



Request for Proposals

**Guidelines for the Submission of
Fiscal Year 2013-14
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS
for PK-12 TEACHERS of
ELA/LITERACY, SCIENCE, LIGO SCIENCE &
MATHEMATICS**

Important Dates

January 21, 2013	RFP Release
February 15, 2013, 4:30 p.m.	Notices of Intent Due
March 1, 2013, 4:30 p.m.	Deadline for Submission of Proposals
March 28-29, 2013	Review of Proposals & Interviews

**1201 N. 3rd St.
Suite 6-200
Baton Rouge, La 70802
225-342-4253**

Important Notices

1. **Scope of FY 2013-14 Request for Proposals**

This RFP provides guidelines for submission of **11.5-month** professional development (PD) proposals in ELA/literacy, science, LIGO science, and/or mathematics for PK-12 educators. Specific detailed information regarding submission of proposals and content focus is provided in the narrative and/or appendices.

2. **Eligibility Requirements**

Guidelines require that proposals be developed collaboratively within a partnership between an institution of higher education (IHE) and a PK-12 high-need local education agency (LEA). Descriptions of targeted schools are included in Appendix F. In accordance with federal requirements of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), key staff of prospective projects must include College of Arts and Sciences and College of Education faculty at public or private institutions of higher education. Community colleges may serve as non-principal partners. In addition, at least one PK-12 partner must represent a high-need LEA, as defined by NCLB (see Appendix E).

3. **Notices of Intent (NOI)**

A non-binding notice of intent is requested of all interested applicants using Form 1 in Appendix H. Each NOI should be submitted electronically to Mr. Bryan Jones at bryan.jones@la.gov by **4:30 p.m., February 15, 2013**. The NOI provides contact information and aids in the selection of appropriate out-of-state peer review teams.

4. **Electronic Submission of Proposals**

Applicants must submit proposals via e-mail **in PDF format** to Mr. Bryan Jones at bryan.jones@la.gov by **4:30 p.m., March 1, 2013**. Responses will be emailed to all applicants within 24 hours to acknowledge receipt of proposals. Proposals should be titled with the last name of PI, name or acronym of institution, focus area (ELA, math, science, and/or LIGO science), and year.

5. **Availability of RFP Electronically**

This RFP, forms and instructions, and budget documents for submitting proposals are available at <http://web.laregents.org>.

6. **Proposal Review**

Proposals for all three discipline-based categories will be evaluated by a single out-of-state review panel. Proposals will be rated by the panel during the initial stages of the review and the top eight to ten will be interviewed in Baton Rouge. Contracts are expected to begin July 1, 2013.

1) Acronyms

- BoR Board of Regents
- CCSS Common Core State Standards
- IHE Institution of Higher Education
- LDE Louisiana Department of Education
- LEA Local Education Agency/School District
- LIGO Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory
- LOSFA Louisiana Office of Student Financial Assistance
- NCLB No Child Left Behind
- PARCC Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers
- PD Professional Development
- PI Principal Investigator
- SACS Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
- S/AYLP Summer/Academic-Year Learning Project
- SIP/SPP School Improvement Plan/School Progress Plan
- TRSL Teachers' Retirement System of Louisiana
- USDE United States Department of Education

TABLE CONTENTS

I.	Timeline.....	1
II.	Program Background and Overview	1
III.	Purpose, Goals and Scope	1
IV.	Guidelines	2
	A. USDE Title II, Part A, <i>NCLB</i>	2
	B. Common Core State Standards.....	3
	C. Academic-Year Planning and Classroom Observations	3
	D. Recommended Project Staff	4
V.	Financial Considerations	4
	A. Cost Sharing.....	5
	B. General Budgetary Guidelines	5
	C. Allowable and Non-Allowable Expenditures	6
VI.	Preparing Proposals for Submission	7
	A. Notice of Intent	7
	B. Proposal Format.....	7
VII.	Review Process	11
VIII.	Contractual Agreement	11
IX.	Ownership of Copyrights and Patents.....	11
X.	Public Nature of Proposals Submitted	11

APPENDICES

A.	PD Guidelines for LIGO Science Projects.....	12
B.	NCLB Legislation	13
C.	High-Need LEAs and Other Target Schools	15
D.	Budget Instructions/Budget Request, Narrative & Cost Sharing Forms (http://web.laregents.org)	15
E.	Submission Forms	17
	1. Notice of Intent	18
	2. Cover Page	19
	3. Project Abstract.....	20
	4. Project Progression Timeline	21
	5. Measureable Objectives Worksheets.....	22
	6. Curriculum Vitae.....	26
	7. Current & Pending Support	27
	8. Memorandum of Agreement Among Partners.....	28
	9. Cooperative Planning Efforts	30
F.	Stipend Options.....	31
G.	Checklist for Submission of Proposals	32
H.	Reviewer Rating Form	33

I. TIMELINE

See Important Dates on the cover page of this RFP.

II. PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

In 1991 Louisiana was one of ten states funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under a new federal program for Statewide Systemic Initiatives. The Louisiana Board of Regents (BoR) and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education provided leadership and matching State funds to create the Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program (LaSIP), which became a state agency in 1992. In 2006 LaSIP merged with the Louisiana BoR as a division within Sponsored Programs. LaSIP's mission continues to provide comprehensive standards-based reform in PK-12 mathematics, science, LIGO science and ELA/literacy content education. LaSIP solicits proposals supporting PK-12 and higher education partnerships dedicated to providing content-rich ELA/literacy, science, LIGO science, and mathematics professional development (PD) projects.

The PD projects must serve teachers, administrators, and highly qualified paraprofessionals employed in at least one high-need Local Education Agency (LEA) within the state of Louisiana.

Funding for the FY 2013-14 projects is provided through sources granted by the United States Department of Education (USDE) Title II, Part A, *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, along with a Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO) grant. LaSIP PD projects operate under the regulations of both funding sources, the guidelines in this RFP, and the subsequent contract if awarded.

III. PURPOSE, GOALS, AND SCOPE

A. PURPOSE

Funded projects will enhance the core content and pedagogical knowledge of teachers in one or more of the following areas: mathematics, science, LIGO science, and ELA/literacy.

