Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program

FY 2013-14 LaSIP REVIEW
FINAL REPORT

March 27-28, 2014

Prepared by:

Michelle Nichols-Yehling, Master Educator
NASA Forum Programs
Adler Planetarium

Michael Pietrzak, President
Advanced Strategies for Professional Development

Wendy Thomas-Williams, Director
Interactive Teaching and Learning Mathematics Project
Northeastern Illinois University

INTRODUCTION

A. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND REVIEW PROCESS

On Friday, January 10, 2014, the LaSIP staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to fund Mathematics, ELA/Literacy, and Science K-12 teacher professional development (PD) projects, as well as Informal/Formal Science Learning PD Initiatives (PDIs) in support of LaSIP's collaboration with Southern University-Baton Rouge and LIGO through an NSF grant to support LIGO SEC Outreach.

In response to the RFP, fourteen (14) proposals were submitted. The review panel was sent the following to read and review: (1) the FY 2014-2015 LaSIP Professional Development RFP for PK-12 Teachers of ELA/Literacy, Science, LIGO Science, and Mathematics; (2) the fourteen proposals; (3) rating forms for each proposal; and (4) a summary sheet of all of the LaSIP proposals with proposed funding amounts.

Each reviewer completed a preliminary review of the proposals by March 23, 2014 and met via Skype with LaSIP personnel on March 23, 2014 to determine which proposals would advance to the second, interview stage of the review. Of the original fourteen (14) proposals submitted, ten (10) projects were invited to participate in face-to-face interviews.

The reviewers convened in Baton Rouge March 27-28, 2014 to interview prospective project directors, university staff and K-12 partners in order to further assess the merits of the proposals. Throughout the interviews, reviewers asked numerous clarification questions and sought a culminating overview of the effectiveness of the projects. The reviewers agreed that this interview process provided extremely valuable information and the clarity needed to properly rank the proposals and recommend funding. On March 28, 2014, the reviewers identified strengths, concerns, project recommendations, an overall funding recommendation for each project (with stipulations, where necessary), a recommended funding amount for each project, and a ranking for each of the project teams interviewed.

B. RANKINGS AND FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Table I contains a rank-order list of projects recommended for funding. A total of $969,000 was recommended for seven (7) projects. Table II contains a rank-order list of projects not recommended for funding. Due to the need for strict budget controls and to ensure the highest levels of fiscal responsibility, the reviewers recommended a lower budget amount for each projects recommended for funding. Stipulations for budget

reductions, content and timelines, including dates for submitting responses to LaSIP staff, are included in this report.

C. REVIEWER CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE OVERALL IMPROVEMENT OF PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PROCESS:

The following are concerns and recommendations to LaSIP for improving the review process, as well as increasing the cost effectiveness and impact of projects:

- Evaluation instruments to be used by project staff should continue to be specifically identified and matched with specific objectives.
- Comments such as “research shows . . .” always require proper citation.
- Applicants should clearly indicate in paragraph form what the process and outcomes were for identifying the participating schools and the process and outcomes for working with those schools to create the proposal.
- All proposals should include school-level assessment results, not district-level assessment results, unless the proposal is meeting the needs of all of the schools in the districts. Discussion should include sub-skill analysis of student data that informs the content focus of the project.
- It should be require that language in the proposal narrative refer to specific Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and/or Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) when discussing alignments to project activities.
- Staff should consider requiring a minimum number of participant contact hours for the summer institute.
- Staff should consider requiring that project teams gather formal feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. These feedback forms should include a minimum set of questions that are common across all funded LaSIP projects; the project team may wish to include others, as well. Project teams should also consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.

2014-15 LaSIP Panel Review

TABLE I

Proposals Recommended for Funding

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
1	95	01LaS-14	Centenary	Vetter	$157,264	$152,000
2	88	07LaS-14	La Tech	Schillinger	$195,493	$172,000
3	87	05LaS-14	LaTech	Kimbell-Lopez	$71,382	$71,000
3	87	06LaS-14	LaTech	Manning	$161,801	$157,000
5	86	10LaS-14	Nicholls	Plaisance	$169,590	$165,000
6	84	03LaS-14	LSU-BR	Mooney	$116,249	$114,000
7	83	11LaS-14	SLU	Williams	$141,943	$138,000
					$1,013,722	$969,000

TABLE II

Proposals Not Recommended for Funding

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
8	81	04LaS-14	LaTech	Deese	$193,825	$0
9	80	08LaS-14	LaTech	Talton	$196,602	$0
10	69	14LaS-14	UNO	Maygarden	$173,119	$0
11	66	12LaS-14	SUBR-LaTech	Young	$238,732	$0
12	65	13LaS-14	ULL	Sheppard	$252,648	$0
13	58	09LaS-14	Nicholls	Lo	$151,576	$0
14	41	02LaS-14	Grambling	Payne	$212,830	$0
					$1,419,332	$0

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: Science

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Northwest Louisiana Professional Development Project: Bridging the Gap and Making Connections between Middle and High School Earth and Environmental Science

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Scott Vetter

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	10
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	8
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	15
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	18
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	10
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	9
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	20

Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$157,264
	Recommended Amount:	$152,000

01LaS-14
Centenary College
Scott Vetter
Focus: Science
Northwest Louisiana Professional Development Project: Bridging the Gap and Making Connections between Middle and High School Earth and Environmental Science
Determination: Recommended for funding at $152,000
Points awarded: 95 of 100
Ranking: #1 of 14

Strength(s):

- The project incorporates 120 hours of professional development (PD) for participants. This is fantastic and very much in line with current research.
- As indicated in prior years, the end-of-year follow-up workshop is a phenomenal example of how to wrap up a project and gives participants a chance to reflect on their progress and for the team to collect evidence of project success.
- The district's willingness to support this project in multiple ways is evident, including release time for teachers to do peer observations and providing substitutes.
- This project uses a feeder school model where 8th-grade teachers are paired (when possible) with 11th-grade teachers. These connections create an opportunity for fostering leadership and collaboration.
- The project team recognizes that teacher participants need to understand the articulation and progression of content and skills at a level higher than the grade level in which they teach.
- During the interview process each of the project team members recognized areas in which he or she could improve the project, clearly articulated their challenges, and stated reasonable ways to address those challenges.
- The district and University members of the project team have worked together for many years, and their level of collaboration and overall enthusiasm to serve teachers are quite evident.
- The content of the project (earth science) was selected because it is a specific need identified by the school district and supported by school assessment.
- Large amounts of time during the academic-year sessions are devoted to analyzing student work.

