

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R027 Review Date: 9/18/2015

Criterion 1: Quality of the Program Plan: 20 Possible Points

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. The proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. | 5.60 |
| 2. The program activities directly relate to the program goals, local objectives, and strategies, as well as to the program description and project requirements. | 2.80 |
| 3. The objectives, strategies, activities, and desired results of the project are clearly specified and measurable. | 2.20 |
| 4. The design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from scientifically based research and effective practice. | 2.80 |

5. Strengths?

Strong opportunity to serve a very unique and challenging student population. Vision. Restorative Discipline. Awareness of need for college and career preparation.

6. Weaknesses?

Absence of a strong plan to meet the purpose of the RFA - "to substantially raise the achievement of their students"; Proposal was so broad based that there was a lack of strong focus on academics. Lack of inventory of skills of existing staff and lack of collaboration to build on those skills. High dependence on outside consultants to have all the answers.

Criterion 1: Quality of the Project Design: Scored 13.4 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: 20 Possible Points:

- | | |
|--|------|
| 7. The costs reflected in the budget are appropriate for the results expected. | 4.90 |
| 8. The budget, including personnel, materials, and other identified expenses, adequately supports the activities outlined in the grant proposal. | 7.00 |
| 9. Expenditures and activities are supplemental to, and do not supplant or duplicate, services currently provided. | 2.10 |

10. Strengths?

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R027 Review Date: 9/18/2015

Split funded employees appropriate for this small of campus.

11. Weaknesses?

Not sure Lifetime Health and Fitness Membership for staff is reasonable and necessary expense for this grant to cover. College of Education NCAS costs seem high.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Program: 20 Possible Point

12. Details of the needs assessment methodology are provided, and the magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed program is significant. 7.00

13. As the result of a robust assessment effort, specific needs have been identified and strategies to address those needs have been described. 7.00

14. Strengths?

Involvement of stakeholders and breadth of data.

15. Weaknesses?

Not apparent why your 2015 STAAR/EOC scores are 63%/62%. What academic data exists for non tested grades? What do the trends over time show? What do you know from taking an inventory of teacher skills and how do gaps in those skills relate to lack of student achievement?

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Project: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: (20 Possible Points)

16. Qualifications, experience, and certifications of program personnel and external consultants are of sufficient quality and depth to ensure successful implementation. 3.50

17. The management plan is designed to achieve the objectives of the proposed program on time and within budget, with appropriate timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. 2.75

18. The procedures ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed program through ongoing monitoring and adjustments as needed. 1.65

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R027 Review Date: 9/18/2015

19. The proposed program will be coordinated with similar or related efforts using existing resources and facilities and with other appropriate community, state, and federal resources to maximize the effectiveness of grant funds. 2.10

20. The level of involvement and commitment to the program of all participants, including management, staff, collaborators, and partners, is sufficient to ensure the successful implementation of the program goals, objectives, and activities. 2.80

21. Strengths?

District level positions supporting the campus. Plan for master instructional leader and data specialist. Involvement of ESC-20 and UTSA.

22. Weaknesses?

Principal not listed as part of the management plan on Schedule 14.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: Scored 12.8 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: 10 Possible Points:

23. The methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of program strategies. 1.40

24. The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures and indicators of program accomplishment that are clearly related to the intended results of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. 2.10

25. The evaluation design includes processes for collecting data, including program-level data (i.e program activities, number of participants served, etc.) and student-level academic data (i.e. achievement results, attendance data, etc.). 2.10

26. The formative evaluation processes outlined in the application provide for the identification and correction of problems throughout the duration of the grant project. 1.40

27. Strengths?

Thoroughly completed schedules.

28. Weaknesses?

Could have provided more baseline data on student academic achievement. Big vision with lack of sufficient supporting details on how you are realistically going to become a ECHS.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: Scored 7 out of 10 Possible Points.

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: 10 Possible Points

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R027 Review Date: 9/18/2015

29. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and scope to ensure equitable access and participation among all eligible program participants. 3.50

30. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and depth to accomplish the goals and objectives of the program and carry out the purpose of the grant. 2.75

31. Strengths?

Applicant is addressing students social-emotional needs.

