for email correspondence and formal notification letters.

Local Outreach: KIPP Chicago Design Team members have used at least three methods of outreach for each of the Aldermen for the proposed locations (below), as well as Alderman in other Wards originally

identified in the Tier 1 proposal. The combined outreach efforts helped us to hone the neighborhood list.

Relevant Community Area	Alderman	Ward	Ward Meetings Attendance (a)	Meeting Request (b)	Formal Notification by Email (c)
Austin, W. Humboldt Park	Emma Mitts	37 th	Yes, attended Monday, June 8, 2015	Yes— we requested a meeting by email on May 28, 2015 and again on July 23, 2015. In addition to the ward night, we met one-on-one with Ald. Mitts on Thursday, July 30, 2015	Yes, on August 9, 2015
Austin, W. Garfield	Jason Ervin	28 th	Yes, attended Wednesday, June 24	Yes – we requested a meeting by email on May 28, 2015	Yes, on August 9, 2015
Woodlawn	Willie B. Cochran	20 th	Yes, attended one-on-one meeting held on July 14, 2015	Yes— we requested a meeting by email on May 28, 2015 and we met with Ald. Cochran on July 14, 2015; a follow-up meeting is being scheduled	Yes, on August 9, 2015

In addition to outreach to legislators within the refined proposed recruitment boundaries, we performed additional outreach to legislators in Wards that cover community areas we had previously considered for site locations:

Community Area	Alderman	Ward	Ward Meetings Attendance (a)	Meeting Request (b)	Formal Notification by Email (c)
Bronzeville	Pat Dowell	3 rd	Attended private meeting held on July 15, 2015	Yes— we requested a meeting by email on June 30, 2015 and met with Ald. Dowell's Director of Education and Social Services, Brian Freedman, on July 15, 2015	N/A: we removed Bronzeville from the neighborhood list at this time
Bronzeville	Will Burns	4 th	Attended private meeting held on August 8, 2015	Yes— we requested a meeting by email on May 28, 2015 and met with Ald. Burns on Friday, August 7, 2015	N/A: we removed Bronzeville from the neighborhood list at this time
Chicago Lawn	Michael Zalewski	24 th	N/A	Yes—we emailed Ald. Zalewski on May 29, 2015. We also spoke by phone in June, at which point the	N/A: we removed Chicago Lawn from the neighborhood list at this time

				Ald. verbally committed to a meeting, though ultimately determined that Chicago Lawn was not a viable neighborhood for us.	
Englewood	Willie B. Cochran	20 th	Yes, attended one-on-one meeting was held on July 14, 2015	Yes— we requested a meeting by email on May 28, 2015 and we met with Ald. Cochran on July 14, 2015; a follow-up meeting is being scheduled	N/A: we removed Englewood from the neighborhood list at this time, though we are still in communication with Ald. Cochran re: Woodlawn

Please see Appendix 1.2.a.2.ii for the meeting requests and formal notifications shared with Aldermen.

1.2.a Question #3. List the community leaders, businesses, or organizations with whom your design team has met to discuss the educational vision for the proposed new school/campus.

Robust community engagement work became our focus once we conducted all necessary conversations with Aldermen and the neighborhoods were determined in late July. We look forward to continuing our efforts to connect with stakeholders, businesses, and organizations in the coming weeks. To date, we have met with, are scheduled to meet with, or requested a meeting with the following in Woodlawn:

Community Area	Community Leaders / Organizations	Work in the Community	Notes
Woodlawn	Preservation of Affordable Housing (POAH)	POAH and the City of Chicago have teamed up with a strong coalition of community-based organizations and stakeholders to transform Woodlawn into a "neighborhood of choice" – a transformation centered on the redevelopment of three city blocks along South Cottage Grove Avenue between East 60th and 63rd Streets. (See Appendix 1.2.a.3.i for additional information.)	Met on July 27; meeting again on Aug 13
Woodlawn	SGA Youth & Family Services	Social service agency serving adolescents, young adults and their families by providing them with professional psychotherapeutic and prevention services. Partnering with Preservation of Affordable Housing (POAH) on Chicago's South Side, SGA's Woodlawn Resource Center looks to provide solutions children, youth and families in Chicago's Woodlawn community, a neighborhood bordered by Lake Michigan and Hyde Park. For over 50 years, community members have been dealing with high rates of crime and violence. SGA's	Met on Aug 5; will meet again in late August

		Woodlawn Resource center brings a variety of services to meet the community's need. (See Appendix 1.2.a.3.ii for additional information.)	
Woodlawn	Woodlawn Children's Promise Community	The Woodlawn Children's Promise Community is a community-based effort to radically improve the trajectory of children's lives in Woodlawn, neighborhood on Chicago's Southside. We promote whole child development in every important aspect of a child's life—before, during, and after school the school day; at home; and across the neighborhood. WCPC has been built from the ground up, systematically engaging community-based organizations, parents, educators, local leaders, and civic institutions to work together as partners in education. (See woodlawnpromise.org for additional information.)	Meeting is scheduled for Aug 18

There are numerous important conversations that we are eager to hold with leaders in Woodlawn, and we will continue to reach out to additional community stakeholders including pastors and other trusted community organizations after Tier 2 submission.

In Austin and W. Humboldt Park, we began by meeting with Ald. Emma Mitts in tandem with honing our Tier 1 neighborhood list. Our proposal for the Austin and W. Humboldt Park communities were solidified later in July and therefore, our planned community leader/organization meetings will be taking place later in August and September. In the meantime, we have focused our initial engagement efforts on connecting with existing KIPP families and canvassing in the W. Humboldt Park area. However, we are confident that continued community engagement efforts will lead us to connecting with critical organizations in the coming weeks. In particular, we already have numerous relationships with local organizations, especially in Austin, and plan to reach out to stakeholders after Tier 2 submission.

1.2.b Question #1. Please describe the structure of the community meetings that your design team has held to discuss the school model and seek residents' feedback on the educational vision for the proposed school.

Members of the Design Team held a community meeting in west Woodlawn at The Grant at Woodlawn Park's community room located at 6129 S. Cottage Grove on Thursday, August 6, 2015. The Grant at Woodlawn Park is a facility operated by the Preservation of Affordable Housing (POAH). The Woodlawn Park properties are providing comfortable and affordable homes to members of the community. The property is located on the main thoroughfare of Cottage Grove in the Woodlawn neighborhood. The Design Team chose this location because of its proximity to the Green Line train and because the intersection of 63rd Street and Cottage Grove is where we have met a several families interested in the opening of a tuition-free, college prep school. Please see Appendix 1.2.b.1.i for Sign-In Sheet.