Concern(s):

- The redelivery plan is very weak. Participants attend a number of LSTA presentations and share experiences afterwards among each other. This plan does not address opportunities for redelivery of program content in a meaningful way to teachers who are not participants in this project.

- Goal 3, Objective 6 is not written in a measurable way. It is unclear what a “100% increase in the working relationship between the middle school and high school teachers” actually consists of.
- There is no one independent of the current project team identified as the project evaluator.

Recommendation(s):

- Given that passing the Earth and Space Science Praxis is one option that will lead teachers to obtaining earth science certification, consider expanding and enhancing the project by aligning project activities and increasing requirements to prepare teachers to demonstrate proficiency on the content assessed by the exam. The project team should consider providing incentives for teachers who wish to explore this method of alternative certification, such as paying for a portion or all of the exam fees for those who successfully achieve established benchmarks in their practice.
- Another resource that may be of use to the project team is lasw.org (website: Looking at Student Work). Because the team uses portions of the academic-year workshops to investigate student work, share experiences, and discuss how lessons were modified, the processes and protocols for analyzing student work at this site and others would be useful for providing structure for these analyses.
- To help provide inter-rater reliability, the project team should consider doing classroom observations for a select sample of teachers simultaneously.
- Consider hiring someone at the University to serve as project evaluator. This will give assurance that the project is reviewed and analyzed in an unbiased way.
- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.

Stipulation(s):

- Before funding for this project is authorized, the PI must obtain the signature of the Dean of the College of Education at Centenary College on the proposal cover page, and a copy of this signed cover page must be returned to LaSIP staff by no later than 4/30/14.
- The review panel recommends a reduced funding amount for this proposal. The PI has the discretion to identify the areas where those reductions can be applied, with the stipulation that the funding may not be removed from participant support (specifically referring to all funds requested in *C. Participant Support* in the Proposed Project Budget Request - Form BR).
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/14.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: ELA

INSTITUTION: Grambling State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The MADIBA Project: Motivating Adolescents by Deconstructing Icons to Build Achievers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pamela Payne

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	3
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	5
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	5
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	5
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	1
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	7
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	5
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	10

Total Score: 41 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $212,830

Recommended Amount: $0

02LaS-14
Grambling State University
Pamela M. Payne
Focus: Literacy
"The MADIBA Project" (Motivating Adolescents by De-constructing Icons, to Build Achievers)
Determination: Not recommended for funding
Points awarded: 41 of 100
Ranking: #14 of 14

Strength(s):

- The project is rooted in a critical pedagogy approach that using a vehicle and mechanism that can provide students with opportunities to engage in activities with the depth, breadth, and rigor inherent in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).
- The critical pedagogy approach, if employed well, would be a valuable method to prepare students for the types of assessment activities they will encounter on the next-generation assessments. These assessments will require students to read and analyze multiple texts (both informational and literary), and then integrate the information to support a well-developed, logical argument, or to write a detailed explanation of the information presented.
- The project staff/artists are accomplished in their fields.

Concern(s):

- Defined leadership is lacking beyond the summer. The PI is assigned to work for two months, full time and the Co-PI is assigned to work 1.5 months. While the PI is also the principal of the school in which the project will be implemented, the failure to define leadership beyond two months in the summer gives no assurance that the project can or will be implemented with fidelity throughout the school year.
- There is no evidence of sustainability or the potential for sustainability beyond the project period. The lack of matching funds places the project at high risk for termination once the funding is exausted.
- Specific connections to the CCSS are lacking. The PI fails to define specific CCSS writing (or other) standards which will serve as the focus of the project.
- Only one activity on Day 2 focuses on the CCSS. Given the project design, participants will engage in no more than two hours of PD in this area. Given the high priority that writing will have in the new high-stakes assessments, this should be a major focus.
- The minimum time devoted to PD related to the CCSS will not allow teachers to develop the depth and breadth of understanding they will need to understand the standards, and how to effectively use project activities to meet the performance expectations given that two *different* sets of standards exist (one for Grades 9-10,

and one for Grades 11-12).

- While the project could be a vehicle for preparing students to meet the college and career goals defined in and through the CCSS, the proposal fails to define how the activities (i.e., workbook, worksheets) will prepare students to produce writing reflecting the depth, breadth, and rigor defined in the CCSS.
- The activities in fall and spring are too limited. Students are to respond to a poet's performance via a survey or discussion. However, there is no explanation of what "respond" means or what the focus of the surveys or discussions will be.
- Student work is focused on reading biographies or autobiographies selected by the teacher during the summer institute, completing a workbook which includes a problem inventory, success worksheets, reconstruction exercises, and a reflection journal. There is nothing to suggest that teachers will be prepared to select complex texts for students to read that develop advanced reading and analytical skills needed to demonstrate to meet the Grades 9-12 CCSS/ELA standards.
- The spring 2015 final production lacks a connection to the activities given that the students' work in fall and spring is focused on reading biographies and autobiographies and completing assignments in a workbook. What activities will be undertaken to develop the performance?
- The proposal does not demonstrate collaborative development. There is strong evidence to suggest that project was developed in isolation by the IHE.