32. Weaknesses?

Biannually meeting with external provider to review provider performance is insufficient. Any problems with providers need to be investigated and remediated as soon as possible. Schedule #18 states no barriers exist which is unrealistic.

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: Scored 6.25 out of 10 Possible Points.

Possible Additional Points: 5 Possible Points

33. Application is organized, completed according to instructions. 3.50

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 3.5 out of 5 Possible Points.

Grant-Specific Review Criteria: 100 Possible Points

34. The applicant has demonstrated a clear ability to benefit from grant resources based on their vision for school reform, district commitments, and existing structures that enable reforms to take hold (Schedule 5). 5.50

35. Family and the community members were meaningfully engaged in assessing the program needs and selecting the school improvement model (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

36. Family and community members will be meaningfully engaged in an ongoing basis through the implementation of the program (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

37. The staff and external providers on the project each serve a function that is essential to meet program goals and their roles are non-duplicative (Schedule 14, Parts 1 and 2). 7.00

38. Methods described for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers ensures highest possible quality in providers (Schedule 14, Part 3). 7.00

39. Methods described for rigorous oversight of external providers ensures ongoing high-quality service and success in delivering outcomes (Schedule 14, Part 4). 5.50

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R027 Review Date: 9/18/2015

40. Capacity gained through the proposed project will create lasting change to campus culture and practices that can be sustained after the grant period ends (Schedule 14, Part 8). 5.50

41. The interventions planned (Schedule 17, all parts) are of adequate scope and scale to meet all requirements of the federal School Improvement Grant model selected, as described in the Program Assurances. 21.00

42. Strengths?

Stakeholder engagement.

43. Weaknesses?

Plan to meet biannually with external provider to review performance. Plan to give external provider another six month to address problems.

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 65.5 out of 100 Possible Points.

44. What do you consider the major strengths of this application?

Stakeholder engagement. Campus addressing social/emotional needs of students through Restorative Discipline. Campus may want to hold a book study on "Lost at School" by Ross Green to learn about the Collaborative Problem Solving Approach.

45. What do you consider the major weaknesses of this application?

Absence of a strong plan to meet the purpose of the RFA - "to substantially raise the achievement of their students"; Proposal was so broad based that there was a lack of strong focus on academics. Lack of inventory of skills of existing staff and lack of collaboration to build on those skills. High dependence on outside consultants to have all the answers.

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter School scored 136.45 out of 205 Maximum Possible Points including Specific Review Criteria.

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R045 Review Date: 9/18/2015

Criterion 1: Quality of the Program Plan: 20 Possible Points

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. The proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. | 6.80 |
| 2. The program activities directly relate to the program goals, local objectives, and strategies, as well as to the program description and project requirements. | 3.40 |
| 3. The objectives, strategies, activities, and desired results of the project are clearly specified and measurable. | 3.40 |
| 4. The design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from scientifically based research and effective practice. | 2.80 |

5. Strengths?

The description of the school population is clearly articulated. The need to have a change is documented. Planned changes, involving the principal as the lead, are stated. Specific plans to make plans based on data is provided.

6. Weaknesses?

The name of the model is not pronounce in the executive summary.

Criterion 1: Quality of the Project Design: Scored 16.4 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: 20 Possible Points:

- | | |
|--|------|
| 7. The costs reflected in the budget are appropriate for the results expected. | 4.90 |
| 8. The budget, including personnel, materials, and other identified expenses, adequately supports the activities outlined in the grant proposal. | 5.50 |
| 9. Expenditures and activities are supplemental to, and do not supplant or duplicate, services currently provided. | 2.10 |

10. Strengths?

The budget reflect gradual decreases which are supported by projected plans to sustain. None of the positions are fully funded .

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R045 Review Date: 9/18/2015

11. Weaknesses?

Only employee benefits are allocated in year 1. More justification of this isolated request is needed. IN light of the academic and social-emotional needs of the students, membership dues costs in civic or community organizations appear to be unreasonable at \$12,000 per year for years 2-5.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: Scored 12.5 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Program: 20 Possible Point

12. Details of the needs assessment methodology are provided, and the magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed program is significant. 7.00

13. As the result of a robust assessment effort, specific needs have been identified and strategies to address those needs have been described. 7.00

14. Strengths?

Building capacity from within is shown to be a long lasting commitment.