The purpose of the meeting was to consult with community residents to better understand their needs so that we can effectively serve its unique targeted student population. The community meeting offered attendees the opportunity to provide feedback on the educational vision for the proposed school and discuss what is most important to them for their community. The meeting had three objectives:

- Allow time for Woodlawn community members and the KIPP Chicago Team and Family to get to know one another
- Discuss the impact of a K-8 KIPP School in Woodlawn based on the proposed academic vision
- Identify feedback from community members about the proposed K-8 KIPP School in Woodlawn

During the meeting, the Design Team presented information about the academic results of KIPP Chicago, the aspiration to partner with the Woodlawn community to open a K-8 KIPP school, and shared aspects of our academic vision in order to receive feedback. Please see Appendix 1.2.b.1.ii for the full presentation.

In order to seek feedback, the Design Team provided attendees with an interactive handout that began by soliciting their opinions on the following two questions:

1. In your opinion, what makes a great school?
2. Name the top three things that makes your community great.

Following those two questions, the Design Team presented five aspects of the academic vision of the proposed school. Attendees were asked to rate those aspects on a 5 point scale with 1 being that it was “not important” to a high-quality education and a 5 being that it was “very important” to a high-quality education. The five aspects of the school that were shared are listed below:

- **More Time.** Students would start school at 7:45 and end school at 4:00. They would also begin school 3 weeks earlier than most Chicago schools.
- **Technology in the Classroom.** Students would have access to technology in their classrooms and login ability to online learning systems. Teachers would schedule time for students to use technology to advance their learning.
- **Students Know What They Know.** Students are responsible for knowing the details about their academic progress. After each assessment, students will track their own achievement data and create a plan on how to achieve their growth goals.
- **Character Counts.** Students will not only focus on academics, but on learning the character traits that will help them become independent learners and young leaders in their community.
- **College Bound.** College bound students are driven by the desire to set high goals and work hard to reach those goals. A culture of college will be built in to each school day.

Attendees provided feedback on an interactive handout sheets that were collected by the presenters. Please see Appendix 1.2.b.1.iii for a template handout, as well as completed handouts with responses. We plan to continue hosting community meetings in each neighborhood and will follow a similar format. This structure allowed us to authentically engage participants rather than “present to” families, and it led to incredibly meaningful conversations both during and after the meeting.

Our West Side neighborhood community meeting has been rescheduled due to a conflict with the originally planned meeting. We are planning to reschedule the community meeting for the week of August 16. Instead, we focused remaining efforts on community canvassing and outreach to the numerous KIPP Chicago families in Humboldt Park, Garfield Park, and Austin. During the week of August 3, we placed calls to 150 families and had 63 detailed conversations about our growth efforts.

1.2.b Question #2. Please discuss the various “on the ground” outreach activities that your design team has conducted. In which geographic areas within the recruitment boundary did your team’s outreach activities take place? Which members of your design team participated in outreach activities? Who else did your design team enlist to help conduct outreach in the

neighborhoods (e.g. advisors, collaborators, supporters, community members, paid staff, etc.)? What materials and information did representatives of your team share with community members to discuss the educational vision for the proposed school? What questions did your team ask community residents?

On-the-Ground Outreach Activities Conducted:

- Over the summer, outreach activities began with targeted conversations with select community stakeholders and religious leaders connected to some of the originally identified private facility options. This early outreach was critical to helping us narrow our neighborhood focus.
- Throughout July, staff members who engaged in student recruitment efforts included information about KIPP's growth as they canvassed door-to-door and talked with families. This process is ongoing through mid-August. Approximately 1,300 flyers were distributed through this effort, with most concentration in and around Woodlawn.
- In early August, growth teams began canvassing in W. Humboldt Park and Austin, and continued canvassing in Woodlawn. This included talking to residents in high-traffic areas, and leaving flyers on cars and at homes. Approximately 600 flyers were distributed during this process.
- In March and again in early August, current KIPP families were called to discuss KIPP's growth efforts. Approximately 300 families received phone calls.
- On August 8 & 9, growth teams in all three neighborhoods continued canvassing by leaving additional flyers with updated NAC information at homes and talking with residents. 6,000 flyers were distributed during this time.

Geographic Areas of Outreach:

- The outreach described above has taken place within all of the refined recruitment boundaries proposed in this Tier 2 application.

Participants in Outreach Efforts:

In addition to all members of the Design Team, including the Proposed Principals, individuals who assisted with outreach efforts include:

- Nine current KIPP parents
- 11 alumni who are current summer interns
- Volunteers from partner organizations including the Illinois Network of Charter Schools (INCS) and Charter Parents United (CPU)
- Numerous additional staff members beyond the Design Team

Materials and Information Shared During Outreach Efforts:

Much of our canvassing was conducted with a focus on having one-on-one conversations with residents. In those conversations, growth teams shared about KIPP Chicago's model, discussed the possibility of new or expanding campuses, and shared their personal stories of why they are passionate about KIPP Chicago. In particular, parents were able to share their own experiences with residents, which allowed for deep and meaningful conversations.

In addition to these conversations, growth teams distributed the following:

- Growth flyers discussing KIPP Chicago's proposal, performance, and model (Appendix 1.2.a.1.i)
- Growth flyers with updated NAC meetings (Appendix 1.2.a.1.ii)
- Flyers inviting the Woodlawn community to a forum to learn more (Appendix 1.2.a.1.iii)
- Proposal notification flyers with additional NAC information (Appendix 1.2.a.1.vi)
- Letters of Support and Intent to Enroll Forms (Appendix 1.3.a.1.i; Appendix 1.3.a.1.ii; and Appendix 1.3.a.2.i)

Questions Asked During Community Outreach:

Conversations are always varied and unique to the individual, but questions often include whether they have children; what their current experience is with their schools; whether they know of KIPP Chicago; if they are interested in learning more or attending a meeting; if they would like to sign a letter of support; and, if they would like an Intent to Enroll Form. Additionally, during the community meeting, we asked for participants to tell us what they believe makes a great school, what is unique about their community, and what aspects of KIPP's model resonate with them. We also asked for feedback using a common classroom technique – glow, grow, throw, and know – to help us continue to understand what is important to families in each community.

We fully expect to continue this time-intensive, but authentic approach to personalized interactions and community engagement well after Tier 2 submission.

1.2.b Question #3. In your design team's interactions with elected officials, community organizations, businesses, parents, and community members, what were some of the reactions to the proposed school? What suggestions or feedback did community members have for the proposed school? Which pieces of feedback did the design team incorporate into the proposal and why?