Recommendation(s):

- The PI should develop an understanding of the depth, breadth, and rigor of the CCSS for ELA, and literacy in history, science, and technical subjects.
- Select specific standards as focus standards for the project.
- Assure that proposed PD adequately prepares teachers to understand these standards. Develop, implement, and assess instruction with consideration for the depth, breadth, and rigor inherent in each standard.
- Place more emphasis on collaborating with partner parishes/districts to assure that administrators and teachers are engaged in the project design. This assures that all activities are responsive to local needs within the context of the delivery model.
- Document collaboration through copies of original sign-in sheets, meeting notes, survey data, etc., to provide reviewers with evidence to support proposal claims.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: Science/ELA

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mastering Assessment for Learning in Science

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Mooney

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	10
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	10
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	10
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	12
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	10
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	9
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	18

Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$116,249
	Recommended Amount:	$114,000

03LaS-14
Louisiana State University and A & M College
Paul Mooney
Focus: Science & ELA/Literacy
Mastering Assessment for Learning in Science
Determination: Recommended for funding at $114,000
Points awarded: 84 of 100
Ranking: #6 of 14

Strength(s):

- District administrators identified a very specific need that was incorporated into the overall design of this project. Science teachers wanted, needed, and requested PD to support use of literacy strategies in science classrooms, and this proposal was crafted around that need.
- There are opportunities to support teacher leadership. Participants can redeliver program content to master teachers and others within departments and/or grade levels during weekly cluster meetings.
- The project team recognizes that incremental growth in student performance, not huge gains, is a much more realistic expected outcome for a project such as this.
- The external facilitator identified for the first day of the summer session is well respected in the field of literacy education.
- This project shows great focus on close reading strategies, rather than a variety of unconnected literacy efforts.
- This project is well grounded in current literacy research.
- The project team has done a great job keeping budgeted costs low for this project.

Concern(s):

- As stated by the panel during the interview process this project is, fundamentally, a literacy-based proposal, not a science proposal. While the project team should be commended for trying to anticipate future district needs with respect to the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), there is not enough time during the summer session to allow participants to fully explore close reading and become familiar with the NGSS. Because the literacy component to this project is so strong and based on a clearly identified need, removing the NGSS component would not appear to significantly impact the scope of the project. Indeed, the reviewers recognize that it would allow more time for participants to become familiar and comfortable with close reading literacy strategies.
- The project proposal did not provide sufficient examples of the tangible products that participants would obtain from the summer sessions. When pressed during the interview the project team was able to articulate some examples, such as

book resources, reading resources, content units, etc., but these materials should have been identified in the proposal.
- The budget narrative did not identify the online assessment system by name or the rationale for the $15,000 cost.

Recommendation(s):
- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.

Stipulation(s):
- Because NGSS is not a fundamental component of this literacy project, the project team should remove NGSS activities and reallocate that time to support more close reading activities. The project must focus solely on close reading of complex text, primarily emphasizing the selection and integration of authentic primary and secondary science sources. The summer and academic-year sessions should all remain and should be refocused toward close reading and related topics.
- The review panel recommends reduced funding for this proposal. The PI for this project has the discretion to identify the areas where those reductions can be applied, with the stipulation that the funding may not be removed from participant support (specifically referring to all funds requested in *C. Participant Support* in the Proposed Project Budget Request - Form BR).
- Before funding is authorized, provide a detailed account to LaSIP staff as to the source of the $15,000 coted cost of the online assessment system, from where and from whom this system originates, where the data storage hosting is going to be located, the company or organization to house the data, the security in place to ensure the data are stored safely, and the personnel involved in the development of this system. This must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/14.
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/14.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: Science

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The 5E Learning Cycle and Science Writing Heuristic Approach to Teaching Chemistry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Deese

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	8
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	9
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	10
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	14
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	9
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	9
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	17

Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $193,825

Recommended Amount: $0

04LaS-14
Louisiana Tech University
William C. Deese
Focus: Science with a focus on chemistry
The 5E Learning Cycle and Science Writing Heuristic Approach to Teaching Chemistry
Determination: Not recommended for funding
Points awarded: 81 of 100
Ranking: #8 of 14

Strength(s):

- The use of the Science Writing Heuristic will serve as a tool to guide participants' thinking and analysis of their work, as well as when reading scientific documents.
- The chemistry content of this project originated with freshman-sophomore content at Louisiana Tech.
- Redelivery is a requirement of the project. Organizational structures are in place at the school and district level to support this.
- An emphasis on ADA compliance for all coursework/content/project resources shared online is noteworthy and should serve as a model for other projects.

Concern(s):

- References to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects were referenced in the interview process. However, the team was unable to articulate, with specificity, which standards will/can be a focus in this project. This is a major concern since students will be expected to read informational texts (which may include science content) and write arguments and informational pieces in response to this content.
- Despite several requests during the interview process for the project team to identify which results from prior projects led to the selection of the Science Writing Heuristic for this project, no specifics were provided that showed how the team used the results of prior projects to choose this strategy.
- The project team was not in agreement as to whether this is a pedagogy-focused project or a content-focused project. This difference of vision is of concern to the review team.
- The proposal did not identify specifically how project activities would cause ACT scores to rise 1 to 3%. It is not clear how the team can identify that variables attributable to this project are directly associated with an increase in ACT scores.
- While the proposal stated that the project focus would be on moving participants toward using more open-ended inquiry activities, the activities presented in the Chemistry Content section of the proposal are prescribed activities with well-known outcomes.