15. Weaknesses?

There are teachers listed with the lower grades with 0-7 students. More explanation is needed as to what these teachers do when there are no students. Assessment is related for students grades 3 and above who take the STAAR test, however, there is no mention of how Pk-3 will be assessed since there are teachers listed

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Project: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: (20 Possible Points)

16. Qualifications, experience, and certifications of program personnel and external consultants are of sufficient quality and depth to ensure successful implementation. 3.50

17. The management plan is designed to achieve the objectives of the proposed program on time and within budget, with appropriate timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. 3.50

18. The procedures ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed program through ongoing monitoring and adjustments as needed. 2.10

19. The proposed program will be coordinated with similar or related efforts using existing resources and facilities and with other appropriate community, state, and federal resources to maximize the effectiveness of grant funds. 2.10

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R045 Review Date: 9/18/2015

20. The level of involvement and commitment to the program of all participants, including management, staff, collaborators, and partners, is sufficient to ensure the successful implementation of the program goals, objectives, and activities. 3.40

21. Strengths?

There is a deliberate intent to not hire full time people to the grant. The commitment of the school board is evident.

22. Weaknesses?

More consistency in use of the terms principal and/or Master Instructional Leader.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: Scored 14.6 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: 10 Possible Points:

23. The methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of program strategies. 1.40

24. The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures and indicators of program accomplishment that are clearly related to the intended results of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. 2.10

25. The evaluation design includes processes for collecting data, including program-level data (i.e program activities, number of participants served, etc.) and student-level academic data (i.e. achievement results, attendance data, etc.). 2.10

26. The formative evaluation processes outlined in the application provide for the identification and correction of problems throughout the duration of the grant project. 1.40

27. Strengths?

Full data review is collected and each staff member participated in data mine activities. A root analysis process to discover possible gaps and solutions was conducted. Commitment levels of the teachers was examined.

28. Weaknesses?

How the data is vertically aligned with State academic standards need more discussion.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: Scored 7 out of 10 Possible Points.

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: 10 Possible Points

29. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and scope to ensure equitable access and participation among all eligible program participants. 3.50

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R045 Review Date: 9/18/2015

30. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and depth to accomplish the goals and objectives of the program and carry out the purpose of the grant. 3.50

31. Strengths?

Many collaborations are listed to coordinate student success. Mentor teacher collaborations are listed.

32. Weaknesses?

The adjustment of schedule to accommodate more collaboration time with community stakeholders needs more specifics and elaboration. More information is needed to include the criteria for best-fit in the turn around model screening and selecting new staff

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: Scored 7 out of 10 Possible Points.

Possible Additional Points: 5 Possible Points

33. Application is organized, completed according to instructions. 3.50

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 3.5 out of 5 Possible Points.

Grant-Specific Review Criteria: 100 Possible Points

34. The applicant has demonstrated a clear ability to benefit from grant resources based on their vision for school reform, district commitments, and existing structures that enable reforms to take hold (Schedule 5). 7.00

35. Family and the community members were meaningfully engaged in assessing the program needs and selecting the school improvement model (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

36. Family and community members will be meaningfully engaged in an ongoing basis through the implementation of the program (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

37. The staff and external providers on the project each serve a function that is essential to meet program goals and their roles are non-duplicative (Schedule 14, Parts 1 and 2). 7.00

38. Methods described for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers ensures highest possible quality in providers (Schedule 14, Part 3). 7.00

39. Methods described for rigorous oversight of external providers ensures ongoing high-quality service and success in delivering outcomes (Schedule 14, Part 4). 5.50

40. Capacity gained through the proposed project will create lasting change to campus culture and practices that can be sustained after the grant period ends (Schedule 14, Part 8). 7.00

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R045 Review Date: 9/18/2015

41. The interventions planned (Schedule 17, all parts) are of adequate scope and scale to meet all requirements of the federal School Improvement Grant model selected, as described in the Program Assurances. 21.00

42. Strengths?

The school leverages its own capacity to provide intervention and support change. There is learning time extended for tutoring.

