



Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program

**FY 2016-17 LaSIP REVIEW  
FINAL REPORT**

**December 2015-February 2016**

**Prepared by:**

**Michael Pietrzak, President  
Advanced Strategies for Professional Development**

**Wendy Thomas-Williams, Math Instructional Coach  
New Visions for Public Schools**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **A. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND REVIEW PROCESS**

On Wednesday, September 16, 2015, the Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program (LaSIP) staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to fund Mathematics, ELA/Literacy, and Science K-12 teacher professional development (PD) projects. In response to the RFP, seven (7) proposals were submitted requesting a total of \$1,157,265. An out-of-state review panel was sent the following to read and review: (1) the FY 2016-2017 LaSIP RFP; (2) the proposals; (3) rating forms for each proposal; and (4) a summary sheet of all of the LaSIP proposals with proposed funding amounts.

The reviewers convened during December 10-11, 2015 to interview, via Skype, prospective project directors, university staff and K-12 partners from each submitting team in order to further assess the merits of the proposals. The reviewers agreed that this interview process provided extremely valuable information and the clarity needed to properly rank the proposals and recommend funding. On February 4, 2016, the reviewers submitted funding recommendations for each project along with numerical ratings and rankings and written accounts of strengths, concerns, recommendations and funding stipulations.

### **B. RANKINGS AND FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

Table I contains a rank-order list of projects recommended for funding. A total of \$643,358 was recommended for four (4) projects. Table II contains a rank-order list of projects not recommended for funding. Stipulations for budget reductions or increases, project content and timelines are included in this report.

### **C. REVIEW CRITERIA**

The review of written proposals and follow-up interview questions were generally focused on, but not limited to, the following:

- Determining if the project was developed to address a real need identified by the school district and if the partnership was authentic, or if the project was built by the institution of higher education (IHE) and the local education agencies (LEAs) were merely recipients of service;
- Identifying how findings from previous PD projects, LaSIP or otherwise, conducted by the project team influenced the development of the proposed project;
- Understanding specific academic content that participating teachers would learn, how this content was identified, and methods for assessing the degree to which the participating teachers mastered the new academic content;
- Assessing specific research-based instructional strategies (pedagogy) the participating teachers would learn and be able to implement as a result of participating in the project, the measures to

be used to assess the degree to which this was accomplished, the methods and timeline for supporting teachers in implementing these new strategies throughout the academic year, and strategies for preparing and ensuring school leadership will monitor, support, and evaluate implementation;

- Noting a contemporary research base to support the project design;
- Seeing specific activities in which the IHE and the K-12 school district engaged to collaboratively develop the proposal, as well as specific participants and the timeline; and
- Addressing the method of collaboration that led to the identification of participants (schools, and specific participating teachers) to assure that the schools and teachers with the greatest need are being served.

#### **D. CONCLUSIONS**

Reviewers commend the Board of Regents for its commitment to a comprehensive, objective review process using out-of-state, third-party reviewers, and a process which includes both a review of the written proposal and an interview. The inclusion of an interview process enhances the likelihood that the State is investing in projects with the greatest potential of success. It provides an opportunity for the review team to seek clarification about items from the written proposal where questions arose. Thus, project teams had opportunity to clarify and/or defend aspects of the proposal which appeared to be deficient or not clearly stated due to space limitations. Project teams were required to respond to deep, pointed questions that ultimately revealed nuances that framed aspects of the projects differently than the written proposals. This was most apparent in two areas: 1) quality of partnerships between an IHE and LEA; and 2) plans for redelivery of the professional development program to non-participants by the teachers who participate in the project. This comprehensive, multi-step process allows the State to enter into contracts with professional development providers with a high degree of confidence that the limited funding available is awarded to those projects that demonstrated the greatest promise for positively impacting student learning in accordance with LaSIP goals.