B. GOALS AND SCOPE

This RFP is designed to help address PD needs identified in School Improvement Plans/School Progress Plans and standardized test scores. LaSIP's ultimate goal is to positively impact academic achievement of students through the enhancement of educators' content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology across the curriculum. Therefore, LaSIP-funded PD should improve the effectiveness of Louisiana's educators and increase leadership capacity. Concurrently, the proposal, in both conceptualization and implementation, must reflect a strong collaborative effort between an institution of higher education (IHE) and one or more high-need LEAs.

Three goals for all LaSIP PD projects are to:

1. increase student achievement on high-stakes testing and other achievement indicators by spring 2014, through increased teacher content knowledge;
2. plan effective PD based on the high-need LEA's/schools' data-driven needs and developed using research-based PD strategies through a true collaborative partnership that will take place in summer institutes, during the AY and/or through online or web-based assignments and job-embedded activities; and
3. increase leadership capacity and pedagogical skills for target schools through school/district buy-in, school-based implementation, and/or mentoring during the AY.

Proposals must demonstrate alignment with the three LaSIP goals by (1) providing two or more project-designed measurable objectives indicating rigor and relevance for each goal, and (2) including objective data that will determine if each objective was met.

Issuance of awards is based on a proposal's demonstration of a capacity to:

- ✓ Provide an intensive, sustainable, positive impact on classroom practices and student performance.
- ✓ Support national and State content standards and State systemic reform initiatives. Proposals should demonstrate alignment with the SIP/SPP, the Louisiana Literacy Plan, and especially the Common Core State Standards where applicable.
- ✓ Reflect current, valid research on diverse teaching methods and learning styles.
- ✓ Include strong academic content and relevant, contemporary instructional strategies.
- ✓ Raise expectations among teachers and administrators regarding student achievement.
- ✓ Ensure effective teaching and learning takes place in both formal and informal settings.
- ✓ Address the results of qualitative and quantitative assessments of teacher quality and performance.
- ✓ Ensure fiscal agent's financial management system(s) provide for accurate, current, and complete disclosure of financial results.

IV. GUIDELINES

A. USDE TITLE II, PART A, NCLB

As part of LaSIP's NCLB Title II Part A funding, federal legislation requires PD projects to include eligible partnerships. See Appendix B for detailed definition of eligible partners under NCLB. Applicants must ensure that the proposal narrative identifies and demonstrates a working relationship between the following statutorily eligible partners:

1. A division or department of an institution of higher education (IHE) that prepares teachers and school principals;
2. A school or department of arts and sciences at the IHE; and
3. At least one high-need LEA.

A community college may be considered one of the statutorily required principal partners only if the community college has a division that prepares teachers and principals. The community college may be a subgrantee (i.e., fiscal agent) if allowed by the rules and procedures of the subgrant competition. In any case, a community college may be an additional, non-principal member of any partnership. Additional partners may include other school districts not identified as high-need LEAs, additional IHEs, public charter schools or LDE redesign schools, and private school(s) that are Brumfield-Dodd approved schools.

B. COMMON CORE STATE and PARCC STANDARDS

Where appropriate and to the furthest extent possible, proposals should incorporate CCSS and the associated PARCC standards in the curricular content and approaches to pedagogy of the summer institutes as well as in the academic-year follow-up. The math standards introduce Algebra I and II, data analysis, and applied math concepts earlier in the curriculum and with more emphasis than in previous years. This fact demands more and better PD, particularly for those teachers holding elementary school certifications. The Language Arts standards focus on content literacy across all disciplines, and reading and writing in domain-specific categories (e.g., science, social studies).

The Board of Regents has recently created a “One Stop Shop” to streamline access to relevant CCSS and PARCC websites and documents at the following location online: <http://www.regents.la.gov/onestopshop>.

Information on CCSS can also be accessed via <http://www.corestandards.org/the-standards> including PDFs of several standards. For PARCC information see <http://www.parcconline.org/common-core-pre-requisite-postsecondary-education-training>.

For information about Louisiana Standards, see Appendices A and D specific to CCSS in math and ELA; for information about the implementation plan for CCSS in Louisiana, see <http://www.louisianaschools.net/lde/uploads/18555.doc>; and for a link to general awareness webinars of Louisiana’s implementation of CCSS, see <http://www.louisianaschools.net/lde/uploads/18583.pdf>.

PIs submitting are expected to incorporate CCSS for literacy where possible and encouraged to align their projects, especially assessment tools, with *A Framework for K-12 Education: Practices, Crosscutting Concepts and Core Ideas*. This document can be downloaded for free at http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13165. It is the latest addition to science education reform that began at the national level with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) providing a basis for the long-term initiative, Project 2061: Science for All Americans. It is one of the main resources being used to develop the upcoming Next Generation Science Standards and many education and PD projects are using this document as a guideline until the standards are finalized. Project 2061’s ongoing mission is to provide foundations for what all students should know and be able to do in science, mathematics, and technology by the completion of secondary education. For the last 25 years Project 2061 has also included science literacy goals in K-12 benchmarks and standards. Further information about this and the upcoming release of the Next Generation Science Standards can be accessed at the following sites: <http://www.nextgenscience.org/> and http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/Standards_Framework_homepage.html.

C. ACADEMIC-YEAR PLANNING AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

Proposals should include workshops to be facilitated at least twice during the school year. Appropriate local or regional locations for holding workshops within each district should be found to promote better participation and sustainability of partnerships. The PD workshops may include non face-to-face activities (e.g., online assignments or other activities assigned specific hours/values). However, budgets should reflect careful planning and consideration of participant compensation when integrating activities

outside of a whole-group setting. That is, the number of hours outside of that type of setting for which a participant may be compensated must be clearly documented. PIs should assign a number of hours and deliverables for stated activities, and PIs must approve these on participant sign-in sheets.

In addition, proposals must demonstrate an agreement to conduct at least two classroom observations for each participant per year in order to monitor the implementation of instructional practices modeled in the summer institute. Staff conducting the site visits must agree to use these observations to drive instruction at future AY meetings and workshops.