43. Weaknesses?

There are numerous spelling errors in the application that cause distraction to reading. While there is learning time for tutoring, there is no clear articulation of learning time extended for Enrichment.

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 68.5 out of 100 Possible Points.

44. What do you consider the major strengths of this application?

A new leader has been identified if the grant is approved and ready to take the position in January 2016. The development of a trainer of trainer model builds capacity. Data digs are scheduled to reflect in the master calendar.

45. What do you consider the major weaknesses of this application?

Experience, training and skills of the new leader is lacking to be presented. It was often confusing with the terms and responsibility of Master Instructional Leader and principal. The Implementation period of some of the tasks appear to need adjustment. Budgetary request for membership fees (\$12,000 per year for years 2-5) in civic organizations did not reveal to have merit, support or impact on the focus of the grant. There is a plan for end of year stipends, however, how it is determined is still somewhat vague. The Intervention with teachers to increase teacher quality lacked a focus on instructional strategies and methods to improve academics.

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter School scored 143.5 out of 205 Maximum Possible Points including Specific Review Criteria.

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R028 Review Date: 9/18/2015

Criterion 1: Quality of the Program Plan: 20 Possible Points

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. The proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. | 5.60 |
| <hr/> | |
| 2. The program activities directly relate to the program goals, local objectives, and strategies, as well as to the program description and project requirements. | 2.80 |
| <hr/> | |
| 3. The objectives, strategies, activities, and desired results of the project are clearly specified and measurable. | 2.80 |
| <hr/> | |
| 4. The design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from scientifically based research and effective practice. | 2.80 |

5. Strengths?

Providing historical information about the school.

6. Weaknesses?

No weakness found in this section.

Criterion 1: Quality of the Project Design: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: 20 Possible Points:

- | | |
|--|------|
| 7. The costs reflected in the budget are appropriate for the results expected. | 4.90 |
| <hr/> | |
| 8. The budget, including personnel, materials, and other identified expenses, adequately supports the activities outlined in the grant proposal. | 7.00 |
| <hr/> | |
| 9. Expenditures and activities are supplemental to, and do not supplant or duplicate, services currently provided. | 2.10 |

10. Strengths?

Reasonable Year 1 budget. Personnel already exists on the campus so there is already familiarity of the needs of the students.

11. Weaknesses?

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R028 Review Date: 9/18/2015

Quantity of some of the resources seems a bit high compared to the enrollment number

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Program: 20 Possible Point

12. Details of the needs assessment methodology are provided, and the magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed program is significant. 7.00

13. As the result of a robust assessment effort, specific needs have been identified and strategies to address those needs have been described. 7.00

14. Strengths?

Use of the Region 20 CNA tool.

15. Weaknesses?

Possibly using more data collection instruments.

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Project: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: (20 Possible Points)

16. Qualifications, experience, and certifications of program personnel and external consultants are of sufficient quality and depth to ensure successful implementation. 4.25

17. The management plan is designed to achieve the objectives of the proposed program on time and within budget, with appropriate timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. 3.50

18. The procedures ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed program through ongoing monitoring and adjustments as needed. 2.10

19. The proposed program will be coordinated with similar or related efforts using existing resources and facilities and with other appropriate community, state, and federal resources to maximize the effectiveness of grant funds. 2.10

20. The level of involvement and commitment to the program of all participants, including management, staff, collaborators, and partners, is sufficient to ensure the successful implementation of the program goals, objectives, and activities. 2.80

21. Strengths?

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R028 Review Date: 9/18/2015

Strong and high expectations for Staff Role and External providers.

22. Weaknesses?

With such a high teacher turn over rate it will be difficult to ensure sustainability. Although there is some evidence of sustainability strategies, there is little evidence of actual specific sustainability processes and deeper implementation.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: Scored 14.75 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: 10 Possible Points:

23. The methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of program strategies.	1.40
24. The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures and indicators of program accomplishment that are clearly related to the intended results of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.	2.10
25. The evaluation design includes processes for collecting data, including program-level data (i.e program activities, number of participants served, etc.) and student-level academic data (i.e. achievement results, attendance data, etc.).	2.10
26. The formative evaluation processes outlined in the application provide for the identification and correction of problems throughout the duration of the grant project.	1.40

27. Strengths?

Use of the TAIS process and 'data digs'.