Interactions and Some Reactions to Proposed School(s):

Our interactions over the summer include meeting with Alderman serving a broad array of neighborhoods, as well as conversations with parents from both the South and West Sides at separate times. Recent interactions include conversations with residents and community members. The following captures some initial reactions, as well as suggestions or feedback that we have heard:

- Overwhelming support from KIPP parents, especially for primary expansion plans
- Support from most community members/residents with whom we have interacted to date
- Broad agreement that students from the neighborhoods we are proposing deserve an opportunity to attend a high-quality school
- Desire for important partnerships, especially with regard to social-emotional supports for children from parents as well as Aldermen
- Interest from Aldermen in the co-location model, its benefits, and our experiences with that approach to date
- Concern from Aldermen that new schools not be located too close to the higher-performing neighborhood schools
- Questions from a few Aldermen about shifting demographics including whether enough families with students reside in the neighborhood, and shifting socio-economic demographics that wouldn't align with our mission to serve students from low-income families

While we are still in the midst of community engagement, and expect that continued conversations and meetings will help us hone our school vision, we believe there is already great feedback to consider. In particular, we are happy to hear that many people believe the co-location model makes sense for our city, and that collaboration and partnerships are important. We also carefully considered feedback from Aldermen, which was an important contributing factor to how we refined our neighborhood list. As stated in the Tier 1 proposal, community engagement has been a vital aspect of our earlier growth. When opening schools previously and engaging with those communities, we heard feedback that included a desire for a school with a focus on social-emotional learning, extended extracurricular opportunities, and more information on college access programming. We expect that similar feedback will continue to arise during this community engagement process and we will be prepared to answer

these questions, as well as receive feedback specific to the proposed communities. We know that open communication with the intended communities lays solid groundwork for relationships that will benefit students throughout their entire educational careers with KIPP. Parent and community engagement and positive relationship building with all residents are critical to the success of KIPP Chicago, and a cornerstone of the prelude to our opening a school.

DIMENSION 1.3: PARENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

1.3.a Question #1. Who are some of the champions of the proposed school in the targeted community(ies)? Please provide any personalized letters of support from parents and/or community members outlining why they believe the proposed school will be an asset to the community.

We have a strong corps of KIPP champions in the communities we are proposing, particularly in the parents and families of KIPP students. For many years, this group has communicated a desire for KIPP's expansion into primary grades, as well as growth into new communities. To date, our numerous conversations with parents have been over the phone and/or in-person, and we will be continuing to collect formal letters of support once parents are back to school in mid-August. Additionally, we have collected letters of support from community residents during early canvassing efforts. At the time of Tier 2 submission, we have collected letters of support from residents in and around the Woodlawn neighborhood, as well from families from the West Side (see Appendices 1.3.a.1.i and 1.3.a.1.ii). Additionally, we have secured 119 unique pledges of support from current KIPP families who were called.

In reviewing the current letters of support and statements from parent phone calls, it is clear that parents believe the proposed school would be an asset to their community. Throughout the process, the Design Team heard resounding feedback that parents desired a high quality school that was safe, had "passionate teachers to help kids love school", and provide special education services that meet the needs of their children.

When discussing the proposed schools with parents that currently have students attending a KIPP middle school in the west of south side of Chicago, they cited that providing a K-8 campus would allow them to have all of their children at the same location. Other than being convenient, parents discussed the need for strong K-4 classrooms in their neighborhoods.

The Design Team also met several people, young and old, that did not have children in the K-8 age range. These community members were still excited at the possibility of providing a good school with longer hours for the children of the neighborhood. Rickie B. of Humboldt Park said, "I think [this school] gives the children in the neighborhood better opportunities." Terrance W. of Humboldt Park/West Garfield Park said in reference to the current options for schools in his neighborhood that he wants "something different in the community." He thought that KIPP could provide "better opportunities for the youth."

1.3.a Question #2. Please provide evidence that parents of age-eligible children would consider sending their children to the proposed school in the fall of 2016 or the proposed opening year.

Through deep relationships with current families and families of alumni, we already know people who would like to send their children to KIPP via a primary school expansion or the opening of new schools. Currently, we are still weaving efforts to obtain intent to enroll forms into existing student recruitment efforts, on-the-ground canvassing, and back-to-school events with families. As stated previously, we were very deliberate to not engage prospective parents until we had narrowed our neighborhood focus and felt confident that we could present the best possible proposal to open in that respective community. Conversations with parents are heartfelt and delicate, and we place tremendous weight on what it takes to authentically connect with a family in a way that would inspire an intent to enroll. We plan to continue these conversations throughout the fall, especially now that we have determined our

prospective neighborhoods. The Intent to Enroll forms that we have collected to date can be found in Appendix 1.3.a.2.i):

Additionally, 62 parents have indicated via phone conversations or through letters of support that they know age-eligible children for the new schools and members of the Design Team will be following up with those families in the coming weeks as school starts back up.

For KIPP #4 in Woodlawn, we can also demonstrate that 42 families from east of the Dan Ryan have chosen to enroll their rising 5th graders into KIPP Bloom College Prep, our middle school in Englewood. Those families would have the option to transfer to the new campus in Woodlawn in 2016 along with a new class of 5th graders.

And finally, as an indication of the strong desire for additional KIPP primary grades on the West Side, 412 students are currently on the waitlist for KIPP Ascend Primary, 155 of whom live in the proposed recruitment boundaries for both KIPP Create Primary and KIPP #5.

1.3.a Question #3. List any elected officials who support the proposed school. Note: if the applicant included a table in Dimension 2.1.b., the applicant may choose to add a "letter of support" column to check if the elected official supports the proposed school.

In Appendix 1.3.a.3, we have included a letter of support from Alderman Emma Mitts of the 37th, in which she communicates her support for our proposed primary school expansion in Austin and a proposed new K-8 campus in the W. Humboldt Park neighborhood in her Ward.

Our conversation with Alderman Cochran of the 20th Ward was encouraging for our desire to open a school in Woodlawn. Specifically, Alderman Cochran requested that we connect with the Woodlawn Children's Promise Community (WCPC). A meeting with WCPC is scheduled for Tuesday, August 18, 2015. Talking with these important stakeholders, among others, is part of the deep community engagement we are committed to, and we look forward to the conversations. Our hope is that these efforts, combined with continued community connections with nonprofits, community based organizations, religious entities, and community leaders, will enable Alderman Cochran to put forth a formal statement of support when appropriate.

1.3.a Question #4. List organizations, businesses, or leaders in the targeted community(ies) (required) or city-wide organizations, businesses, or leaders (optional) that support the proposed school. Attach letters of support that explain the basis for their support of the proposed school. Note: if the applicant included a table in Dimension 2.1.c., the applicant may choose to add a "letter of support" column to check if the community organizations or stakeholders support the proposed school.

Though we have met with organizations, businesses, and leaders in our proposed communities, we have not solicited formal support from them. We believe strong relationships are built on an investment of time and continued collaboration, and we feel it has been too early to request formal letters of support. However, we are hopeful that our continued engagement efforts will lead to demonstrated support during future community forums and hearings.

Appendix 1.3.a.4 includes a letter of support from Charter Parents United, a peer organization and advocate for strong parent and community engagement.

1.3.b Question #1. Based on your design team’s interactions with parents, community members, elected officials, community organizations, leaders, and businesses, who in the community is opposed to the proposed school? What is your understanding of why they are opposed to the proposed school?