D. RECOMMENDED PROJECT STAFF

Project staff should include (1) one Principal Investigator and one or more Co-PIs (representing the College of Education and College of Arts and Science partnership requirements of NCLB); (2) a part-time site coordinator (not to be filled by a graduate student) to oversee weekly correspondence and mentoring of participants, and possibly providing instruction during the summer and AY workshops; and (3) one part-time administrative assistant, which may be filled by a graduate student.

These positions are only recommendations since it is permissible for one individual to serve in several roles. Should modifications to the recommended project staff be necessary after the proposal has received funding, these changes must be pre-approved by the program manager and adequately justified in order to be in compliance with the proposal. The request for approval of changes to project staff must include, but is not limited to, submission of a curriculum vita.

A PI may submit only one LaSIP proposal; however, he/she may act as Co-PI on up to three (3) additional proposals. Individuals who are not employed by an eligible Louisiana IHE (e.g., out-of-state scholars, scientists, engineers or employees of industry) may serve and be listed as consultants. The PI and Co-PI must be faculty members at an eligible Louisiana IHE, with representation from both the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences. Proposals that include a PI or Co-PI who is listed on multiple proposals must contain a statement verifying that they will be available to perform all of the duties assigned to them in each proposal with no time conflicts. For proposals that reach the interview stage of the review process, teams with PIs or CoPIs on multiple proposals should be prepared to present evidence briefly describing the organization of the various time commitments.

V. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

LaSIP 2013-14 funding is anticipated to total up to \$1.5 million, and LaSIP anticipates funding between 6-10 PD proposals. LaSIP awards have averaged between \$180,000 and \$250,000. Funds awarded are to be used for activities in direct support of work required for the execution of all proposed PD activities. A complete guide to budget requirements is available in Appendix D at <http://web.laregents.org>.

A. COST SHARING

LaSIP encourages cost sharing through institutional support and leveraging of funds from districts, schools, and other entities. The nature and amount of cost sharing are

considered direct evidence of the partners' desire to implement the project and their commitment to the project's ultimate success. As a result, the awarding of a grant is influenced in some measure by the extent of the commitments. Institutional cost-sharing commitments are not taken lightly by the external reviewers who evaluate proposals. Institutions and schools are encouraged to make only those commitments that they can realistically meet because matching commitments pledged in a proposal must be honored if the proposal is fully funded.

Suggested cost share from any partner may include additional stipends for teachers; funds to purchase teacher classroom materials relevant to content of the PD project; travel expenses to attend the project; travel, lodging, meal and/or registration expenses to attend professional State content conferences; funds for substitutes during the AY if the proposal projects job-embedded PD; university faculty salary support; fringe; and/or administrative support.

B. GENERAL BUDGETARY GUIDELINES

The budget should adhere to the following general guidelines. Specific guidelines are included in Appendix D.

Due to the limited availability of initial NCLB funds, PIs SHALL NOT request more than \$80,000 for the July 1 through September 30, 2013 period. Funding for the remainder of the project term will arrive in early October and be added to each contract via amendment. NCLB funds arriving in October are retroactive to July 1, 2013.

1. The budget should be reasonable and clearly aligned with the measurable objectives and activities of the proposed project.
2. Contracts will be for a period of 11.5 months. Yearly contracts are expected to begin July 1, 2013 and continue until June 15, 2014.
3. Participants, as well as coaches/lead teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, and administrators, may be compensated up to \$25/hour, as long as payment is for time spent outside of their usual work day for which they are already being paid. (Participants must be compensated at least \$20/hour and at most \$25/hour.) Appendix J details two options regarding participant compensation; PIs must choose one of the two options. The payment option pledged in the proposal must be honored in the event that the proposal is funded.
4. All financial resources available for LaSIP projects are reimbursement funds. Institutions must pay for services and activities before requesting reimbursement, using mandated procedures and forms provided (Appendix E). Supporting documentation is mandatory for budget categories C and D, Participant Support and Travel.
5. Budget modifications greater than \$500 must be requested prior to expenditure of funds and approved by LaSIP program managers and Ms. Christine Coulon Norton, Grants and Contracts Manager. For budget modifications less than \$500, e-mail notification to Ms. Norton at christine.coulon@la.regents.gov will suffice.
6. PIs may be required to modify budgets based on reviewer funding recommendations.
7. Budgets are reviewed each quarterly billing cycle and are subject to reduction in categories C & D, Participant Support and Travel, if the number of participants drops below 85% of the number of participants for which the project was funded on two consecutive billing cycles. Proposal budgets should be planned carefully with realistic expenditures and appropriate compensation for staff that matches actual time worked.
8. Budgets should reflect careful planning and consideration of participant compensation when integrating activities outside of a whole-group setting; the

number of hours outside of such a setting for which a participant may be compensated must be clearly documented. PIs will assign numbers of hours and deliverables for stated activities, and they must approve this on participant sign-in sheets.

9. Electronic submission of the proposal is considered certification to LaSIP that the fiscal agent is aware of the claimed commitment(s) and has determined said commitment(s) to be consistent with all applicable guidelines, regulations, and/or policies.
10. Budgets may support participant stipends and in-State participant and staff travel/lodging/meal expenses when attending State content conferences, but these expenses must be prepared in advance and stated in the proposal. LaSIP will not reimburse any conference registration fees that were not requested in the proposal.
11. A project with less than 85% of its recruited participants for which the project was funded should not begin activities without the written approval of the LaSIP staff.

C. ALLOWABLE AND NON-ALLOWABLE EXPENDITURES

1. Allowable Expenditures

- a) Non-recurring expenses such as teacher stipends, project supplies, instructional or classroom materials to be stored at participating schools, consultants, university faculty/staff support, travel/lodging, and other costs, according to State regulations, PPM 49
- b) Expenses incurred for attendance at State content conferences, including travel, lodging, meals, and stipends, only if not being paid by the school district and stated in the proposal and budgeted for in advance
- c) Special purpose equipment as deemed legitimate by LaSIP program managers and the Assistant Director for Contracts and Fiscal
- d) Indirect costs and fringe benefits
- e) All required employer-paid taxes and TRSL benefits for educators. Subcontracting with school districts in order to disperse stipends and fringe payments may be better suited for institutions required to hire participants in order to compensate educators. LaSIP will not reimburse stipend requests without appropriate documentation of benefit payments
- f) Projects not budgeting TRSL for participants will be penalized in the review process. All projects are required to pay TRSL on stipends.
- g) Expenditures for faculty and staff requesting additional compensation for work performed during the project shall be based on the normal policy of the institution governing compensation to faculty/staff members for such assignments.