28. Weaknesses?

Need more evidence of actual measurable goals and performance increment rates.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: Scored 7 out of 10 Possible Points.

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: 10 Possible Points

29. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and scope to ensure equitable access and participation among all eligible program participants.	3.50
30. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and depth to accomplish the goals and objectives of the program and carry out the purpose of the grant.	2.75

31. Strengths?

The use of multiple external providers

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R028 Review Date: 9/18/2015

32. Weaknesses?

The depth of how to reach the goals and objectives are not clearly indicated

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: Scored 6.25 out of 10 Possible Points.

Possible Additional Points: 5 Possible Points

33. Application is organized, completed according to instructions. 3.50

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 3.5 out of 5 Possible Points.

Grant-Specific Review Criteria: 100 Possible Points

34. The applicant has demonstrated a clear ability to benefit from grant resources based on their vision for school reform, district commitments, and existing structures that enable reforms to take hold (Schedule 5). 7.00

35. Family and the community members were meaningfully engaged in assessing the program needs and selecting the school improvement model (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

36. Family and community members will be meaningfully engaged in an ongoing basis through the implementation of the program (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

37. The staff and external providers on the project each serve a function that is essential to meet program goals and their roles are non-duplicative (Schedule 14, Parts 1 and 2). 8.50

38. Methods described for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers ensures highest possible quality in providers (Schedule 14, Part 3). 7.00

39. Methods described for rigorous oversight of external providers ensures ongoing high-quality service and success in delivering outcomes (Schedule 14, Part 4). 7.00

40. Capacity gained through the proposed project will create lasting change to campus culture and practices that can be sustained after the grant period ends (Schedule 14, Part 8). 7.00

41. The interventions planned (Schedule 17, all parts) are of adequate scope and scale to meet all requirements of the federal School Improvement Grant model selected, as described in the Program Assurances. 21.00

42. Strengths?

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter

County-District #: 130-801

Reviewer No: R028

Review Date: 9/18/2015

The school has already started the reform process.

43. Weaknesses?

Screening process lacks detail and depth.

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 71.5 out of 100 Possible Points.

44. What do you consider the major strengths of this application?

The passion and commitment that school personnel has towards these students.

45. What do you consider the major weaknesses of this application?

The application refers to 'research has shown' but then lacks the follow up with the actual research.

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter School scored 145 out of 205 Maximum Possible Points including Specific Review Criteria.

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R001 Review Date: 9/17/2015

Criterion 1: Quality of the Program Plan: 20 Possible Points

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. The proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. | 5.60 |
| <hr/> | |
| 2. The program activities directly relate to the program goals, local objectives, and strategies, as well as to the program description and project requirements. | 2.80 |
| <hr/> | |
| 3. The objectives, strategies, activities, and desired results of the project are clearly specified and measurable. | 2.20 |
| <hr/> | |
| 4. The design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from scientifically based research and effective practice. | 2.80 |

5. Strengths?

The needs of this learning community are clearly identified and supported.

6. Weaknesses?

Goals are not all measurable or expressed in measurable terms.

Criterion 1: Quality of the Project Design: Scored 13.4 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: 20 Possible Points:

- | | |
|--|------|
| 7. The costs reflected in the budget are appropriate for the results expected. | 4.90 |
| <hr/> | |
| 8. The budget, including personnel, materials, and other identified expenses, adequately supports the activities outlined in the grant proposal. | 7.00 |
| <hr/> | |
| 9. Expenditures and activities are supplemental to, and do not supplant or duplicate, services currently provided. | 2.10 |

10. Strengths?

Proposed expenditures are reasonable and supplemental in nature.

11. Weaknesses?

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R001 Review Date: 9/17/2015

Goals for training are abundant and may be too much to internalize all at once.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Program: 20 Possible Point

12. Details of the needs assessment methodology are provided, and the magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed program is significant. 7.00

13. As the result of a robust assessment effort, specific needs have been identified and strategies to address those needs have been described. 7.00

14. Strengths?

Needs assessment is ongoing and includes feedback from various stakeholders.