Recommendation(s):

- If open-ended activities are a focus of the summer work, plan for and utilize activities that are actually open-ended.
- During the interview, the PI stated that the project team “might not get to them all” (referring to the list of chemistry activities). More purposeful and specific planning would help eliminate the possibility of planning too many activities for a given time period during the sessions.
- The project team as a whole needs to become more knowledgeable of the CCSS for Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects and should be able to state specifically which standards are addressed in planned project activities.
- Changes in ACT scores are not a good measure of project success.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: ELA

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Building Sustainability: Powerful Instruction through Interactive Read Alouds, Literary Stations, and Workshop Model (Year-Two Continuation)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	10
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	10
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	10
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	15
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	10
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	9
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	18

Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$71,382
	Recommended Amount:	$71,000

05LaS-14
Louisiana Tech University
Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez
Focus: ELA
Building Sustainability: Powerful Instruction through Interactive Read Alouds, Literacy Stations, and Workshop Model (Year Two-Continuation)
Determination: Recommended for funding at $71,000
Points awarded: 87 out of 100
Ranking: #3 of 14 (tie)

Strength(s):

- The staff is highly competent and well-credentialed. The university-level partners are recognized, accomplished leaders in the field of literacy.
- All partners (IHE and school district) clearly work together as a professional community with strong team chemistry.
- During the interview, the school and university partners equally communicated multiple unintended and unexpected positive outcomes experienced as a result of this strong partnership. Most significant is the unintended outgrowth of a Professional Development School Model that emerged resulting in IHE partners reporting that they are now providing teacher preparation and graduate-level education courses in a room made available to them in the Glen View School.
- The inclusion of extensive student-level data in the proposal demonstrates that the project staff understands the importance of using student learning and achievement as the measure of effective professional development.
- This is a continuation project where full implementation of read-alouds, literacy stations, and a writers' workshop will take place, allowing participants to work not just on implementation but also incorporating deeper literacy content levels.
- The entire project is fully mapped to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).
- The project is based on correcting problems originally noted in the report submitted by the school observation team.

Concern(s):

- The proposal language is almost exactly the same as that submitted for another proposal in this cycle, even though this is a continuation project proposal. More specific and detailed information for how this continuation project enhances and extends the first iteration of this project would have been preferable. The differences between the two projects did not stand out as much as they could have.
- Though the written project model integrates a number of best practices, the inclusion of the CCSS in Appendix J suggested that these were not an integral part of the proposal. While this concern was resolved satisfactorily during the

interview, it was significant enough to the review team to articulate this concern.

Recommendation(s):

- There is a set of 200 iPads and technology carts available in the school, but while they are used in literature stations, only paper and pencil are used for writing activities. Consider also using these electronic resources and a multitude of free applications to address CCSS Writing Standard 6 for Grades K, 1, and 2: *With guidance and support from adults, use a variety of digital tools to produce and publish writing, including in collaboration with peers.*
- The information provided in Appendix J regarding the inclusion of the CCSS alignments should be provided in the 15-page narrative portion of the proposal (albeit in a more summative manner) to assure that reviewers see this integration clearly at the outset.
- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.

Stipulation(s):

- The review panel recommends reduced funding for this proposal. The PI has the discretion to identify the areas where those reductions can be applied, with the stipulation that the funding may not be removed from participant support (specifically referring to all funds requested in *C. Participant Support* in the Proposed Project Budget Request - Form BR).
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/14.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: ELA

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Powerful Instruction through Interactive Read Alouds and Workshop

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Libby Manning

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	10
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	10
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	10
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	15
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	10
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	9
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	18

Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$161,801
	Recommended Amount:	$157,000

06LaS-14
Louisiana Tech University
Libby Manning
Focus: ELA
Powerful Instruction through Interactive Read Alouds and Workshop
Determination: Recommended for funding at $157,000
Points awarded: 87 of 100
Ranking: #3 of 14 (tie)

Strength(s):

- Project staff includes individuals who are accomplished and recognized in literacy scholarship.
- This project is an effort to extend a 2013-14 funded LaSIP project into Grades 3-5 center which receives students from the K-2 site involved in the 2013-14 project.
- The proposal evaluation plan includes multiple measures that will be used to evaluate the project and results will be analyzed for statistical significance.
- This project is fully mapped to the CCSS.

Concern(s):

- This proposal replicates much of the language from the *Building Sustainability* proposal submitted by Dr. Kimbell-Lopez, even though this is a new project.
- The project does not have a formal teacher-leadership component as required by the RFP.

Recommendation(s):

- Develop a teacher leader cohort/cadre/group as an outcome of the project and require participants to redeliver content to their peers in the parish.
- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.

Stipulation(s):

- The review panel recommended reduced funding for this proposal. The PI has the discretion to identify the areas where those reductions could be applied, with the stipulation that the funding may not be removed from participant support (specifically referring to all funds requested in *C. Participant Support* in the Proposed Project Budget Request - Form BR).
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/15.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: Science/Math/ELA

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: STEAM Power

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Don Schillinger

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	9
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	8
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	14
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	18
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	9
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	8
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	17

Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$195,493
	Recommended Amount:	$172,000

07LaS-14
Louisiana Tech University
Don Schillinger
Focus: Science/MATH/ELA
STEAM Power
Determination: Recommended for funding at $172,000
Points awarded: 88 of 100
Ranking: #2 of 14

Strength(s):

- The PI is passionate about the project and increasing the number of students interested in STEM.
- The PI's commitment to depth, breadth, and rigor was clearly articulated in multiple ways throughout the interview process.
- The condition that all participants must complete a set of pre-summer institute modules as the "ticket" into the summer institute is an excellent tool for ensuring readiness and a common base of prerequisite knowledge, skills, and understanding. This may serve as a model for future LaSIP-funded projects.
- The project team expressed interest in creating video PD "training" videos from video footage which could be captured during the PD program.
- The use of the NBC LEARN site provides a vehicle for project participants to share lesson plans created as part of this project. A valuable by-product of this will be that lesson plans will need to withstand external review by NBC LEARN and only those accepted will be published.
- The enthusiasm of the school partner representatives for this project was extremely evident throughout the interview.