At this time, we do not know of any specific opposition to the proposed schools – any stated opposition was taken into consideration during the refinement of our proposed neighborhoods over the summer. However, we recognize that this is a reflection of where we are in the overall community engagement process for our newly refined community list and proposed boundaries. We anticipate there will be many different opinions about opening new and expanded KIPP schools, and we are prepared to encounter some opposition. However, we will seek to fully understand all positions, including those in opposition to the schools, so we can ensure KIPP Chicago will respond to and fit the needs of the communities.

DIMENSION 1.4: CONTINUED PARENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

1.4.a Question #1. What is your design team's continued community engagement plan from proposal submission leading up to the opening of the school?

KIPP Chicago believes community engagement must be an ongoing process. Beyond the development and approval of new schools, we must continue to engage families and community members to position the schools for successful openings and strong first years. Moreover, fulfilling our mission of helping underserved Chicago students get to and through college requires deep engagement in the community and involved families who desire to send their children to KIPP, year after year.

After the Tier 2 submission, steps we will continue to take to build community support will include:

- hosting school tours at existing KIPP Chicago campuses so that stakeholders can see our model in action;
- ensuring we are active participants in ward nights and community meetings where we built initial relationships;
- ongoing conversations with elected officials – including hosting “Aldermen Days” similar to what we’ve done at other KIPP Chicago schools, and inviting officials to significant school-based events;
- significant on-the-ground student recruitment efforts in order to secure meaningful interactions with families;
- inviting stakeholders to KIPP Chicago events; and,
- engaging key stakeholders as we further develop facility plans.

Proposed Principals will take a role in continuing community engagement in the neighborhoods where we will open. On a broader level, members of the Design Team and Parent Advocacy Leaders (further described in Dimension 1.4.b Question #1) will continue engaging elected officials. We expect to further our work with INCS to continue hosting legislative tours, provide engagement opportunities for parents, and provide support for any parent or community member who wants to continue advocating on our behalf. We are also reaching out to KIPP cousins across the network to better understand successful parent and community engagement approaches in other communities.

1.4.b Question #1. What formalized mechanism(s) will the proposed school have in place for parents and the community to be involved in the governance of the school and/or provide regular feedback to the Board of Directors? If the proposed governance structure does not require parent and community representatives on the Board, please explain why not. What policies and/or procedures will be in place for parents to share an objection or concern regarding a governing board policy or decision, administrative procedure, or practice at the school?

KIPP Chicago has grown to operate three schools, across four campuses in three distinct communities in Chicago. As further detailed in Dimension 3.2.a Question #1, our Board of Directors provides leadership, direction, and support in governing the full organization, but day-to-day operations of each school is managed by each Principal with oversight from the Executive Director. For this reason, the current governance structure does not *require* a parent or community representative on the Board.

While we do not have a parent or community representative on the Board of Directors, we have established Parent Advocacy Leaders (PALs) at each of our schools and will add a new PAL at each of the proposed schools. Currently, the PALs serve as community-level ambassadors and assist with various

advocacy needs. Moving forward, we plan to add additional PALs to ensure there is a mechanism in place for feedback to the Board.

In addition to the PALs, the KIPP Chicago Board of Directors keeps a pulse on overall parent feelings about our schools through results from the KIPP Healthy Schools and Regions (HSR) survey. Parents, students and teachers are surveyed through HSR annually and parents respond to questions such as the following using a five-point scale:

- Overall, I am satisfied with this school.
- Parents are involved in making important school decisions.
- The school communicates with families openly and respectfully.
- The teachers make their lessons relevant to my child's culture and background.
- I am proud that my child attends KIPP.
- The school has a positive impact on my child's academic performance, character, and conduct/behavior.

Responses are aggregated at the school and regional level, and a report is shared with the leadership team and Board of Directors. Results allow the Board to understand parent satisfaction at a macro level and to identify areas where schools may need to address parent concerns.

Finally, parent objections and concerns filter through the Principal and, when necessary, to the Executive Director, who serves as a member of the Board. In extreme cases, the Executive Director may also share a concern or grievance with the Chair of the Board for further review. KIPP Chicago works hard to resolve parent grievances or concerns before a matter escalates to that level.

1.4.b Question #2. Describe the coalition of partners and collaborators that your design team has formed in the targeted community(ies) who can provide support services for the school's students and families once in operation. Please describe any community-based partnerships you are proposing for the new school (required) and partnerships with city-wide organizations (optional). Please provide letters of support from these organizations. Explain whose responsibility it will be leading up to school opening and once the school is in operation to oversee these partnerships. Note: If an identified partner will play an integral role in implementing the proposed school model (e.g. providing services or supports as part of the school day or after-school hours), please also provide a detailed memorandum of understanding (MOU), letter of intent or commitment, or draft contract between the two organizations (required).

Partnerships are critical to meet the varying and comprehensive needs of students and families. KIPP Chicago has placed great importance on connecting students and families to resources based on individual needs. To that end, we have a strong list of partners with whom we've worked in the past (see Dimension 2.1.b Question #14) and with whom we expect to expand work within the newly proposed communities (as geographically appropriate for their catchment areas). Furthermore, we will leverage existing partners and peers to suggest new partnerships specific to the communities we are proposing. We expect continued community engagement will also surface the right potential partners. For example, in the Woodlawn community, there is an opportunity to partner with SGA Youth & Family Services for social-emotional supports, and an opportunity to expand our current partnership with the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration to provide additional social work support at the new KIPP campus. The Woodlawn Children's Promise Community is also a vital organization for the greater Woodlawn area and we would welcome ways in which we could collaborate.

The Director of Community Engagement will oversee partnerships at the macro level, as well as at the school level, with support from the Principal and/or Social Worker. We have established this position to

thoughtfully create, maintain, and forward the critical relationships required to meet the multitude of services students may need. The Director of Community Engagement develops and oversees effective community engagement, parent engagement, and student recruitment strategies. The goal of this position is to build strong community relationships; to ensure families know KIPP Chicago is a high-performing, free, college prep education option in their community; and to develop partnerships with organizations that can help further the mission of KIPP Chicago.

1.4.b Question #3. How will the proposed school contribute to the broader community? What services will it provide to families of students and/or community residents?

Schools have a great responsibility to be an active and helpful member of the community. At KIPP Chicago, one of the core philosophies central to our culture is that “We are a Team and Family.” This applies to the full breadth of KIPP stakeholders – from school leaders and staff to students, their parents, and many members of their extended families. For KIPP Chicago to fulfill its mission of helping students all the way through college, we must commit to engage the whole family rather than act as a transactional stop on the K-12 continuum.

Among the services we provide are continued support to alumni and their families for 10+ years after 8th-grade graduation, supporting them on each step to and through college. We also help connect families to services through our numerous partners and peers (see Dimension 2.1.b Question #14). And, each school hosts Team and Family Saturdays, where students and families come together to engage in extracurriculars and/or to attend various workshops.