2. Non-allowable Expenditures

- a) Memberships to trade groups or teacher associations
- b) Meals or food during the workshop day
- c) General purpose equipment (e.g., furniture, filing cabinets, etc.)
- d) Special purpose equipment (non-disposable items such as cameras, video or overhead equipment, tools, computers/computer equipment, screens, display boards, etc.), unless deemed appropriate and pre-approved by program managers and the Grants and Contract Manager
- e) Out-of-state conference travel for participants and staff
- f) Tuition or support of graduate or undergraduate students except as a percentage of administrative support staff costs
- g) Building or infrastructure improvements

VI. PREPARING PROPOSALS FOR SUBMISSION

A. NOTICES OF INTENT AND PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

See Cover Page for dates and times. Proposals will be reviewed by an out-of-state peer review team. Contracts are expected to begin July 1, 2013.

B. PROPOSAL FORMAT

The proposal must contain the following elements in the order listed below. Any reference to research throughout the proposal should be clearly cited:

1. **Cover Page** (Appendix E, Form 2)
2. **Project Abstract** (Appendix E, Form 3)
3. **Table of Contents**
4. **Project Progression Timeline** (Appendix E, Form 4)
This timeline of events provides details regarding planning and recruitment, implementation of activities, and expected progress toward fulfilling measurable objectives documented in the proposal (Appendix E, Form 4)
5. **Narrative**
The narrative section of the proposal is limited to a maximum of 15 single-spaced pages, using a minimum of 12-point font, without footnotes. The narrative must include the headings shown below, in the order given below.
 - a) **Rationale and Need for the Project (10 points)**
Briefly describe the need for the project in relation to data-driven needs of the partner LEA(s) and other targeted schools in the partnership. Proposals should include the following types of information which specifically support the mission and focus of the proposed project:
 - (1) Detailed profile of students and teachers to be served, including demographic information,
 - (2) Specific content needs of teachers and students to be addressed in this project, including appropriate documentation from SIP/SPP and State test results,
 - (3) Other pertinent needs to be addressed
 - (4) Discussion of how well all partners have worked together to assess district/school needs and recruitment,
 - b) **Project Design (50 total points)**
The project design focuses on **improving student achievement** and reflects up-to-date knowledge from research and effective practice. Begin the section with a broad description of participants, their students, and how the project will support the SIP/SPP. Additional design plans should follow in the order below.
 - i) **Measurable Objectives (10 points)**
Writing project objectives will guide the planning process for the PI and partners, as well as aid in the assessment of its success. Objectives must be specific, measurable, attainable, results-focused, and timely. Objectives will

guide the review team in understanding the project's expected outcomes as a result of the partnerships and funds requested.

Form 5 in Appendix E should guide the writing of meaningful objectives. A minimum of three (3) worksheets are required, one for each of the three LaSIP goals. When completed, each sheet should include at least two measurable objectives that support the goal. These forms must be included in proposals since they ensure uniformity for the review panel.

Objectives may involve changes in student achievement, student behavior, teachers' content knowledge and use of effective instructional strategies, and/or increased leadership skills and analysis of student data to drive instruction. Objectives should not be restatements of goals or descriptions of project activities and should not include specific numerical improvements without baseline documentation.

ii) Specific Content-Matter/Classroom Instructional Strategies (15 points)

Address subject-matter content, including classroom instructional materials and classroom instructional strategies that will be employed. Describe the connection between the project's content focus and relevant content and assessment standards.

iii) Delivery Method (20 points)

This section includes a detailed description of and evidence for the delivery method being proposed and how the approach will enhance teachers' content knowledge and classroom strategies for improved student achievement. Details should include the following:

- (1) Description of participant selection process, including who will be recruited, their qualifications, and their proposed role in achieving objectives of the project.
- (2) Detailed account of the amount of time (number of hours) and frequency of contact throughout the project.
- (3) Explanation of the stipend payment selection as it relates to the project (Appendix F). The PI should plan to document time spent outside of a whole-group setting, including the number of hours and deliverables required.
- (4) Plan for ensuring effective leadership PD for coaches/lead teachers and any follow-up or mentoring activities if the project involves using instructional coaches.
- (5) Plan for providing feedback and support to participants and administrators during the project to ensure implementation of new knowledge and behaviors.
- (6) Plan for dissemination to other teachers at the school or district, if applicable.

iv) Collaborative Partnerships and Participant Recruitment (5 points)

Clearly indicate the process used to identify partnering schools and the roles of the targeted schools in creating the proposal and program plan. Include a description of how project staff will recruit participants and interact with teachers and administrators to ensure comprehensive, faithful implementation of the program. Provide specific details regarding how partnerships with the districts/schools will be developed and implemented. Proposals should include letters of support from the superintendents of

targeted districts. PIs are strongly encouraged to secure a letter of support from the principal of each participating school.

Proposals must document a working/planning relationship with the high-need LEA and other targeted or low-performing schools. Participation by at least one principal, teacher, and school or district leader in the high-need LEA to be served is required in the planning process to ensure that the nature and content of planned activities will meet the needs of the targeted audience.

c) Quality of Key Personnel (10 points)

The quality of the personnel who will carry out the project has a direct impact on its potential for success. While it is not expected that each member of the team will possess all the qualities required to ensure a successful project, collectively the team must demonstrate the competencies and skills necessary to provide high quality instruction in content and instructional strategies. In addition, it is essential that members of the team have PD experience with teachers and students similar to those targeted.

In addition to the information requested below, the proposal should also contain the following: (1) brief vitae (2 pages each) highlighting relevant training and experience for all project personnel included in the budget (Form 6), and (2) current and pending support information (Form 7). If a position is not filled, a description of the qualifications of the person to be hired must be included. Upon hiring, a biographical sketch must be submitted to the LaSIP office for approval.