Concern(s):

- While one of the school-based representatives provided feedback that prior similar projects may have positively contributed to increases in reading scores of students with special needs and other secondary indicators (i.e., attendance, discipline referrals), the project team could not identify specifically how project activities would raise ACT scores an average of 5 to 10 percent. This specific change appears to be chosen arbitrarily given that, when questioned, the PI stated that increases in ACT scores cannot be directly linked to variables attributable to the project.
- When options for redelivery were discussed, one of the College of Education partners focused on bringing teachers to the University rather than articulating ways to use the Maker Spaces in the high schools more creatively.
- Even with participants completing a pre-institute set of modules, a 4-day summer institute session is a very short amount of time for participants becoming

comfortable enough with all of the Maker Space materials to create modules, try out lessons and then redeliver the training to others.
- The district's technology high school identified for this project is not necessarily one of the schools with the greatest needs in the district.

Recommendation(s):
- Use another source of student data (replacing the ACT) to evaluate the project. Options might include local (school-level) assessments and/or project-specific data collection tools that measure the specific project outcomes.
- Offer 4 or 5 hours of graduate credit instead of 3 hours as a means of compensating participants for the additional 30 hours of pre-institute preparation activities they must complete to certify them for participation in the summer institute (or, if this option is not available due to University regulations, consider other options for compensation). This will allow for 4 additional days of direct contact during the summer institute, as the funds would then become available for stipends for this extended summer session.
- Involve local construction trades and affiliated companies, foundations, individuals, and other community resources (such as including a posted "We need…" wish list) to collect in-kind donations and/or funding to outfit the Maker Spaces with additional materials, to outfit the third unfunded traveling Maker Space, and/or ***especially*** to outfit other higher-need high schools in the participating districts with traveling or on-site Maker Spaces.
- Consider creating a "lab" situation during the summer institute bringing in/using high school students (who may be on campus attending summer programs or who are in summer school at participating schools) to allow project participants an opportunity to do a trial run of their newly created modules.
- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.
- Consider referencing sources and connecting with organizations that have begun to develop a research base for Maker Space-type learning frameworks (or related creative learning models) such as New York Hall of Science Design-Make-Play Report from their January 2012 conference (http://dmp.nysci.org/system/files/filedepot/1/DMP%20Report.pdf), or Hive Learning Networks and their interim briefs, etc.
- Consider creating a process for awarding student "badges" for levels of module completion and new skill mastery as a motivator for students such as those offered by Mozilla (http://openbadges.org).

Stipulation(s):

- Remove one set of Maker Space materials from the budget, for a savings of $12,023.
- Remove office supplies from the budget, in the amount of $2,600.
- During the interview process Co-PI Lindsey Keith-Vincent offered to remove her salary from the budget if it would help make the project budget more efficient relative to available funding and other recommended projects. The panel appreciates that concession and stipulates the removal of those funds ($4,000 plus $1,859, for a total of $5,859) from the budget.
- The PI for this project has the discretion to identify the areas where the additional reductions to reach the recommended funding amount can be applied, with the stipulation that the funding may not be removed from participant support (specifically referring to all funds requested in *C. Participant Support* in the Proposed Project Budget Request - Form BR).
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/14.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: Mathematics

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project InCITE-Instructional Coaches Increase Teaching and Evaluation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carolyn Talton

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	8
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	9
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	14
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	15
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	10
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	9
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	10

Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$196,602
	Recommended Amount:	$0

08LaS-14
Louisiana Tech University
Carolyn Talton
Focus: Mathematics
Project InCITE - Instructional Coaches Increase Teaching and Evaluation
Determination: Not recommended for funding
Points awarded: 80 of 100
Ranking: #9 of 14

Strength(s):

- The project team has identified/developed a high-quality, robust set of resources for participants which the reviewers conclude will provide a rich professional learning opportunity.
- The grant proposal is a direct outgrowth of a request from Winn Parish. The partnership started at the district level between Winn and Grant parishes, with the university team later identified and brought on board.
- Specific references to the "*PARCC Blueprints"* are made and the quality of the references suggests that the PI has significant depth of knowledge of the new assessments.
- The PD for the teachers is clearly defined to prepare for shifting classroom instructional practices in meaningful ways to give students the necessary requisite knowledge to enable them to generate rather than select responses in assessment environments.
- The project is designed to address identified needs that surfaced during the needs assessment activities undertaken as part of the process used to develop the School Improvement Plan.
- The use of technology is expansive and includes expectations for integration of technology by participants.
- Focused "walk-throughs" (aka "learning walks") conducted weekly involve the instructional coordinator, principal, assistant principal, and teachers (peers), and include time to debrief after each is completed.

Concern(s):

- In previous years the review panel has had concerns that the project team is not well structured for collaboration and that the project is still driven from the top down. There is little evidence that the PI has incorporated recommendations by prior review teams to alter the structure of the team to take advantage of existing resources. The PI directs the action of the team and takes on many of the roles of the team, including evaluator and site coordinator. Some funds budgeted for the PI might be used to support more substitute release time and support for the instructional coaches to take on much more of the classroom observation duties.