15. Weaknesses?

Goals may need to be separated into different years. Attempting to meet all needs at once may be too difficult for both staff and students.

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Project: Scored 14 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: (20 Possible Points)

16. Qualifications, experience, and certifications of program personnel and external consultants are of sufficient quality and depth to ensure successful implementation. 3.50

17. The management plan is designed to achieve the objectives of the proposed program on time and within budget, with appropriate timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. 2.75

18. The procedures ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed program through ongoing monitoring and adjustments as needed. 1.65

19. The proposed program will be coordinated with similar or related efforts using existing resources and facilities and with other appropriate community, state, and federal resources to maximize the effectiveness of grant funds. 2.10

20. The level of involvement and commitment to the program of all participants, including management, staff, collaborators, and partners, is sufficient to ensure the successful implementation of the program goals, objectives, and activities. 3.40

21. Strengths?

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R001 Review Date: 9/17/2015

Level of involvement and commitment of all stakeholders is evident.

22. Weaknesses?

Proposed program timeline is vague and does not support activities. Procedures for feedback on external services allows for one year before action is taken.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: Scored 13.4 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: 10 Possible Points:

23. The methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of program strategies.	1.10
24. The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures and indicators of program accomplishment that are clearly related to the intended results of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible.	2.10
25. The evaluation design includes processes for collecting data, including program-level data (i.e program activities, number of participants served, etc.) and student-level academic data (i.e. achievement results, attendance data, etc.).	2.10
26. The formative evaluation processes outlined in the application provide for the identification and correction of problems throughout the duration of the grant project.	1.10

27. Strengths?

A consistent and detailed plan for monitoring program strategies was clearly presented.

28. Weaknesses?

How this information is to be used to affect instruction was not as clearly defined.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: Scored 6.4 out of 10 Possible Points.

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: 10 Possible Points

29. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and scope to ensure equitable access and participation among all eligible program participants.	3.50
30. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and depth to accomplish the goals and objectives of the program and carry out the purpose of the grant.	2.75

31. Strengths?

The needs of the campus were clearly defined and addressed.

32. Weaknesses?

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R001 Review Date: 9/17/2015

Too many needs were focused on at once. Needs were addressed on surface but clearly, given the situation discussed, a more in-depth course of action may be needed.

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: Scored 6.25 out of 10 Possible Points.

Possible Additional Points: 5 Possible Points

33. Application is organized, completed according to instructions. 2.75

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 2.75 out of 5 Possible Points.

Grant-Specific Review Criteria: 100 Possible Points

34. The applicant has demonstrated a clear ability to benefit from grant resources based on their vision for school reform, district commitments, and existing structures that enable reforms to take hold (Schedule 5). 7.00

35. Family and the community members were meaningfully engaged in assessing the program needs and selecting the school improvement model (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

36. Family and community members will be meaningfully engaged in an ongoing basis through the implementation of the program (Schedule 13, Part 4). 7.00

37. The staff and external providers on the project each serve a function that is essential to meet program goals and their roles are non-duplicative (Schedule 14, Parts 1 and 2). 7.00

38. Methods described for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers ensures highest possible quality in providers (Schedule 14, Part 3). 5.50

39. Methods described for rigorous oversight of external providers ensures ongoing high-quality service and success in delivering outcomes (Schedule 14, Part 4). 5.50

40. Capacity gained through the proposed project will create lasting change to campus culture and practices that can be sustained after the grant period ends (Schedule 14, Part 8). 8.50

41. The interventions planned (Schedule 17, all parts) are of adequate scope and scale to meet all requirements of the federal School Improvement Grant model selected, as described in the Program Assurances. 21.00

42. Strengths?

Proposed program is based on urgent needs identified and supported by viable data.

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R001 Review Date: 9/17/2015

43. Weaknesses?

The scope of needs is too great to be undertaken at once. Needs might be better divided into multiple years to allow for a deeper understanding and better implementation. Consistency in teaching staff which was achieved for two years has now been disrupted.

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 68.5 out of 100 Possible Points.

44. What do you consider the major strengths of this application?

The needs of this campus are real and unique. The need is urgent.

45. What do you consider the major weaknesses of this application?

This actual proposal was weak although the need is great.