- (1) Provide a description of project staff (including consultants, if any) that includes their role in the project, time commitment, project responsibilities, and relevant training and/or experience.
- (2) Document assurance that the composition of the project team conforms to the guidelines of NCLB.

d) Project Evaluation (10 points)

Specifically identify the project-designed assessment plans that will provide diagnostic, formative and summative evaluations of how the project is meeting the goals of this RFP. This section will further examine the project's success in increasing student achievement through their teachers' PD. The evaluation instruments need to be matched with the specific proposal objectives. The project evaluator should be specifically identified along with what his or her specific duties and the amount of time that person will spend on project evaluation.

e) Budget Request, Budget Narrative, and Cost Sharing (20 points)

The budget should clearly support and be aligned with the goals and objectives of LaSIP. It should be both reasonable and cost effective, based upon the number of days of PD, the number of participants, and the level of staff involvement in the project. The budget will consist of three (3) sections (the Budget Request, the Budget Narrative, and the Cost-Sharing Statement) that correspond with the budget forms and instructions in Appendix E and must comply with the budget guidelines contained herein and in all relevant appendices.

A complete budget for the 11.5 month award period is required. Justification must be included for each line item and each line item in the budget justification must directly correspond to the measurable objective that it supports.

6. Appendix

Provide a summary of the latest ongoing or completed PD project implemented by the proposal's PI or Co-PIs. The summarized work should be the project most closely related to the PD work being proposed. For proposals that continue or are related to ongoing FY 2012-13 LaSIP projects, 2012-13 Interim Reports may be supplemented for this appendix. Summaries of other ongoing or completed projects should present data in the following format:

Related Ongoing or Recently Completed Professional Development

- I. Project Information
 - A. Project title
 - B. Principal Investigator
 - C. Co-PIs and/or other major contributors
 - D. Number of participants
 - E. Proposal Abstract
- II. Summer Institutes
 - A. Briefly describe summer institute purpose, topics covered, format, goals and objectives and how the process related to the overall goals and objectives of the grant
 - B. Pre- and Post-Test Data: List the individual scores on each test with percentage improvement for each, and overall percentage improvement
 - C. Rate your satisfaction with workshop outcomes, how/if they shaped your approach to AY activities
 - D. Describe how Common Core State Standards and PARCC assessments were incorporated into institute activities, and estimate the amount/percentage of total time spent on CCSS related items
 - E. Any other summer data that you collected and any constructive observations/analysis you made based on that data
- III. AY Activities
 - A. Describe AY activities (in the first semester if work is ongoing) of the project such as workshops, classroom visits and/or individual contacts
 - B. Any data analysis or observations you have regarding AY activities
- IV. Evaluation Tools
 - A. Tools used (or that you will use) to analyze project success
 - B. If work is ongoing, list measures you have taken so far to ensure your ability to evaluate project success

VII. REVIEW PROCESS

LaSIP professional development proposals undergo rigorous competitive reviews based on recommendations of out-of-state consultants with appropriate expertise. Funding depends on successful implementation and continued availability of all sources of funds. Proposals are reviewed in two stages: (1) evaluation of written proposals and (2) interviews with prospective staff and school partners by a team of consultants either on-site or through teleconferences for the seven to ten top-rated proposals during the initial phase of the review. Review panels assess proposals and conduct interviews using the Reviewer Rating Form (Appendix H). Their recommendations will be comprise a final Statewide Report and become public record. Notification of awards will be made soon thereafter. Reviewer' recommendations, strengths and concerns will be transmitted to the PIs for their responses.

VIII. CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT

Institutions awarded funding enter into a contract with the Louisiana BoR. All State, federal and BoR laws, regulations and guidelines must be followed. Notification of awards will be made immediately upon approval of the Review Panel Final Report. Reviewers' comments will be forwarded to all PIs with expectations of receiving responses and/or changes in writing before contracts are awarded. Contracts are expected to be issued no later than July 2013.

IX. OWNERSHIP OF COPYRIGHTS AND PATENTS

Ownership of copyrights and patents or other proprietary interests that may result from contract activities shall be governed by the contract, applicable federal regulations, State law, and local institutional policies.

X. PUBLIC NATURE OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

Once a proposal is received in the LaSIP office it becomes public record. Applicants should be aware that, by law, if a request for a proposal is made by the public then a copy must be provided.

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

APPENDIX A: PD Guidelines for LIGO Science Projects

Overview of LIGO Science

The Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO) Education Outreach Program provides cutting-edge science exploration opportunities for teachers and students. Begun in 2004 as a five-year, \$5 million initiative, LIGO secured NSF funding for an additional five years.

A collaborative effort exists among the LIGO Science Education Center (LIGO SEC), Southern University-Baton Rouge (SUBR), LaSIP, LA GEAR UP, and the Exploratorium of San Francisco. LIGO SEC Outreach implements initiatives and programs to achieve the following goals: (1) communicate LIGO-related science concepts to the public; (2) strengthen pre-service and in-service science teaching; and (3) create a national model that demonstrates how universities, systemic programs, school districts, and informal learning environments can work together to support inquiry-based science teaching and learning. The diagram below depicts the LIGO SEC Outreach collaborative organization and initiatives.

Professional Development Initiative

LIGO-related PD projects assist teachers in assimilating LIGO science in Louisiana science and mathematics curricula with emphasis on 6th-12th grade classes. The initiative includes college and university personnel who have been trained at the Exploratorium and have gained a relevant understanding of the following: 1) how scientific concepts associated with LIGO SEC exhibits prepared by the Exploratorium can be used for instructional purposes, and 2) how insights of the associated scientific concepts can be integrated in targeted classrooms based on Louisiana's curriculum and accountability needs. LIGO PD should encompass the concepts of light, waves, resonance and/or astronomy, as well as best practices from past projects.

Teachers Reform Science Instruction

After teachers have received the training prior to the start of the school year in which the proposal was funded, they then implement inquiry-based teaching strategies using LIGO SEC investigations and the integration of "snacks" into the curriculum. Snacks are mini-models of the larger exhibits housed at LIGO SEC. Inquiry-based teaching incorporates discovery-based learning which allows students to explore with little guidance; the clarification of concepts occurs through exploration and manipulation of materials.