- The identified project evaluator is the PI of another LaSIP proposal. While this person's credentials are not in question, it is highly recommended that a person be secured to serve as evaluator who is not in a leading role as part of a competing project in order to preserve objectivity.
- Of greater concern is the actual role of the evaluator in this project. As the PI specifically stated during the interview, the person identified as the external evaluator is merely functioning as a statistician. Evaluation activities and duties are conducted and managed by the PI. This does not sufficiently utilize the skills of the evaluator to provide recommendations supported by data analysis.
- It was unclear how the use of technology will be measured as part of the project.
- The results of a statewide survey were used as supporting documentation for the activities proposed, but statewide needs are not necessarily indicative of the needs of teachers in Winn and Grant parishes. It was unclear if the survey results were only from respondents from Winn and Grant parishes.
- Problem-Attic was only budgeted for the month of July, not the entire duration of the project. This would make it of limited use to the participants.

Recommendation(s):

- Consider video recording teachers/coaches who are successful at redesigning instruction and assessment in ways that reflect the Standards for Mathematical Practice, edit, and make this video bank available to teachers via the Internet.
- Consider budgeting for Problem-Attic for the entire duration of the proposal.
- Choose an evaluator who is not a PI of a competing proposal. Revise the evaluator's role so that he or she is able to assess the entire project and provide recommendations for improvement, not just perform mathematical calculations.
- Revise the project team and roles/responsibilities to take advantage of structures and personnel already in place to accomplish instructional coaching and other related tasks.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: Science

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Science Instruction for the Next Generation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Glenn Lo

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	9
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	7
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	6
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	5
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	9
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	7
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	10

Total Score: 58 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$151,576
	Recommended Amount:	$0

09LaS-14
Nicholls State University
Glenn Lo
Focus: Science
Improving Science Instruction for the Next Generation
Determination: Not recommended for funding
Points awarded: 58 of 100
Ranking: #13 of 14

Strength(s):

- This project is the beginning of a 3-5 year extended effort to help address needs in the parish/district.
- The project team is commended for attempting to incorporate several redelivery options for project participants.

Concern(s):

- Because there are different topics addressed during each week of the summer session (physical science, life science), there is no guarantee that participants will take part in both weeks, though applicants who elect to attend both weeks would receive selection preference. A better format would have been to choose one content area or the other.
- Content instruction is not evident in the summer session program plan. The summer session seems primarily focused on lesson-plan development; participants need to have a strong level of demonstrated content familiarity at a level higher than the grade level in which they are expected to teach.
- Including stipend payments for non-participant colleagues is fundamentally flawed. There is no indication of how those non-participants would earn their stipends, other than simply attending sessions led by participants. This is not a viable redelivery model and only rewards attendance, not substantial participation that results in meaningful change in content knowledge, self-efficacy, and/or pedagogy.
- The project plan does not state how lessons created to address various NGSS performance expectations will be integrated across and within grade levels so that coverage will be deemed “adequate” for the DCIs, crosscutting concepts, or science/engineering practices incorporated into each performance expectation.
- Participants will earn 5 hours of compensation for lesson plan development and post-delivery documentation, even though some participants may spend less time than this to create and document a lesson. This design could compensate participants for time they did not spend on the project.
- The quality of participants’ lessons and the use of the 5E lesson-plan model do not seem to be assessed in any evident way according to the evaluation plan.

- The budget does not detail the number of student workers needed to set up labs, how much time is needed for that specific effort, or why students are needed for clerical work. The lab component is confusing because there is no mention in the proposal of how participants will utilize labs during the sessions.
- The budget does not detail how the amount requested for materials to be used for lessons was developed, especially if the lessons have yet to be created.
- The estimate in the budget narrative for on-campus housing, conference registration and lodging was vague. What was the estimate for each of these items separately and how was that number determined?
- No external evaluator is identified.

Recommendation(s):

- If this project is proposed in the future and provides stipends for non-participants, include a very specific plan for how mentored non-participant colleagues would earn their stipend payment and how their effort would be tracked as part of the project plan. Mere attendance at a redelivery session is not sufficient.
- If this project is proposed in the future, consider addressing one content area, not two. While the review team appreciates that the project team was responding to survey results to create this plan, participants would be better served by having access to a longer summer program focusing on one, in-depth content area.
- Include a detailed description of how content instruction is incorporated into the summer session and/or the academic-year sessions and how participants will be assessed on their content knowledge.
- Use a rubric shared with the participants to assess lessons created as a result of this project.
- Provide more detail in the budget narrative as to how budget totals and estimates were determined.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **10LaS-14**

PROJECT FOCUS: **Mathematics**

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Naturally Understanding Mathematics By Exploring and Reasoning 2014-15 (Project NUMBER 2014-15)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: DesLey Plaisance

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	8
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	8
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	13
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	16
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	10
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	8
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	18

Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$169,590
	Recommended Amount:	$165,000

10LaS-14
Nicholls State University
DesLey Plaisance
Focus: Mathematics
Naturally Understanding Mathematics By Exploring and Reasoning 2014-15
(Project NUMBER 2014-2015)
Determination: Recommended for funding at $165,000
Points awarded: 86 of 100
Ranking: #5 of 14

Strength(s):

- The project partnership with St. Mary Parish Public Schools enhances the existing P-20 "pipeline" that is solidifying as a result of the ongoing, intentional partnership between St. Mary Parish and Nicholls State University.
- The project expands and extends the vast mathematics-related PD of previous LaSIP projects implemented by the PI and connects logically and seamlessly to them.
- Use of ALEKS and Kentucky assessments are valuable enhancements to the project.
- Use of an external reviewer on Kentucky assessment is evidence of the PI's commitment to assuring valid and reliable (tools) assessment results.
- One of the PI's stated intents is to involve another University staff member in the project activities to expose her to quality teacher PD programs so she can lead the next generation of teams.

Concern(s):

- The written proposal provides little evidence that the teachers will learn to develop performance tasks which integrate multiple standards within real-world context (as opposed to tests).