Additionally, we believe it benefits the community greatly when we can share space with a traditional neighborhood school that is significantly underutilized. Sharing space allows both schools to be in operation, reduces the amount of overhead for both schools, and provides opportunities for collaboration. Ideally, our co-shares will have joint after-school programming to benefit all students, and teachers from both schools will be able to participate in some shared professional development so that all teachers and students can continue growing together.

DIMENSION 4.1: FINANCIAL FORMS AND BUDGET NARRATIVE

4.1.a Financial Forms and Budget Narrative

Question #1. Complete the budget workbook. Instructions are provided on the first tab of the budget workbook. Include a budget narrative that summarizes the budget and describes how the budget reflects the mission, vision, education plan, and overall strategic development of the proposed school. Discuss how resources will be used to support identified school priorities, including any changes in that allocation over the first five years of the school's existence. If a Next Generation blended learning applicant, please include costs associated with the implementation of the blended learning model, including device set-up support, device repair and replacement, infrastructure, IT support and home Internet access.

Despite the fact that the district and state are in a difficult financial position at this time, we must not back away from the challenge of ensuring every student in the city of Chicago has an opportunity to go to and through college, regardless of her/his zip code. KIPP Chicago believes our mission and vision are more critical than ever – when limited budgets arise, we cannot make choices that limit student options; instead, we must creatively seek ways to reduce costs away from the classroom and continue providing high quality education for the students that need it the most.

KIPP schools across the country seek private funding to support programs that extend beyond the classroom, finance capital campaigns, and fuel the growth of KIPP schools in their respective regions. In Chicago, we share these fundraising needs, but are faced with the additional challenge that charter schools in the state of Illinois and, more specifically, in the city of Chicago, are subject to one of the lowest charter per-pupil tuition rates in the nation. To achieve our mission and implement the KIPP model that has proven successful nationwide, KIPP Chicago must fundraise beyond the current per-pupil tuition rate provided to our Chicago schools.

Budget overview: KIPP Chicago's model delivers 24% more instructional time than traditional Chicago Public Schools and delivers the KIPP Through College Program, which is a comprehensive high school and college placement and completion program that provides assistance for our students from 7th grade through college completion. Public funding covers 92 percent of total costs, which requires KIPP Chicago to raise between \$2 million and \$2.3 million per year for the first five years of this growth plan, depending on whether the model is based on co-shares or independent facilities. As KIPP Chicago grows, the need for fundraising also grows; as our schools reach scale, the need stabilizes and then decreases. Once KIPP Chicago reaches its full 10-school plan, fundraising exclusively supports the KIPP Through College program. Appendix 4.1.a.1.i-ii (Budget Workbooks) gives a complete analysis of the revenues and expenses for each new school under a co-share and independent facility model.

Revenues: Per-pupil funding from CPS remains our most central source of revenue—yet it has fluctuated dramatically over the last 5 years. It is important to note that these projections assume public per-pupil funding will not increase from 2014-2015 levels; this is an assumption that is locked into the budget by CPS. If funding truly stays fixed for the next five years, we are forced to make tough choices about our model, but remain confident we can continue excellent results for our families. CPS per-pupil revenue figures are dependent solely on enrollment, and we monitor student recruitment and enrollment very carefully to ensure we meet financial targets. Additionally, we take advantage of federal funding to supplement revenue from CPS and the state. The Charter Schools Program (CSP) continues to be a strong source of start-up funding for KIPP, and we also use federal ERATE dollars to help offset the costs of voice and internet services. For a description of private fundraising, please see Dimension 4.1.b Question #1.

Expenses: Our key costs fall into the buckets of direct students costs, personnel costs, and facilities.

Direct student costs including Next Generation learning: Our direct student costs have changed significantly in the past five years as we have transitioned schools to a Next Generation learning model. In primary schools, we provide nine computers in every classroom, and in middle schools, we provide thirty computers in every classroom. Our curriculum is now a blend of paper-based materials and computer-based programs—we use start-up funding and private grants to cover these costs, but continue to also urge the use of free and/or inexpensive options wherever possible. For example, we switched to Chromebooks in our middle school classrooms (a less expensive option) and now use Khan Academy as one of our math curriculum options (a free option). While we are cautious not to adopt a less effective curriculum or technology just because it is free, when we find like-minded organizations offering high quality resources at no or low cost, we incorporate them as it makes sense.

It is also important to note that we invest in certain programs that *are* expensive because we deem them critical to ensure students are well prepared for college-prep high schools and college. We continue to increase investment in after-school programs such as coding, gardening, violin, basketball, volleyball, Zumba, Step, cheerleading, Girls on the Run, Girl Scouts, and rugby, to name a few. It is critical that students and families can access a well-rounded experience both in and out of the classroom. Additionally, each spring, all middle school students may attend End-of-Year Field Lessons at colleges and universities across the country such as University of Illinois, University of Wisconsin, University of Michigan, Michigan State, Bradley University, Morehouse, Spelman, Howard, University of Maryland, and George Washington University. These experiences give them first-hand exposure to college life, and make our mission and vision come alive, proving the possible that if they stay committed, they will graduate from college.

Personnel costs: Personnel expenses account for approximately 55% of costs. It is extremely important to us to pay employees a competitive salary that recognizes their hard work and dedication to students and families. While we would love to give staff higher raises each year, we are careful to increase salaries only in so far as public funding increases. In years during which funding has been cut, we have been able to increase salaries modestly while finding other places to trim. We have never had to lay off staff members due to changes in funding from the district.

Facilities costs: Facilities are the third significant bucket of expenditures. We remain committed to finding opportunities to co-share with existing CPS schools that are underutilized. We strongly believe that there are enough school buildings in Chicago; there are just not enough high-quality seats in neighborhoods that need them the most. For this reason, we urge CPS to consider co-share opportunities with high-quality charter operators to make it possible for charters to grow and spend every dollar possible on education, rather than diverting resources to unnecessary capital expenditures. Our hope is that CPS will approve KIPP for co-shares to keep utilization as high as possible in these buildings and to minimize the number of charter schools that need to operate in non-CPS buildings. If that is not possible, we will seek independent facilities to keep providing KIPP schools to students in Chicago who need us the most.

Regardless of facility type, one key cost that continues to increase is the bandwidth required to operate Next Generation schools. Each school requires an extensive build-out for the internal network as well as upgraded bandwidth to handle Internet traffic generated by student and staff devices. We continue to work aggressively on ERate funding to pay for bandwidth. As ERate funds shift away from internal network build-outs, we have successfully attracted private donors to help share these costs.

As we consider growth, we will further assess our model to keep fundraising realistic. We will continue to explore innovative staffing models that are sustainable. We will explore facility options to make sure we have the best long-term strategy. And we will continue researching effective curriculum – both traditional forms and Next Generation – to ensure our students are on a path to college-readiness after attending our schools.

4.1.b Question #1. Discuss additional revenue needed to maintain financial viability over the five-year contract, including assumptions behind the calculation of need. Please identify existing relationships with potential funders, indicate current levels of interest, and articulate contingency plans in the event that development goals are not realized.