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Meadowland Charter School scored 138.7 out of 205 Maximum Possible Points including Specific Review Criteria.

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Boerne - Meadowland County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R025 Review Date: 9/17/2015

Criterion 1: Quality of the Program Plan: 20 Possible Points

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. The proposed project is appropriate to, and will successfully address, the needs of the target population or other identified needs. | 6.80 |
| <hr/> | |
| 2. The program activities directly relate to the program goals, local objectives, and strategies, as well as to the program description and project requirements. | 3.40 |
| <hr/> | |
| 3. The objectives, strategies, activities, and desired results of the project are clearly specified and measurable. | 3.40 |
| <hr/> | |
| 4. The design of the proposed project reflects up-to-date knowledge from scientifically based research and effective practice. | 3.40 |

5. Strengths?

Complete support from all stakeholders including parents and students via surveys and meetings, establishes urgency and unique needs of campus with the high population of residential treatment students, focus on social and emotional needs, collaboration with ESC 20, tools used from NCLB?TAIS/CSI, exact features of the program are described and clearly articulated in the summary and explained throughout the rest of the application

6. Weaknesses?

Little info regarding individualized instruction with such a low teacher to student ratio

Criterion 1: Quality of the Project Design: Scored 17 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: 20 Possible Points:

- | | |
|--|------|
| 7. The costs reflected in the budget are appropriate for the results expected. | 5.95 |
| <hr/> | |
| 8. The budget, including personnel, materials, and other identified expenses, adequately supports the activities outlined in the grant proposal. | 8.50 |
| <hr/> | |
| 9. Expenditures and activities are supplemental to, and do not supplant or duplicate, services currently provided. | 2.10 |

10. Strengths?

tightly aligned and reflective of the proposed activities, emphasis on extra duty pay for existing teachers, not overly staffing with possible unsustainable goals.

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Boerne - Meadowland County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R025 Review Date: 9/17/2015

Great job aligning providers with needs for training teachers to establish a core group of teachers who are highly trained and will hopefully be retained by the school over time to pass along organizational knowledge. Technology expenses were justified, not just like an add on.

11. Weaknesses?

Double check current Title I funds to see if you can do some of this now. It sounded like you had a way to make it work and actually had features of the program already in place. Not sure if the LEA can/will pitch in after current year budget is in place, but possible for next year??

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of Budget: Scored 16.55 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Program: 20 Possible Point

12. Details of the needs assessment methodology are provided, and the magnitude or severity of the problem to be addressed by the proposed program is significant. 10.00

13. As the result of a robust assessment effort, specific needs have been identified and strategies to address those needs have been described. 10.00

14. Strengths?

Clearly inclusive of input from all stakeholders, relies on multiple data points, understands that even though in the future some students scores will not be added to the school subset, it is still important for the students to reach success in academics and emotional realms.

15. Weaknesses?

None

Criterion 3: Need for the Proposed Project: Scored 20 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: (20 Possible Points)

16. Qualifications, experience, and certifications of program personnel and external consultants are of sufficient quality and depth to ensure successful implementation. 5.00

17. The management plan is designed to achieve the objectives of the proposed program on time and within budget, with appropriate timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. 5.00

18. The procedures ensure feedback and continuous improvement in the operation of the proposed program through ongoing monitoring and adjustments as needed. 3.00

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Boerne - Meadowland County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R025 Review Date: 9/17/2015

19. The proposed program will be coordinated with similar or related efforts using existing resources and facilities and with other appropriate community, state, and federal resources to maximize the effectiveness of grant funds. 3.00

20. The level of involvement and commitment to the program of all participants, including management, staff, collaborators, and partners, is sufficient to ensure the successful implementation of the program goals, objectives, and activities. 4.00

21. Strengths?

I was initially concerned about the lack of emphasis on the new principal, but it became clear through the management plan how the principal will have an important role and new created autonomy within the structure of this grant. Great job. Excellent coordinated efforts from campus, district, ECS, vendors and universities

22. Weaknesses?

None

Criterion 4: Quality of Management Plan: Scored 20 out of 20 Possible Points.