Recommendation(s):

- Focus the literacy component on Common Core Writing Standards 1 and 2. Students at all grades will benefit from framing written mathematical arguments (CCSS.W.1) and explanations of why and what they did (CCSS.W.2).
- Strongly consider recording the workshops on video and creating PD content-focused vignettes/excerpts for on-demand access by teachers and administrators.
- Strongly integrate the common addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division situations defined and outlined on pages 88-89 of the CCSS for Math and use these as the foundation for preparing participants to develop classroom and assessment tasks.

- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.
- Investigate using task analysis rubrics such as the Tri-State Rubric to assess whether higher-order thinking skills are used in mathematics problems.
- Consider redelivery to teachers of ELA, science, and social studies focusing on the ideas in the Standards for Mathematical Practice and opportunities for applying mathematics in real life situations.
- Use *Understanding By Design* (http://www.authenticeducation.org/ubd/ubd.lasso) as a resource to drive lesson planning.

Stipulation(s):

- The review panel recommends reduced funding for this proposal. The PI for this project has the discretion to identify the areas where those reductions can be applied, with the stipulation that the funding may not be removed from participant support (specifically referring to all funds requested in *C. Participant Support* in the Proposed Project Budget Request - Form BR).
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/14.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **11LaS-14**

PROJECT FOCUS: **Math/Science**

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrated Science Technology and Mathematics (I-STEM)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Troy Williams

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	9
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	9
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	13
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	15
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	4
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	8
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	10
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	15

Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$141,943
	Recommended Amount:	$138,000

11LaS-14
Southeastern Louisiana University
Troy Williams
Focus: Mathematics/Science
Integrated Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (I-STEM)
Determination: Recommended for funding at $138,000
Points awarded: 83 of 100
Ranking: #7 of 14

Strength(s):

- The project incorporates 90 PD contact hours, which is in line with current research.
- The summer workshop session is 12 days in length, which should provide ample time for participants to explore workshop content.
- Redelivery is an expected part of this project. The district Chief Academic Officer expects redelivery of all PD (not just this project) to grade level/content teams in weekly cluster meetings.
- The results of the pretest will focus the instructional design of the summer session.
- This project is directed not just at high-need public schools, but also includes private and parochial schools.
- The school district representative is an outstanding leader, as evidenced by her enthusiastic involvement in prior successful projects; the review team is confident of her ability to see this project to completion.
- Blackboard and the OnCourse system are both available to participants.

Concern(s):

- The PI has assumed all duties related to evaluation of this project, rather than securing the services of an external evaluator who can provide objective feedback.

Recommendation(s):

- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate the feedback information electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.
- Hire an external evaluator to assess the project as a whole. The data can be collected by the existing project team, but data analysis and development of project recommendations and alterations should be done by an independent evaluator.

Stipulation(s):

- The review panel recommends reduced funding for this proposal. The PI has the discretion to identify the areas where those reductions can be applied, with the stipulation that funding may not be removed from participant support (specifically referring to all funds requested in *C. Participant Support* in the Proposed Project Budget Request - Form BR).
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff no later than 4/30/14.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: LIGO Science

INSTITUTION: Southern University-Baton Rouge/Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project SLT (Project Southern University and A&M College, Louisiana Tech University and Teachers)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Luria Young

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	8
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points) Project SLT	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	9
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strateg (of 15 Points)	14
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	7
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	2
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	9
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	8
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	9

Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$238,732
	Recommended Amount:	$0

12LaS-14
Southern University and A & M College
Luria Young
Focus: LIGO (Science)
Project SLT (Project Southern University and A&M College, Louisiana Tech University and Teachers)
Determination: Not recommended for funding
Points awarded: 66 of 100
Ranking: #11 of 14

Strength(s):

- The format of this project is based on a long-standing series of LaSIP-funded LIGO Science projects.
- The project team is commended for incorporating museum-based science to expand PD opportunities for science teachers and for utilizing the unique local resource of LIGO.

Concern(s):

- There appears to be role overlap on the team, which is composed of two separate project teams that, in several prior years, were two competing projects. With the merger of the projects, though, a difficulty seems to have arisen since the two projects are centered in vastly different parts of the state. The number of project staff nearly doubled while the number of project participants has decreased over time. The number of project participants served by this project is lower than all other proposed projects and only serves participants from past projects. While it is evident that the teams wanted to continue to collaborate as they have for a short while, the panel questions whether this is an effective strategy to serve participants in a cost-effective manner.
- Most, if not all, project participants and staff would need to travel to the central Louisiana summer workshop site and incur travel-related lodging, mileage, and meals costs. This would not have been a necessary expenditure if the project was not attempting to serve participants in such geographically disparate regions of the state.
- While this staff-heavy and expensive project that serves a minimal number of teacher participants was accommodated last year with a sizeable reduction in awarded budget, further accommodations this year would result in a drastic change to the scope and design of the project. The potential scale of these changes is too large to warrant funding, even at a reduced amount.
- Appendix L of the proposal included results of 2012 and 2013 Project MISE assessments. There is very little information provided as to how the assessments were administered, who the participants were, how many participants completed

all of the requirements of the program, and any other details related to whether the project reached its goals. There is one short paragraph of description and the remainder is presented in the form of graphs with no analysis provided and no recommendations for improvements of the program based on the assessment results.