Student Field Trips to LIGO

Participants collaborate with project and LIGO SEC staff to arrange student field trips to LIGO. In preparation for the field trip, students explore physical science concepts using snacks. While at the site, students are given the opportunity to tour the facility, visit the SEC, and participate in investigations on the subject of LIGO-related sciences. After returning to their schools, teachers continue to use LIGO SEC "snacks" and other investigations to further student learning.

Teachers Attend Follow-up Workshops and Conferences

If allocated funds are available LaSIP teachers will participate in special workshops that reinforce and expand their knowledge of physical science content as it relates to LIGO themes.

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

APPENDIX B: No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Legislation

Eligibility

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised of at least: (1) a private or State Institution of Higher Education (IHE) and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals (College of Education); (2) a College of Arts and Sciences; **and** (3) a **high-need local education agency (LEA)** [Note: for purposes of this definition, the statutorily required partners will be referred to as “principal partners.”]

An eligible partnership may also include other LEAs, such as the elementary, middle, or secondary schools listed in Appendix F. Non-principal partners may include a two-year or community college; a public charter, private, or parochial school; community resource centers such as a museum, or local businesses.

***A high-need LEA is defined in NCLB as an LEA:**

1. that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line, according to the U.S. Census; **or** for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; **and**
2. for which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; **or** for which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing [Section 2102(3)].

Purpose Of Partnerships

The intent of the legislation is to support professional development activities in core academic subjects of mathematics, science, and ELA/literacy that ensure projects (1) provide long-term, sustained, high-quality professional development for Louisiana’s K-12 teachers;(2) provide access to teachers in high-need LEAs; (3) result in change of teacher practice or teachers’ content knowledge that increases student achievement in the classroom; (4) influence the implementation of research-based curriculum in undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs; and (5) strengthen collaboration between faculties of IHEs and among other partners in the program.

The federal law requires that, in order for an IHE to be eligible for a grant, it must enter into an agreement with a local school district, or consortia of such districts, to provide sustained, high-quality professional development for the elementary and secondary school teachers in the schools of that district. Therefore, the proposal must be aligned with the assessment of the needs of the local schools, and teacher participants and administrators from the schools to be served by the project must be involved in the planning process. Financial and programmatic participation by school districts, nonpublic schools, and the sponsoring IHE is necessary and should be reflected in the proposed budget information.

Priorities

Consistent with the priorities and criteria of the USDE NCLB regulations, LaSIP will make awards that support the following types of partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating high-need LEAs:

- a. **Professional development activities** in core academic subjects of mathematics, science, and/or ELA/literacy, with a literacy component across all content area(s); and
- b. **Development and provision of assistance to LEAs** and their teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities and ongoing support.

Funding

The intent of the legislation and goals of LaSIP are to support projects likely to bring about lasting change. **Workshops held in the summer months must have organized support for teachers during the academic year through classroom implementation by project teaching staff. The NCLB program will not support short-term professional development projects.** Such projects usually lack breadth of coverage and conceptual foundation, and have minimal impact on classroom instruction. Supported activities should equip teachers and principals with proper materials and management techniques, and should present opportunities for discussion and evaluation. Annual-year activities may include, but are not limited to, workshops, demonstrations/observations/debriefings, coaching and mentoring, and on-line assignments.

Proposals that include up to 10% of participant recruitment from pre-service students are invited. Such proposals must identify possible improvements to campus teacher education programs, e.g., improvements that involve further innovation in teacher education programs to better meet the needs of schools for well-prepared teachers. Proposals that include IHE students are invited, but any costs incurred as a result of including IHE students in the summer component must be contributed or matching from the IHE/LEA partner. Curriculum development projects will not be supported.

APPENDIX C

School Districts in Louisiana Classified by NCLB as “High Need” According to Definition #1 (≥ 20% of school age children 5-17 living in poverty) (U.S. Census Data, 2009)

Acadia 24.98%	Evangeline 26.90%	Sabine 23.78%
Allen 23.04%	Franklin 34.32%	St. Bernard 30.94%
Assumption 21.93%	Grant 23.52%	St. Helena 27.13%
Avoyelles 30.29%	Iberia 24.19%	St. John the Baptist 20.91%
City of Baker 23.29%	Iberville 24.81%	St. Landry 29.56%
Bienville 29.41%	Jackson 23.92%	St. Martin 21.88%
Bogalusa 42.29%	Jefferson 20.52%	St. Mary 23.36
Caddo 25.01%	Lincoln 25.63%	Tangipahoa 25.91%
Calcasieu 21.18%	Madison 45.75%	Tensas 43.96%
Caldwell 24.65%	City of Monroe 35.85%	Terrebonne 20.49%
Catahoula 31.34%	Morehouse 34.19%	Union 25.24%
Claiborne 29.47	Natchitoches 31.63%	Vermilion 21.95%
Concordia 38.83%	Orleans 33.01%	Vernon 23.52%
De Soto 24.60%	Ouachita 21.90%	Washington 27.42%
East Baton Rouge 22.99%	Pointe Coupee 24.11%	Webster 25.13%
East Carroll 53.81%	Red River 31.17%	West Carroll 27.18%
East Feliciana 21.87%	Richland 31.59%	Winn 34.54%

School Districts in Louisiana Classified by NCLB as “High Need” According to Definition #2 (≥ 20% of teachers teaching outside area of certification) (2010-11 LDOE Data)

East Baton Rouge (38% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

LA School for Math, Science and the Arts (43% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

Natchitoches (20% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

Orleans (51% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

Rapides (22% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

Sabine (26% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

Richland (20% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

Tensas (26% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

Terrebonne (34% of teachers teaching outside certification area)

APPENDIX D

All items listed in Appendix E are available at <http://web.laregents.org>.

1. Budget Instructions
2. Budget Request (BR) Form
3. Budget Narrative (BN) Form
4. Cost Sharing (CS)

2012-13 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

APPENDIX E: Proposal Submission Forms Provided

Form 1	Notice of Intent
Form 2	Proposal Cover Page
Form 3	Project Abstract
Form 4	Project Progression Timeline
Form 5	Measurable Objectives Worksheets
Form 6	Curriculum Vitae
Form 7	Current and Pending Support
Form 8	Memorandum of Agreement Among Partners
Form 9	Cooperative Planning Efforts

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

NOTICE OF INTENT

Name of Institution (Include Branch/Campus and School or Division):

Address (Include Department):

Principal Investigator(s):

Phone: ()

Fax: ()

E-mail:

Tentative Title of Project:

This non-binding Notice of Intent should include the following information:

- (1) The primary focus, including discipline/subject matter;
- (2) The districts or regions to be served; (Place an * by the high-need LEAs)
- (3) The intended grade levels; and
- 4) The proposed outcomes.