KIPP Chicago has an exceptional track record of meeting its fundraising goals. Its highly committed Board of Directors and staff have steadily increased annual philanthropic revenue. In FY10, when we began our growth, our annual fundraising equaled \$600,000. Five years later, we now average \$2.5 million each year. Our total fundraising from FY10 through FY15 equals \$10.5 million.

Revenue Need: KIPP Chicago built a comprehensive, multi-year strategic development plan in 2014, which outlined strategies the Board of Directors and External Affairs team members will use to raise additional revenue needed to achieve growth plans. This plan accounted for the new and expanded schools KIPP Chicago has outlined in this proposal. In a co-share model, KIPP Chicago will need on average \$1.9 million per year for five years as schools scale, whereas in an independent facility model, KIPP Chicago will need \$2.3 million on average per year to fund the core model and lease assumptions; capital expenditures will be financed originally through Turner-Agassi and then through a capital campaign. This fundraising helps offset growth and program costs while schools scale. Our fundraising need will peak in FY17 and FY18 and then decline as efficiencies are realized. At scale, KIPP Chicago's school operations will be sustainable on public revenue, and we will rely on private fundraising only for KIPP Through College, the alumni support program. We will also consider seeking additional revenue for programmatic enhancements, but only as such opportunities make sense programmatically and financially.

Viable Funders: KIPP Chicago has built strong relationships with many local funders who are enthusiastic about KIPP's continued growth in Chicago. The [REDACTED] has made several multi-year grants to KIPP Chicago in support of general operations, KIPP Through College, instructional technology, and the arts. The [REDACTED] has also committed another multi-year investment in KIPP Chicago's growth, pending approval from the CPS Board of Education. KIPP Chicago is also a member of [REDACTED] portfolio. As such, KIPP Chicago receives six-figure general operating grants and management support. [REDACTED] aspires to support its portfolio members over a five-to-ten year period as they scale. [REDACTED] program, and its regional fund, [REDACTED] have invested over \$500,000 in KIPP Chicago's school models, and are currently considering another proposal.

It is also important to note that KIPP Chicago's relationship with the national KIPP network uniquely positions us to benefit from federal funding that might otherwise prove unattainable. In fall 2014, KIPP secured Charter School Program (CSP) funds for KIPP Chicago's proposed schools, providing us access to \$600,000 for each school opened in 2016 (paid over three years). This means that KIPP Chicago will be able to access \$1.8M in federal funds to offset start-up costs if KIPP #4, KIPP#5, and KIPP Create Primary are approved. Additionally, the KIPP Foundation identifies and applies for other federal and private foundation opportunities on behalf of KIPP regions that qualify and choose to participate. Private funders that support KIPP regional growth via the KIPP Foundation include the [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. KIPP Chicago

has received grants via all of these channels and anticipates ongoing support if our growth plans are met with CPS approval.

Finally, if KIPP Chicago is approved for growth via an independent facility, we will consider low-interest loans through organizations such as the [REDACTED], and we will further explore whether New Market Tax Credits is an option to offset costs.

Contingency Plan: KIPP Chicago is a lean organization that operates with a conservative financial model. KIPP Chicago has consistently met or exceeded its annual fundraising goals each year, allowing the organization to build its reserves. KIPP receives private revenue from various constituents (Board of Directors, high net worth individuals, family foundations, private foundations, corporate foundations and businesses). This diversification protects the organization. Should KIPP Chicago face revenue losses, we will look closely at our programming, evaluate expenditures for mission alignment and impact on student outcomes, and search for efficiencies. If absolutely necessary, we will scale back programming.

DIMENSION 4.2: FINANCIAL CONTROLS AND MONITORING

4.2.a Question #1. Describe the policies and procedures that the proposed school and Board will utilize to sustain financial health of the organization and ensure legal compliance with any requirements and restrictions for the use of public funds. How will the Board receive updates and monitor the school's financial position? Who is responsible for directly managing and overseeing the school's budget? Please note that Illinois Charter Schools Law (105 ILCS 5/27A-5(f)) requires charter schools to submit an annual audit of school finances conducted by an outside, independent contractor.

KIPP Chicago designs and implements controls in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) guided by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission's Internal Control—Integrated Framework, commonly referred to as the COSO Framework or Framework. The Framework is designed to efficiently and effectively aid executive leadership to construct and maintain strong systems of internal controls. By definition, internal control is a process, overseen by an entity's board of directors, management, and other personnel, to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of objectives relating to operations, reporting, and compliance. The Framework provides five components of reasonable assurance including control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring activities.

Effective control exists when all five components are both present and functioning in an integrated matter. The Framework notes the use of sound judgment in designing, implementing, and assessing internal controls within the boundaries established by laws, regulations, and standards. The following narrative explains KIPP Chicago's effective controls over the appropriate use of public and private funds to ensure our ongoing financial health and legal compliance.

Control environment: The 'control environment' describes organizational infrastructure and practices, and serves as the foundation for all other components of internal control, providing both discipline and structure. The tone of the control environment is set by the Board of Directors, an independent group of professionals committed to ensuring legal compliance, promoting financial stability, and overseeing the appropriate execution of duties and responsibilities of KIPP Chicago's employees. The Board of Directors considers management's recommendations but ultimately provides independent oversight of the organization.

KIPP Chicago hires competent and qualified employees throughout the organization. The Executive Director is chosen by the Board of Directors following a rigorous and objective selection process. Together, the Board of Directors and Executive Director evaluate the extent to which organizational leaders both model and cultivate a control environment marked by strong compliance with public and private fund agreements and geared towards programmatic and organizational success. Refer to Appendix 3.2.b.1.iii (Board Resumes/Bios) for a complete listing of resumes for the Executive Director, Board of Directors, and Appendix 2.2.a.1.ii (Design Team Member Resumes) for organizational leaders.

The Board of Directors and Executive Director determine the appropriate structure, reporting lines, authority, and responsibility as detailed in Dimension 3.2 of this proposal. The KIPP Chicago organizational structure ensures proper segregation of duties and clear lines of authorization authority to ensure our legal compliance and financial stability.

Risk assessment: Risk assessment is the identification, weighing, and analysis of various risks to the achievement of organizational objectives, forming a basis for determining how risks should be managed (via control activities).

Our leadership team, with the Board of Directors, regularly assesses potential risks to organizational objectives during committee meetings and monthly management team meetings. Appropriate controls are identified and incorporated to mitigate any identified risks. Our current objectives related to financial stability include: retain 60 days of cash flow, achieve 100% of budgeted enrollment, maintain a current ratio of at least 1.2, exceed a liquidity ratio of 1.5, achieve 100% of fundraising goals, and achieve an increase in net assets.