## 2016-17 LaSIP Panel Review

### TABLE I

#### Proposals Recommended for Funding

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
1	90	02LaS-16	LSU-A&M	Bach	\$148,253	\$148,253
2	89	11LaS-16	NIC	Plaisance	\$183,037	\$183,037
3	82	13LaS-16	SLU	Williams	\$152,902	\$152,902
4	78	01LaS-16	CEN	Vetter	\$159,166	\$159,166
					\$643,358	\$643,358

### TABLE II

#### Proposals Not Recommended for Funding

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
5	65	03LaS-16	LSU-A&M	Madden	\$166,215	\$0
6	60	05LaS-16	LaTech	Manning	\$211,680	\$0
7	32	04LaS-16	LaTech	Lvov	\$136,012	\$0
					\$347,692	\$0

**RATING FORM FOR 2016-2017 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 01-LaS-16

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science

**INSTITUTION:** Centenary College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Elementary Science Teachers Enhancement Program (ESTEP):  
Physical Sciences and STEM

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Scott Vetter

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 7  
(of 10 Points)

**B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)**

**i. Measurable Objectives** 7  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 11  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 15  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4  
(of 5 Points)

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

**D. Project Evaluation** 7  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 17  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 78 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$159,166  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$159,166

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>01-LAS-16</b>
<b>IHE</b>	<b>Centenary College</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Elementary Science Teachers Enhancement Program (ESTEP): Physical Sciences and STEM</b>
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Scott Vetter</b>
<b>Focus</b>	<b>Science</b>
<b>Determination</b>	<b>Fund with stipulations</b>
<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>\$159,166</b>
<b>Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>78</b>

### **Strengths**

- The project incorporates 120 hours of professional development for participants across the summer institutes and academic year, as suggested by current research. This includes a 10-day summer institute at the beginning and a 5-day institute at the end.
- The end-of-year follow-up workshop is an excellent method to wrap up a project that gives participants a chance to reflect on their progress and for the project team to collect final evidence related to project objectives.
- Time during the academic year sessions will be devoted to analyzing student work.
- The partnership with the district is strong and the project was developed in response to district needs; the district is driving the focus of the project.
- This plan addresses opportunities for possible redelivery of program content by participants to teachers who are not participants in this project.

### **Concerns**

- The project plan does not include opportunities to actually engage teachers in real science (i.e. using the scientific method), in using real-world technology as tools for data collection and analysis, and problem solving.
- While the project replicates the model of previously funded LaSIP science PD proposals, there was very little evidence of incorporation of “lessons learned” or adoption of previous reviewer recommendations.
- The rationale for the subject matter of the project (physical science) was that the content was selected at the district’s request, rather than being based upon, at least in part, analysis of available or collected student and teacher data by the project team.
- There is a large number of science GLE’s chosen as the focus for the project content. The list is not based on data analysis.
- The subject matter taught and assessed during the summer institute will be 3rd-5th grade content, and the assessment tools will be developed from released state science assessment questions for grades 3-5. While it is understood that educators need to know the content that they teach, this approach is not likely to expand or deepen their own science content knowledge on a post-secondary level.
- It is unclear how or if the chosen standards and skills align with the proposed Science and Technology Concepts (STC) units for grades 3-5, or how/which STC units will be utilized.
- Goal 3, objective 1 is not a teacher leadership objective. It addresses pedagogy with respect to student assessment, not teacher buy-in and mentoring.
- Most of the data referenced in the narrative, outside of the summer institute pre/post-tests, are qualitative in nature (i.e., teacher observations, teacher surveys, and daily teacher feedback).

- It is stated that past programs have had an impact on student outcomes on statewide test results; however, no school or class-level assessment results, specifically for related science content for the classes taught by project participants were included.
- There are no formalized processes or protocols for analyzing student work, for providing structure for these analyses, or for documenting these crucial teacher activities.
- It is unclear what the specific role of the master teacher will be and how that teacher will be used during the summer institute.

### **Recommendations**

- Formalize the analysis of the student work process and collect artifacts (analysis session notes, protocols and anonymous student work, etc.) to document this portion of the academic year workshop activities. A resource that may be of use to the project team is lasw.org (website: Looking at Student Work) or similar.
- In order to improve the participants' subject-specific content knowledge, the Summer Institute content should be taught and assessed on a post-secondary level.
- Narrow the project content focus (for example, choose one set of GLE's, such as Position and Motion of Objects and Forces). This will allow time needed to deeply explore the big ideas and to help participants understand (a) crosscutting concepts, (b) how to apply practices, and (c) and core ideas. This may also facilitate participants' understanding of the progression of science skills from grades 3-5.
- To help provide inter-rater reliability, the project team should consider doing classroom observations for a select sample of teachers simultaneously or view and rate select video-recorded teacher observations.
- Formalize the redelivery plan that participants will implement as a required component of the project.
- Formally gather feedback forms, agendas and attendance 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, Plickers, Socrative, or others.
- Consider having participants do two "Hots, Gots and Nots" feedback forms: one specifically for *science content* and one specifically for *pedagogical content* (instructional strategies). This type of feedback can be quickly collected using formative assessment tools such as Plickers and Socrative.
- Collect student data from the science probes participants implement in the classroom and used during summer institute and any academic year workshop sessions. Model how the data from these probes are to be collected, analyzed and used to inform instruction.
- Collect student data from common grade-level science probes periodically to demonstrate project outcomes related to student progress.