[This information will be used to ensure adequate preparation for the review of LaSIP PD proposals, including engagement of consultants with appropriate expertise. Applicants may modify the information provided above in part or whole as proposal development continues.]

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

COVER PAGE

Indicate content focus (Science, LIGO, ELA/Literacy, or Mathematics): Grade Level(s) Targeted: Number of Targeted Participants:		School Districts To Be Served: Indicate high-need districts with an asterisk *
Name(s) of Submitting Institution(s) of Higher Education (Include Branch/Campus/Other Components):		
Address of Institution of Higher Education (Dept/Unit, Street Address/P.O. Box Number, City, State, Zip Code):		
Title of Proposed Project:		
Funds being requested for each funding cycle:		
July 1, 2013-September 30, 2013	October 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014	
Matching funds from partners:		
IHE:	High-need LEA(s):	Other:
The signatories certify that the institution and the proposed project are in compliance with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations.		
Name/Title/Institution (if different from the primary institution listed)	Dept./Telephone No. Email Address	Signature
Principal Investigator		
Co-Principal Investigator		
Campus Head or Authorized Institutional Representative		
Dean, College of Education		
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences		
Authorized Fiscal Agent		

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

PROJECT ABSTRACT

Name of Institution (Include Branch/Campus):

College/Department:

Principal Investigator:

Phone: ()

Fax: ()

E-mail:

Title of Project:

Abstract (maximum of 500 words): Address each item below in the order given:

- (1) A brief paragraph describing the overall vision of the project
 - (2) The project's specific content focus and measurable objectives
 - (3) The high-need LEA(s) and targeted schools/districts involved
 - (4) The participants for which the project is designed (i.e., classroom teachers, special ed teachers, paraprofessionals, and/or administrators)
 - (5) The number of days & contact hours during the summers & AY
 - (6) The number of participants & content coaches
 - (7) The targeted grade levels
 - (8) The primary activities and proposed outcomes
-

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Measureable Objectives Worksheet (1)

Aligned with the first LaSIP goal stated below, design at least two measureable objectives which answer each of the following five questions:

- (1) **Who** is involved?
- (2) **What** is the desired outcome?
- (3) **How** will progress be measured?
- (4) **When** will the outcome occur?
- (5) What is the **level of proficiency**?

Combine the five answers to form a sentence for your measureable objective. Use the checklist provided on page ___ to ensure the objectives contain all necessary components. This page may be duplicated if additional objectives are desired.

LaSIP Goal 1: *Increase student achievement on State high-stakes testing.*

Who:

What:

How:

When:

Proficiency Level:

Goal 1, Objective 2:

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONALDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Measureable Objectives Worksheet (2)

Aligned with the first LaSIP goal stated below, design at least two measureable objectives which answer each of the following five questions:

- (1) Who is involved?
- (2) What is the desired outcome?
- (3) How will progress be measured?
- (4) When will the outcome occur?
- (5) What is the level of proficiency?

Refer to page _____ for a detailed explanation of each question. Finally, combine the five answers to form a sentence for your measureable objective. Use the checklist provided on page 44 to ensure the objectives contain all necessary components. This page may be duplicated if additional objectives are desired.

LaSIP Goal 2: *Plan effective PD based on the high-need LEA(s)/schools' data-driven needs and developed using research-based PD strategies that will take place in summer institutes, during the academic year (AY), and/or through on-line or web-based assignments and job-embedded activities.*

Who:

What:

How:

When:

Proficiency Level:

Goal 2, Objective 1:

Who:

What:

How:

When:

Proficiency Level:

Goal 2, Objective 2:

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Measureable Objectives Worksheet (3)

Aligned with the first LaSIP goal stated below, design at least two measureable objectives which answer each of the following five questions:

- (1) **Who** is involved?
- (2) **What** is the desired outcome?
- (3) **How** will progress be measured?
- (4) **When** will the outcome occur?
- (5) **What** is the **level of proficiency**?

Finally, combine the five answers to form a sentence for your measureable objective. Use the checklist on provided on page 44 to ensure the objectives contain all necessary components. This page may be duplicated if additional objectives are desired.

LaSIP Goal 3: Increase leadership capacity and pedagogical skills for target schools through school/district buy-in, school-based implementation, and mentoring during the AY.

Who:

What:

How:

When:

Proficiency Level:

Goal 3, Objective 1:

Who:

What:

How:

When:

Proficiency Level:

Goal 3, Objective 2:

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Measureable Objectives Worksheet (continued)

Measurable objectives should indicate rigor and relevance and must include objective data that will determine that the objective was met. Objectives should be clearly identify the following:

Who is involved: The people whose behaviors, knowledge, and/or skills are to be changed or enhanced as a result of the program.

What the desired outcomes are: The intended behavior, knowledge, and/or skill changes that should result from the program or activities.

How progress is measured: What tools or devices (surveys, tests, data from other sources) will be used to measure the expected changes? Remember to ensure that the project has the resources/capacity (time, staff, funding, etc.) to perform the measurements.

Proficiency level: Identify the criteria that will determine success of the project (i.e., total mastery 100% or 80% of the time).

When outcomes will occur: Identify the time frame for success. (*Writing Objectives: A Guide*, NCMS Department of Education Services)

Objectives Checklist:

- Objectives contain all elements
 - Who
 - What
 - How
 - When
 - Proficiency Level

- Redundancy has been eliminated
- Objectives relate to needs assessment findings
- Objectives can really be measured
 - Capacity to perform measurement is present
 - Instrument or data source has been identified

- Shows how assessment:
 - Assesses what each component does
 - Assess outcome
 - Should not have separate assessment unless you expect different outcomes of different groups (i.e., all students vs. students receiving specific supplemental services)

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name				Current Position Title	
				Project Position Title	
EDUCATION (Begin with baccalaureate or other initial professional education and include postdoctoral training.)					
INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE	YEAR CONFERRED	FIELD OF STUDY		

RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE: DO NOT EXCEED TWO PAGES. Begin with present position, list in reverse chronological order previous relevant employment, experience, and honors.