Control activities: Control activities are the policies and procedures that help mitigate identified risks to the achievement of objectives to acceptable levels (risks can never be completely eradicated). Control activities occur throughout the organization, at all levels. In coordination with the Executive Director, the Board of Directors approves controls related to legal compliance and financial stability to ensure the proper use of public funds. The Board of Directors must approve material changes to internal controls. KIPP Chicago implements policies and procedures detailed in the Fiscal Policies and Procedures manual (aka the 'Finance Manual'). See Appendix 4.2.a.1.ii Financial Policies and Procedures for the complete Finance Manual.

The primary areas of control include security and documentation related to data, cash and cash equivalent processes, deposits, fundraising, approvals, financial reporting, and asset procedures. The Finance Manual is designed to mitigate risks associated with validity, accuracy, completeness, classification, timeliness, and aggregation. The Finance Manual primarily outlines authorization of transactions, segregation of duties, adequate records and documents, security of assets and documents, and independent checks and reconciliation, which contributes to the mitigation of financial stability risks and legal compliance risks to reasonable levels. The Finance Manual is reviewed at least quarterly to ensure all policies and procedures remain present and function in an integrated matter. If management determines a policy or procedure is ineffective or absent due to changes in the environment, it is the Chief Operating Officer's duty to address the risk immediately, to update the Finance Manual pending the Board of Directors' approval, and then to implement the new control. It is the Board of Directors' responsibility to assess management's performance in these functions.

Information and communication: Information is the data obtained both externally and internally to assess an entity's performance relative to objectives. Information allows KIPP Chicago to carry out our responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner. Communication is the complete and timely transfer of information across the organization. Adequate communication relies upon open and effective channels with stakeholders, donors, partners, employees, families, students, and other parties as applicable.

We use secure electronic communication to transfer information in a timely manner to appropriate audiences. We also schedule regular meetings with the Board of Directors to ensure continuing communication and information sharing throughout the organization.

To advise KIPP Chicago regarding financial and legal compliance issues, we maintain communication with an external legal and financial body. This helps us ensure compliance in our use of public and private funds. We also maintain a positive and open relationship with Chicago Public Schools (CPS) to ensure ongoing compliance with legal and financial directives issued from CPS. Refer to the Finance Manual in Appendix 4.2.a.1.ii Financial Policies and Procedures for more information on Competitive Bidding and Financial Reporting.

KIPP Chicago's Accountant, COO, and External Affairs Team create the following reports:

- Monthly Financial Report

- Statement of Financial Position
 - Statement of Activities
 - Statement of Cash Flows
 - Statement of Financial Comments
 - Annual Forecast and Board Metrics
- Monthly Development Report
- Quarterly Financial Reports
 - Statement of Financial Position
 - Statement of Activities
 - Statement of Cash Flows
 - Statement of Financial Comments
 - Annual Forecast and Board Metrics
- Quarterly Development Report
- Annual Financial Reports
 - 990's
 - Audit
 - Annual Budget

These reports are effective and timely in assessing financial stability, growth, control, and compliance. Together, these documents satisfy both Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) and CPS financial reporting requirements. We submit to an independent audit annually, per compliance agreements. The frequency of and reviewing bodies for these reports are detailed below.

In addition to the financial reports above, the following reports are submitted to CPS per requirements.

- Annual Budget –July 1
- SGSA, Title 1, and Title II Program Design – July 1
- Membership for Per Pupil Funding – quarterly
- Special Education Reimbursement Invoices – 15th day following each quarter
- Quarterly Financial Reports –30th day following each quarter, 45 days after Q4
- Annual Audit – November 1
- Projected Enrollment for Next School Year – December
- Form 990 – February 15th (with approved extension)

Monitoring activities: Monitoring is the process of assessment of the design and operation of controls on a suitably timely basis to take necessary actions—by the appropriate personnel. We regularly assess the financial stability, legal compliance, and control effectiveness of our organization. It is the Board of Directors’ responsibility to review the management team’s progress in meeting organizational objectives. It is the Executive Director’s responsibility to report pertinent information actively, quickly, and consistently to the Board of Directors to ensure financial stability and legal compliance. The Chief Operating Officer and the Accountant are primarily responsible for maintaining and overseeing the budget with direction and approval from the Board of Directors. Internal controls are reviewed quarterly by the Executive Director and at least annually by the Board of Directors. Significant changes in control environment or deficiencies are reported immediately to the Board of Directors and/or the management team. It is the management team’s responsibility, in coordination with the Board of Directors, to promptly control outstanding risks to a reasonable level.

The Board of Directors meet at least on a quarterly basis and more regularly per the need of the organization. The Finance Committee meets at least on a quarterly basis and more regularly per the need of the business.

The following table outlines the frequency of financial reporting and reviewing persons:

Financial Reporting Review

	B.O.D.	Finance Committee	Executive Director	Member of B.O.D.
Monthly Statement of Financial Position			- Either or -	
Monthly Statement of Activities			- Either or -	
Monthly Statement of Cash Flows			- Either or -	
Monthly Statement of Financial Comments			- Either or -	
Monthly Annual Forecast and Board Metrics			- Either or -	
Monthly Development Report			- Either or -	
Quarterly Statement of Financial Position	X	X	X	
Quarterly Statement of Activities	X	X	X	
Quarterly Statement of Cash Flows	X	X	X	
Quarterly Statement of Financial Comments	X	X	X	
Quarterly Annual Forecast and Board Metrics	X	X	X	
Quarterly Development Report	X	X	X	
990's	X	X	X	
Annual Audit	X	X	X	
Annual Budget	X	X	X	

Chicago Public Schools also monitors the health of KIPP Chicago through the reports detailed above (see 'Information and Communication').

Conclusion: KIPP Chicago's Executive Director and Board of Directors attest that the previously described controls under the guidance of the COSO Framework are effective and efficient in controlling the risk of obtaining objectives to a reasonable level. The Executive Director and the Board of Directors further attest that the controls, policies, and procedures described above represent a clear and actionable plan to sustain financial stability and ensure legal compliance regarding the proper use of private and public funds.

A listing of financial reports generated can be found in Appendix 4.2.a.1.i.

DIMENSION 4.3: FACILITIES

4.3.a Question #1. Provide an overview of the space requirements needed to successfully implement the proposed school model, including a description of how the proposed site will need to evolve to support the school as it grows. If proposing a Next Generation blended learning model, please include technological requirements to implement the model (e.g. broadband, power, networking, hardware, distribution, speed and availability of the Internet connection at the facility, etc.).

Co-Shares: For its three proposed campuses, KIPP Chicago is working with CPS to determine whether co-shares are possible. Three of our four current campuses are co-shares. In all cases, the co-share has allowed an underutilized school to become much more efficient. We believe co-shares are a true win-win for the district and for KIPP Chicago. They allow the district to keep neighborhood schools open for families that want that option, *and* they allow families a choice for a different option (if they are seeking one) without having to travel outside their neighborhood.