### **Stipulations**

- Provide a detailed evaluation plan which includes a timeline for data collection (quantitative *and* qualitative) and analysis throughout the project. The tools and assessments used to evaluate the project should be reviewed and/or chosen by the project evaluator to ensure they are valid, reliable and measure the project outcomes.
- Provide a detailed description of the role and credentials of the master teacher/mentor, as well as when/how this person will serve the project as a paid consultant.

**RATING FORM FOR 2016-2017 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 02-LaS-16

**PROJECT FOCUS:** ELA

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana State University and A&M College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Writing that Works: Developing Ongoing Professional Development on  
Integrating the CCSS to Improve Student Writing, Grades Pre-K-12

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Jacqueline Bach

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 9  
(of 10 Points)

**B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)**

**i. Measurable Objectives** 9  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 14  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 17  
(of 20 Points)

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

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

**D. Project Evaluation** 8  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:**

90
----

 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$148,253</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$148,253</u>



<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>02-LAS-16</b>
<b>IHE</b>	<b>Louisiana State University and A&amp;M College</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Writing that Works: Developing Ongoing Professional Development on Integrating the CCSS to Improve Student Writing, Grades Pre-K-12</b>
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Jacqueline Bach</b>
<b>Focus</b>	<b>ELA - Literacy</b>
<b>Determination</b>	<b>Fund with stipulations</b>
<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>\$148,253</b>
<b>Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>90</b>

### **Strengths**

- The team is strong and all participants engaged equally in the interview process. Responses were clear and all members of the team, whether from the IHE or LEA, spoke confidently and clearly.
- It was evident that the project was developed through collaboration among members from the IHE and the LEA.
- The project was developed in response to a need identified by the LEA and the interventions proposed are based on data that suggest they will be effective in addressing the identified needs.
- There is a focus on developing teachers' capacity in teaching academic vocabulary which has potential to positively impact student learning and achievement across the curriculum.

### **Concerns**

- There are discrepancies and contradictions in the proposal. The title states the project is for teachers in PK-12, though the activities state that only teachers from Grades 9 and 10 will participate.
- The use of the 6 Trait Rubric rather than one that directly and unambiguously reflects the specific dimensions of the State's Writing Standards for High School distracts the teachers and students from a focus on the Standards and leaves the teachers responsible for making connections between the 6 Trait Rubric and the Standards.
- The 6 Trait Rubric is typically used in elementary school and, as such, does not reflect the depth of the State's High School Writing Standards.

### **Recommendations**

- None

### **Stipulations**

- Prior to funding, revise the rubric to align clearly and unambiguously with the dimensions and depth of the State's High School Writing Standards.

**RATING FORM FOR 2016-2017 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 03-LaS-16

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Mathematics

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana State University and A&M College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Building Meaningful Relationships to Improve Student Learning in  
Algebra I

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** James Madden

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 8  
(of 10 Points)

**B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)**

**i. Measurable Objectives** 6  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 7  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 10  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 5  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 17  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 65 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$166,215  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>03-LAS-16</b>
<b>IHE</b>	<b>Louisiana State University and A&amp;M College</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Building Meaningful Relationships to Improve Student Learning in Algebra 1</b>
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>James Madden</b>
<b>Focus</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>
<b>Determination</b>	<b>DOES NOT MEET FUNDING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>65</b>

### **Strengths**

- The project is strongly rooted in a self-efficacy model which is intended to frame course content around the unique needs of participants.
- The project is intended to support other initiatives already in progress between the IHE and East Baton Rouge Parish School District.
- The project includes a professional development coach whose sole function is to support algebra teachers in the classroom and whose work will complement ongoing efforts conducted through other projects.