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT

List all State and federal funding support for each IHE faculty member during the funding cycle. Duplicate this form for each IHE faculty member, and use additional sheets as necessary.

NAME OF FACULTY: _____

Status of Support:	Current	Pending	Submission Planned in Near Future
Proposal Title (or Semester Teaching Support):			
Source of Support:			
Award Amount (or Monthly Teaching Rate): \$		Period Covered:	
Location of Activity:			
Person-Months or % of Effort Committed to the Project:		Cal Yr	AY Summer

Status of Support:	Current	Pending	Submission Planned in Near Future
Proposal Title(or Semester Teaching Support):			
Source of Support:			
Award Amount (or Monthly Teaching Rate): \$		Period Covered:	
Location of Activity:			
Person-Months or % of Effort Committed to the Project:		Cal Yr	AY Summer

Status of Support:	Current	Pending	Submission Planned in Near Future
Proposal Title (or Semester Teaching Support):			
Source of Support:			
Award Amount (or Monthly Teaching Rate):		Period Covered	
Location of Activity:			
Person-Months or % of Effort Committed to the Project:		Cal Yr	AY Summer

**2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
Memorandum Of Agreement Among Partners**

_____ (Name of Sponsoring Institution or Institutions)	_____ (Project Title)
_____ (Principal Investigator)	_____ (Co- Principal Investigator)

This cooperative agreement reflects the overall commitment as well as the specific responsibilities and the roles of each of the partners listed below. This MOA documents the actual working partners who are responsible for contributing to the writing of the proposal, collecting and reporting data, and for the day to day success of the project.

Type of Partner	Name of Active Partner	Title	IHE or District & School	Signature
Teacher Preparation Program (Required)				
Dept./School of Arts & Sciences (Required)				
High-need Local Education Agency/Agencies (LEA – Required)				
Additional Targeted Partners				

Memorandum of Agreement Among Partners (cont.)

Sponsoring Institution:

Principal Investigator:

Type of Partner	Name	Title	IHE or District & School	Signature
Additional Partners				
Additional Partners				
Additional Partners				

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Cooperative Planning Efforts

Describe the process of collaboration between the high-need LEA(s), other targeted schools, and the IHE(s) in determining the needs of the LEA(s) in planning and writing this proposal. The statement should be endorsed and dated by an official from each participating institution. In addition, Letters of Support must be included in the appendices of the proposal.

1. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

2. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

3. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

4. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

5. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

6. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

7. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

8. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

9. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

10. _____

Typed Name, Title, Organization	Signature	Date
--	------------------	-------------

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

APPENDIX F: Stipend Options

You must choose either Option A or B for use in your project, and document your choice in your proposal. Should your proposal be funded, you must provide this information to your participants within a Participant Agreement or Project Syllabus. For either option, you must insert the number of days and hours for your project and the hourly stipend rate, and provide a list of your project deliverables. Projects must provide a total stipend hourly rate at a minimum of \$20 per hour and a maximum of \$30 per hour. LaSIP encourages the use of Option B.

Option A

Attendance is expected for all ____ days (total of ____ hours) of the project. Participants will receive a maximum fee of \$25 per hour for attendance participation at the summer institute and academic year workshops. Payment will be made only on approval of and documentation from the principal investigator, (*Name of authorized person*), according to the LaSIP Attendance Policy. Participant will be paid only for the actual hours he/she participates in the professional development program. If the Participant has unexcused absences for more than 15% of the scheduled program hours, Participant may be dropped from the program at the discretion of the principal investigator and will not be eligible to receive instructional materials from the project. Any instructional materials already received must be returned to the principal investigator. LaSIP Attendance Policy regarding unexcused absences will be enforced.

Option B

Attendance is expected for all ____ days (total of ____ hours) of the project. Participant will receive a \$20 per hour for attendance participation at the summer institute. Upon completion of the required activities/deliverables (designed by PI) and days of attendance during the AY, participant will receive the remaining \$5 for each full hour attended during the summer project. This will in effect raise the stipend rate to \$25 per hour attended and will only apply if participant meets required obligations. Stipends for the AY workshops will be \$25 per hour for attendance. Payment will be made only on approval of and documentation from the principal investigator, (*Name of authorized person*), according to the LaSIP Attendance Policy. Each participant must complete the assigned deliverables during the AY. If the participant has unexcused absences for more than 15% of the scheduled program hours, the participant may be dropped from the program at the discretion of the principal investigator and will not be eligible to receive either instructional materials from the project or the additional \$5 per hour for attendance participation at the summer institute. In this event, any instructional materials already received must be returned to the principal investigator. LaSIP Attendance Policy regarding unexcused absences will be enforced.

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

APPENDIX G: Checklist for Submission of 2012-13 Proposals

- Proposal Cover Page
- Project Abstract
- Table of Contents
- Project Progression Timeline with Measureable Objectives
- Narrative
- A. Rationale and Need for the Project
- B. Project Design:
 - i. Measurable Objectives
 - ii. Specific Subject-Matter Content
 - iii. Delivery Method
 - iv. Collaborative Partnerships and Participant Recruitment
- C. Quality of Key Personnel
- D. Project Evaluation
- E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative, and Cost Share
- References/Letters of Support
- Measureable Objective Worksheets
- Curriculum Vitae
- Current and Pending Support
- Memo of Agreement Among Partners

2013-14 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

APPENDIX H: Rating Form

**RATING FORM FOR 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____

PROJECT FOCUS: _____

INSTITUTION: _____

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: _____

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: _____

A. Rationale and Need for the Project _____
(of 10 Points)

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives _____
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies _____
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method _____
(of 20 Points)

iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment _____
(of 5 Points)

C. Quality of Key Personnel _____
(of 10 Points)

D. Project Evaluation _____
(of 10 Points)

E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing _____
(of 20 Points)

Total Score: (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: _____

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: _____