Within each KIPP Chicago co-share, KIPP and our district partner schools collaborate to ensure a safe, productive, and innovative learning environment for *all* of our students. We share goals to improve educational outcomes and expand opportunity for students in each neighborhood. In this pursuit, we commit to open communication, mutual respect, and building common purpose among our shared school communities. Elements of our vision include:

Leadership

- KIPP and district principals meet regularly to ensure clear and proactive communication, and to share best practices from each school
- KIPP shares professional development opportunities, including KIPP School Leadership Programs and KIPP School Summit, with district principals

Academics

- KIPP pursues technology grants that provide resources for both schools, as well as tech support
- KIPP hosts high school and college fairs open to the school community
- KIPP Chicago shares KIPP Through College strategies, including high school placement, college placement, and financial aid seminars for families
- KIPP teachers participate in shared professional development with co-share teachers whenever possible, such as the Literacy Design Collaborative with Nash Elementary

Operations

- Shared crisis management plan and procedures to ensure safety
- Student-focused routines and procedures that maximize learning time

Culture

- “All the students are ours” culture
- KIPP shares the character strengths curriculum
- Proactively establish routines and procedures that promote safety and learning
- Shared community service commitments in each neighborhood
- Shared after school and enrichment partnerships

Private Facilities: As a safety net, KIPP Chicago is also currently has partnerships with IFF and Turner-Agassi to determine if it is feasible to acquire a building independent of the district. While this option is more expensive, and much less desirable, it is necessary to consider if the proposed co-shares do not materialize. Together, IFF and Turner-Agassi provide the resources necessary to locate, finance, and develop properties into charter schools.

Space Requirements: In our model, each grade level needs five classrooms. This means, in a K-8, we will need a total of 45 classrooms, as well as separate spaces for administrative offices, a gymnasium, cafeteria, and a kitchen. Generally, each grade level needs 10,000 square feet, although we gain efficiencies with more grade levels in a building, so a full K-8 will need approximately 70,000-80,000 square feet (Plan A). Ideally, each K-8 school will have enough room for all classrooms to be in the same building, but we are working on alternative scenarios in case they are needed. For example, we can obtain two campuses in close proximity to each other – each having 35,000-40,000 square feet, and 20-25 classrooms, and we could have K-4 in one building and 5-8 in the other (Plan B). This is the format of our KIPP Ascend campus in the North Lawndale neighborhood. Finally, there is an option to acquire a small building with the intent to add space following a capital campaign (Plan C).

Grades	Kinder	1st	2nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	Total
# of Rooms	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	45

Additional Rooms	Offices	Special Ed	Gym	Cafeteria	Kitchen	Auditorium
# of Rooms	2	2	1	2	1	1

Site Evolution: KIPP Chicago Schools grow 1-2 grades at a time, depending on the space available. Ideally, we will acquire all the space we will need at the onset, rather than negotiating for space as we grow. If we are successful in establishing a CPS co-share, we will ask that all needed space be allocated to us at the beginning of the co-share, regardless of the year in which we will reach full capacity. If we find ourselves, however, needing to acquire space outside of CPS, it is likely that we will obtain 30,000-40,000 square feet in year one, and an additional 30,000-40,000 square feet in year three or four to keep costs as low as possible.

We ready the classrooms we need (i.e. paint, furnish, install access points, etc.) in the summer ahead of the fall enrollment season, to better match funding we receive to when expenses are actually incurred. This minimizes the amount of revenue that is required in the early years and distributes expenses to match when students matriculate to the higher grades.

Next Generation blended learning: Our commitment to blended learning requires us to build robust internal networks that can handle up to a 1 Gb Internet connection at each campus, prior to the beginning of the school year. We use the federal ERate program as well as private dollars from donors to complete the network build-out at each campus, before teachers arrive to start summer induction.

Aside from this investment, our schools do not require many additional technological requirements to implement our model. Even in older buildings, the electricity is usually adequate because 30 Chromebooks per classroom can be charged in a cart off one outlet. We do not need to knock down walls to build large computer labs because our classroom-based models are sufficient for our needs. The one additional consideration we have is security in the building; our extra technology investments require a careful look at the locks, doors, windows, sensors, security cameras, etc. to ensure everything is well-maintained and able to provide a secure environment.

4.3.a Question #2. Provide an overview of each proposed site and include the following supporting materials: a. The address and a general description of the property, including its current owner and previous use; b. An Inspecting Architect's Report completed by a CPS-approved architect; c. An ADA Compliance Report completed by a CPS-approved architect; d. If the property is not currently ADA compliant, a plan for bringing the building into compliance; e. Evidence that the site is or will be secured (Letter of Intent or Memorandum of Understanding) and a description of your design team's plan to meet lease or purchase requirements; f. A plan detailing how rehabilitation work will address issues raised by the architect, meet applicable building codes, and support the proposed school's educational program, including: the scope of work to be completed; A description of persons/managing parties responsible for project management and related qualifications; A project timeline for any necessary renovations; A completed Sources and Uses of Funds Report for facility development and the planned funding mechanism to cover projected costs.

Below is the list of sites that we are currently considering for growth. Because each location is a CPS building, we are not yet submitting the specified reports (the ADA Compliance Reports, the Inspecting Architect's Reports, the Letter of Intents/Memorandums of Understanding, the Rehabilitation Plans, and the Sources and Uses of Funds Reports).

Facility Name	Address	Community	Current Use	Proposed Use
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	KIPP #4 Co-Share
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	KIPP #5 Co-Share
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	K-8 Charter School*

*The proposed facility for the expansion of KIPP Create College Prep into the primary grades will be an incubation solution. Ultimately, we will need to find a permanent home for KIPP Create Primary or change our model at KIPP Create in order to have enough room for all grades.

We will continue working with CPS to determine whether co-shares are possible in our proposed communities. The following list is a description of private facilities that may prove viable if co-locations are not possible.

Facility Name	Address	Square Feet	Lease or Sale	Cost
KIPP #4	[REDACTED]	114,000	Sale	\$700,000
		27,900	Sale	\$320,000
		40,500	Lease	TBD
		40,000	Sale	TBD
		30,000	Sale	\$204,120
KIPP #5	[REDACTED]	46,500	Lease	\$5.25/SF
		TBD	Sale	\$315,000
		76,000	Sale	\$1.875M
KIPP Create Primary	[REDACTED]	30,000	Sale/Lease	\$995,000
		TBD	TBD	TBD

4.3.a Question #3. Describe the plan to secure and update (if applicable) an appropriate facility in time for school opening.

We are working with IFF and Turner-Agassi to identify the most cost effective solutions for KIPP Chicago to open two new schools and expand a third school in the year 2016-2017. As mentioned before, our goal is to work with CPS to partner with other district schools in co-shares. If this plan does not come to fruition, we will work with IFF and Turner-Agassi to allow KIPP #4, KIPP #5, and KIPP Primary Expansion to open. Please see Appendix 4.3.a.3 for a letter of support from Turner-Agassi. A proposed timeline/facility plan will be submitted prior to the October 28, 2015 vote.