Recommendation(s):

- If the applicants wish to propose projects in future years, this should be done with a focus in either northern or southern Louisiana, or they should propose a merger that reduces staff and increases participants.
- If proposals submitted in the future build on the results of prior efforts, PIs should provide excerpts of the most recent year's report so that reviewers can see results of the entire program to be able to assess whether the current program design takes the results into account.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **13LaS-14**

PROJECT FOCUS: **ELA/Mathematics**

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: English and Mathematics Common Core (EMC²) Academies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter Sheppard

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	8
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points) Project SLT	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	8
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strateg (of 15 Points)	8
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	10
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	5
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	9
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	7
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	10

Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$252,648
	Recommended Amount:	$0

13LaS-14
University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Peter Sheppard
Focus: ELA and Mathematics
English and Mathematics Common Core (EMC^2) Academies
Determination: Not recommended for funding
Points awarded: 65 of 100
Ranking: #12 of 14

Strength(s):

- The project team acknowledges the need for participants to be leaders in their own districts.
- The evaluation plan was designed to obtain statistically significant results.
- The partner school districts committed a large amount of in-kind support to the project (over $55,000), including supporting instructional coaches.

Concern(s):

- This project is trying to accomplish too much with too many participants in too short a period of time. The proposal states the project has "hopes" of producing demonstrable statistical gains in: 1) participants' knowledge of algebra, 2) participants' knowledge for teaching algebra and its foundations while interlinking the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Standards for Mathematical Practice, and 3) students' knowledge of the prerequisites of formal algebra. Similarly, the ELA track of the EMC² academies will focus on teaching ELA and incorporating the CCSS with hopes of producing statistical gains in: 1) participants' knowledge of the CCSS; 2) participants' knowledge for how to teach ELA using the CCSS; and 3) students' ability to read, write, speak, listen, and use the conventions of English.
- The amount of work expected of each participant (the creation of 15 new lessons, classroom lesson implementation, and assessment tasks) is enormous and unrealistic given the time and support available within this project.
- The project is designed to prepare middle school teachers in both ELA and mathematics. While there is a clear reading/writing connection in mathematics, the converse is not true. It is unclear why ELA and mathematics teachers would all need to experience the same levels of PD focused on increasing understanding of the CCSS for ELA and mathematics, as well as improve their knowledge of how to teach using the standards in both areas, as these teachers are usually departmentalized. While there are specific CCSS/ELA standards that have connections to the expectations outlined in math, there is little likelihood that ELA teachers will need to devote time to learning algebra standards or how

to teach algebra. Thus, the PD proposed seems inappropriate.
- The objectives reference using 2013 test scores as pre-treatment scores and 2014 scores as post-treatment. This error in dates (2013 should have been 2014, and 2014 should have been 2015) was included several times in the proposal.
- No external evaluator is identified.

Recommendation(s):
- Narrow the scope of focus in future proposals to increase the likelihood that participants will have sufficient time to explore the depth and breadth of a focused body of content and the strategies needed to teach that content.
- Identify specific standards which have a role in the math curriculum and craft professional development to aid teachers in understanding these standards and developing capacity to integrate them into the math curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
- Develop and deliver separate professional development for math and ELA teachers unless combining them in a single program/session can be done in ways that assure that 100% of the activities apply to both groups.

RATING FORM FOR FY 2013-2014 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14LaS-14

PROJECT FOCUS: Science/Math

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Inquiery-Based, Coastal-Focused Science and Mathematics in Middle and High Schools 2014

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Diane Maygarden

A. Rationale and Need for the Project (of 10 Points)	6
B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	7
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	10
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	13
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	2
C. Quality of Key Personnel (of 10 Points)	9
D. Project Evaluation (of 10 Points)	7
E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing (of 20 Points)	15

Total Score: 69 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$173,119
	Recommended Amount:	$0

11LaS-14
University of New Orleans
Diane Maygarden
Focus: Science/Mathematics
Inquiry-Based Coastal-Focused Science and Mathematics in Middle and High Schools - 2014
Determination: Not recommended for funding
Points awarded: 69 of 100
Ranking: #10 of 14

Strength(s):

- This proposal is a math and science project, using a lens of Louisiana's coastal wetlands, which is a very relevant topic for the state of Louisiana.

Concern(s):

- There is a very inconsistent level of school involvement in the development of the proposal. The school teams were not equal partners in the design of this project; one of the school representatives stated during the interview that she was not involved in the project design process.
- The redelivery plan is weak. Participants host a conference to showcase student work, to which other teachers are invited. Despite this redelivery model drawing no non-participant attendees during the current iteration of this project, this plan continues to be incorporated into the current proposal.
- During the interview a team member mentioned that two lessons created as part of an existing project were to be included in a forthcoming book. The review team does not consider this to be a strategy for redelivery, as there is no documented participant feedback, there is no documentation of the number of people served by including these activities, the range of content and pedagogy delivered is very small, and there is no guarantee that the readers of the book are going to be within the targeted grade range for this proposal.
- The team indicated that the lesson study component of the current project is not working; despite this problem, it is a major part of the current proposal. The review team questions why a strategy that is not working continues to be utilized.
- The project team was not able to identify specific Common Core State Standards (CCSS) that aligned with proposed activities. Discussion during the interview included generalizations of good literacy practices and strategies, but not integration of specific CCSS.
- The detailed profile of students and teachers to be served was presented at the parish level, not at the school level.
- The parish-level data was the same data that was included in last year's proposal.

- The review team questions the value of testing participants to create a lesson plan in 30 minutes without prior notice of the lesson plan's topic. This is a measure of a participant's test-taking ability, not of their ability to reflect on program content and instructional strategies and effectively create a lesson that incorporates project content.
- Goal 3, Objective 2 requires little effort on the part of potential collaborating schools, other than submitting a signed letter of collaboration, and does not indicate follow-through on the part of the project team or the schools.

Recommendation(s):

- Use a lesson plan rubric to analyze participant-developed lessons rather than a short test. Make this rubric available to all participants prior to commencing lesson development activities.
- If future proposals are submitted use the most recent school-level data available, not data from a prior proposal.
- Consider changing the design of the project based on thoughtful analysis of the current level of effectiveness of redelivery and lesson study components, and use these analyses to fix outstanding issues.
- Include all school representatives in the design of the project.