### **Concerns**

- The purpose of LaSIP is to fund projects that “will enhance the core content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge of teachers” (RFP, Section III A). The written proposal for this project does not fully define the specific adult/college-level content knowledge that teachers will be expected to learn, nor do the project objectives include outcomes for this. This was not clarified during the interview. The lack of clearly stated content expectations and measures makes it impossible to determine potential program effectiveness.
- While the team and the Cain Center have an ongoing relationship with the EBR school district, there was no evidence to show that the partners engaged in a collaborative planning process to design this specific project, nor the content/type of the communications with the nine staff members at the core schools.
- The process of identifying, training and using teacher leaders as apprentices for the project is unclear.
- No analysis of student and/or teacher data from the schools named/involved related to the project outcomes is presented to make the case for the project fulfilling a demonstrated need.
- The number of hours planned for professional development activities is 69, fewer than the number of distributed hours that the current research base for effective math and science teacher PD suggests to effect changes in teacher practice.
- There is no rationale presented to support looking for teacher rating of “Competent”, a 3 according to the Dreyfus Five-Stage Model of Adult Skill Acquisition, as opposed to a rating of 4 (Proficiency) or 5 (Expertise).
- The majority of the evaluation measures of the project outcomes are qualitative in nature.
- There is no structured plan, including training and support, to develop teacher leaders who will be able to provide “on the ground” support, guidance, and leadership in the Mathematics Programs in their schools and throughout the district beyond the life of the funding.
- There are funds budgeted for principal consultants. This is not an allowable expense according to the LaSIP RFP.

**RATING FORM FOR 2016-2017 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 04-LaS-16

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science/Math

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Making Things Small Count: Practical Nano/Micro Technology

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Yuri Lvov

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 7  
(of 10 Points)

**B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)**

**i. Measurable Objectives** 2  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 3  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 5  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 2  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 6  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 2  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 5  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 32 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$136,012  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>04-LAS-16</b>
<b>IHE</b>	<b>Louisiana Tech University</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Making Things Small Count: Practical Nano/Micro Technology</b>
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Yuri Lvov</b>
<b>Focus</b>	<b>Science/Mathematics</b>
<b>Determination</b>	<b>DOES NOT MEET FUNDING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>32</b>

### Strengths

- The topic of the project is relevant and timely.
- This proposal provides the foundation of a valuable professional development project and could be developed into an effective, research-based project with the potential for improving instruction and increasing student learning and achievement in science, mathematics, and ELA/literacy.
- A sampling of relevant, interesting science content is included.

### Concerns

- The proposal does not demonstrate that the planned activities are a direct response to strategically identified needs.
- The data used to show need for the project are broad and general.
- Project effectiveness is in part to be measured by an increase in student scores in Biology and Algebra I; however, there is no plan to assure that these teachers will actually participate in the project activities. The proposal reads, “There will be two teams of ten 9th-12th grade educators participating. All teachers will be certified but are not obligated to have science or mathematics certification to participate.”
- The proposal states, “90 hours of professional development will take place through a hybrid format including 30 hours of pre-visit work, five face-to-face days during the summer institute with the fifth being a showcase, and four days during the academic year for additional lab work and pedagogical showcases.” While this has potential for being an effective delivery model, the 30 hours of pre-workshop time (one-third of the project) do not relate to specific measurable outcomes and assessment is lacking. Further, there is no evidence of how the content from the 30 hours will connect to the face-to-face sessions.
- The online component is a random collection of topics that fails to demonstrate a clear learning path to an identified outcome.
- Redelivery plans do not reflect the requirements of the State’s RFP. The proposal states “At least 85% of project participants will redeliver the material from the summer institute at a regional conference or at the LATECH mini conference as well as in a UTeachTech Step Course.” Redelivery is intended to directly impact teachers in the district who did not participate.
- The redelivery plan cited above is outside of the control of the participants unless they are the group selecting presentations for the conference and hiring faculty to teach courses. As there is no evidence of commitment from any third parties, there is no way to determine whether this plan has any likelihood of being achieved.
- Responses to participant opinion polls on project effectiveness (e.g., “at least 80% of the participants in the project will rate the project as good or very good at providing instructional strategies by the end of the project”) are not an appropriate measure of project effectiveness.