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: 10 Possible Points:

23. The methods of evaluation provide for examining the effectiveness of program strategies. 2.00

24. The methods of evaluation include the use of objective performance measures and indicators of program accomplishment that are clearly related to the intended results of the project and will produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. 3.00

25. The evaluation design includes processes for collecting data, including program-level data (i.e program activities, number of participants served, etc.) and student-level academic data (i.e. achievement results, attendance data, etc.). 3.00

26. The formative evaluation processes outlined in the application provide for the identification and correction of problems throughout the duration of the grant project. 2.00

27. Strengths?

Even though this is a small program the evaluation activities alone build capacity in all staff members enabling a multitude of impact for years to come. Great job with 100% participation in data mining, finding root causes, addressing social and emotional needs prior to and in conjunction with academic needs. Excellent description of how each vendor's services will be evaluated and addressed if not meeting the needs

28. Weaknesses?

none

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Boerne - Meadowland County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R025 Review Date: 9/17/2015

Criterion 5: Quality of Project Evaluation: Scored 10 out of 10 Possible Points.

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: 10 Possible Points

29. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and scope to ensure equitable access and participation among all eligible program participants. 5.00

30. Strategies and activities are of sufficient quality and depth to accomplish the goals and objectives of the program and carry out the purpose of the grant. 5.00

31. Strengths?

Great job, congruent, reflective, aligned Activities are manageable and cohesive for staff PD and growth Love the literacy coach partnership with UTSA

32. Weaknesses?

None

Criterion 6: Meeting Program Requirements: Scored 10 out of 10 Possible Points.

Possible Additional Points: 5 Possible Points

33. Application is organized, completed according to instructions. 5.00

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 5 out of 5 Possible Points.

Grant-Specific Review Criteria: 100 Possible Points

34. The applicant has demonstrated a clear ability to benefit from grant resources based on their vision for school reform, district commitments, and existing structures that enable reforms to take hold (Schedule 5). 10.00

35. Family and the community members were meaningfully engaged in assessing the program needs and selecting the school improvement model (Schedule 13, Part 4). 10.00

36. Family and community members will be meaningfully engaged in an ongoing basis through the implementation of the program (Schedule 13, Part 4). 10.00

37. The staff and external providers on the project each serve a function that is essential to meet program goals and their roles are non-duplicative (Schedule 14, Parts 1 and 2). 10.00

38. Methods described for recruiting, screening, and selecting external providers ensures highest possible quality in providers (Schedule 14, Part 3). 10.00

2015-2020 Texas Title I Priority Schools, Cycle 4

Grant Review for RFA# 701-15-107

Document Control Number: 083

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Boerne - Meadowland County-District #: 130-801 Reviewer No: R025 Review Date: 9/17/2015

39. Methods described for rigorous oversight of external providers ensures ongoing high-quality service and success in delivering outcomes (Schedule 14, Part 4). 10.00

40. Capacity gained through the proposed project will create lasting change to campus culture and practices that can be sustained after the grant period ends (Schedule 14, Part 8). 10.00

41. The interventions planned (Schedule 17, all parts) are of adequate scope and scale to meet all requirements of the federal School Improvement Grant model selected, as described in the Program Assurances. 30.00

42. Strengths?

A focus on improving teacher pedagogy and capacity to meet social and emotional needs of severely at risk students, the great stakeholder input. Non academic supports along with the vision to evolve into an ECHS, flexible schedule, modified school day, new principal, job embedded PD, operational flexibility and autonomy, ongoing training in data analysis and use for informing instruction

43. Weaknesses?

Just curious about whether current funding could meet these goals Curious about how individual instruction takes place with a less than 5:1 ratio, is it computer work stations and teacher front loading and follow up? Are there any cross grade level instructional arrangements?

Overall Assessment of the Application: Scored 100 out of 100 Possible Points.

44. What do you consider the major strengths of this application?

Ability to meet the stated goals for social and emotional training for teachers, embedded PD, parent outreach

45. What do you consider the major weaknesses of this application?

None - a few minor concerns listed on other answers. Best wishes for a great year and success with your students.

Applicant: Meadowland Charter School - Boerne - Meadowland Charter School scored 198.55 out of 205 Maximum Possible Points including Specific Review Criteria.