There are a number of more effective designs for project evaluation readily available for PD projects.

- The project proposes that “at least 80 % of the participants will increase scores on the content assessments created by project staff following completion of the coursework”. Given that the proposal fails to define exactly what participants will know and be able to do upon completion of coursework, the reviewers are unable to determine if that metric has validity.
- There is no rationale provided in the proposal for having participants develop a book about nano/micro technology for preschool students, nor is there any demonstrated instructional need in Early Childhood education known/presented to the reviewers to support this activity. It is highly questionable that this was included in the proposal since, during the interview, one of the PIs stated that it was thought to be “a good idea that we would try”. A plan, time, resources, and human capital are not assigned to this activity nor is there any apparent alignment of this activity with CCSS or State Science Standards, or even the project goals, which are targeted for high school teachers.

**RATING FORM FOR 2016-2017 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 05-LaS-16

**PROJECT FOCUS:** ELA

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Assessment Literacy: Data-Based Instruction

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Elizabeth Manning

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 6  
(of 10 Points)

**B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)**

**i. Measurable Objectives** 5  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 7  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 10  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 6  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 15  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 60 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$211,680</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>05-LAS-16</b>
<b>IHE</b>	<b>Louisiana Tech University</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Assessment Literacy: Data-Based Instruction</b>
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Elizabeth Manning</b>
<b>Focus</b>	<b>ELA</b>
<b>Determination</b>	<b>DOES NOT MEET FUNDING REQUIREMENTS</b>
<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>60</b>

### **Strengths**

- This is a strong, knowledgeable, and well-credentialed team each of whom is proficient, respected, and highly accomplished and recognized in their appropriate areas of expertise, including literacy education.
- The project flows from needs identified through a strong ongoing relationship between the Institution of Higher Education and the School District.
- The project outlines a rich program for deepening teachers’ understanding of assessment and effective use of assessment data to inform planning and instruction.
- A strong interim evaluation report for the previous project, which included statistical analysis, was included.

### **Concerns**

- This otherwise strong proposal fails to meet the most basic requirement for the funding, which is clearly stated in multiple places in the RFP including the initial reference on page i: “This RFP provides guidelines for submission of 11.5-month professional development (PD) proposals focused on enhanced content knowledge in ELA/literacy, science, and/or mathematics for PK-12 educators.”
- This team submitted a proposal that was essentially the same as the previous year with no substantive modification to address the deficiencies noted by the 2015-2016 review panel.
- There is no College of Arts and Sciences participation, which is a requirement of the federal funding source. This may be because the team did not plan for teachers to develop content knowledge in a discipline normally found in a College of Arts and Sciences.
- Use of Grades 3-5 data to inform a K-2 project is questionable. Data included in the Appendix would have been more appropriate for determining needs for a K-2 project.

### **Additional note:**

It should be reiterated that the 2015-2016 LaSIP Review Panel included in that year’s Final Report the following note, which went unheeded:

*The [2015-2016] RFP requires that “[f]unded projects will enhance the core content and pedagogical knowledge of teachers in ... ELA/literacy” [Section III A, RFP] ... While knowledge of assessment and assessment strategies is professional content knowledge, it is not among the content areas about which teachers are expected to gain content knowledge set forth in the requirements. To be fundable, this project would have needed to define specific ELA/Literacy content knowledge the participating teachers would acquire as a result of participating in this project. While during the interview, the team stated the teachers would be reading and writing, there are no defined outcomes that would assure the State would be properly allocating grant funds.*



**RATING FORM FOR 2016-2017 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 06-LaS-16

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Mathematics

**INSTITUTION:** Nicholls State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Naturally Understanding Mathematics by Exploring and Reasoning  
2016-17 (Project NUMBER 2016-17)

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** DesLey Plaisance

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 8  
(of 10 Points)

**B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)**

**i. Measurable Objectives** 9  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 12  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 15  
(of 20 Points)

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

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

**D. Project Evaluation** 10  
(of 10 Points)

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

**Total Score:** 89 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$183,037  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$183,037

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>06-LAS-16</b>
<b>IHE</b>	<b>Nicholls State University</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Naturally Understanding Mathematics by Exploring and Reasoning 2016-17 (Project NUMBER 2016-17)</b>
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>DesLey Plaisance</b>
<b>Focus</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>
<b>Determination</b>	<b>Recommended for funding</b>
<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>\$183,037</b>
<b>Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>89</b>

### **Strengths**

- There is a strong, positive, longstanding partnership between the IHE and LEA.
- This project is developed and staffed by a strong, knowledgeable, respected, and well-credentialed team.
- The Math Department faculty in the College of Arts and Science is the primary driver of this project, which is unique in that most LaSIP proposals tend to be driven by Colleges of Education.
- There is a clear, strong focus on supporting the development of math content knowledge among the teachers participating in the project.
- Paraprofessionals are included in the project activities, and an option for undergraduate credit is available for these participants. This can serve as a foundation for a *Grow Your Own* program. At a minimum, it enhances the effectiveness of the paraprofessionals and has the potential of increasing their sense of efficacy and confidence when working with students.
- The project continues to capitalize on an existing partnership with St. Mary Parish Public Schools that enhances the existing P-20 “pipeline.”
- The project has included an external evaluator and a clearly delineated evaluation plan that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data sources for each objective. This plan employs a quasi-experimental design which lends validity to reported program results.
- The project includes a detailed plan and support for dissemination and participant redelivery of content as an integral activity.
- The project provided a detailed grade-level sub-analysis by CCSS math domain of student data for the parish.
- Participants who complete the project components will receive three hours of graduate credit.
- A sample syllabus for the professional development course was included. It delineates the specific subject-matter content and instructional strategies that will be employed.
- The project design includes references to relevant, contemporary research bases for content, delivery methods and instructional strategies.
- The IHE provided in-kind support in the form of tuition waivers for the graduate course.

### **Concerns**

- While high teacher turnover is an issue in this parish, this team, which has received LaSIP funding for multiple years, has not developed resources that could be “reused” with teachers new to the district. Given the widespread availability of technology and apps for recording and publishing, this is something that should be strongly considered.

**RATING FORM FOR 2016-2017 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 07-LaS-16

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science/Math

**INSTITUTION:** Southeastern Louisiana University

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

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Troy Williams

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 8  
(of 10 Points)

**B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)**

**i. Measurable Objectives** 8  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 10  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 15  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4  
(of 5 Points)

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

**D. Project Evaluation** 9  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 82 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$152,902  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$152,902

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>07-LAS-16</b>
<b>IHE</b>	<b>Southeastern Louisiana University</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Integrated Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (I-STEM)</b>
<b>Principal Investigator</b>	<b>Troy Williams</b>
<b>Focus</b>	<b>Science/Mathematics</b>
<b>Determination</b>	<b>Recommended for funding</b>
<b>Recommended Funding</b>	<b>\$152,902</b>
<b>Score (out of 100)</b>	<b>82</b>

### **Strengths**

- The project team demonstrates a well-established partnership between the Tangipahoa district and SLU project staff.
- The project plan proposes an integrated math/science approach to professional development.
- College-level physical science course content will be used for the summer institute training.
- The project includes a 12-day summer institute as well as three full-day academic-year sessions.
- Planned math content will focus on integration of the Common Core 8 Mathematical practices.
- There is a plan for project content redelivery and for reviewed project unit plans dissemination through an online repository.

### **Concerns**

- The project team needs to reconsider the number of summer institute topics. As discussed during the interview, project staff found there were too many science standards for participants to successfully complete during the last project.
- The project plan did not specify what adult-level math content participants will learn that will lead to improved professional practice.
- In the proposal it is stated that algebra will be a focus content topic. However, there are no algebra standards listed in the summer institute content topics table.

### **Recommendations**

- Strategically select fewer math and science topics to be covered based on participant needs and student (skill-level) assessment data, and cover them in depth.
- Consider using a specific, common formative assessment tool (for example, one or two science probes) for each grade level in order to measure student progress across the project and as proof of improvement in participant pedagogical and content practices.
- Have the external evaluator review and, if necessary, recommend assessment instruments for measuring project outcomes to ensure they are valid and reliable.
- Teach administrators what to look for in I-STEM participants' classrooms with respect to instructional and assessment practices to support the transfer of new skills.
- Collect and score lesson plans at the midpoint and end of the school year to ascertain whether participants continue to implement practices and strategies learned during the summer institute and academic year sessions. This will enable project staff to better ascertain the level of participant transfer of new skills.