



Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program

**FY 2017-18 LaSIP REVIEW  
FINAL REPORT**

**April 2017**

**Prepared by:**

**Eric Hart, Chair**  
Grand View University

**Cynthia Deaton**  
Clemson University

**Catherine A. Rosemary**  
John Carroll University

## INTRODUCTION

A review panel chosen for their extensive experience in K-12 professional development (PD) and expertise in one of the three eligible content areas, mathematics, science and English language arts (ELA), conducted a review via phone and email during February and March 2017 for the purpose of evaluating seventeen (17) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program (LaSIP). The panel consisted of:

- Eric W. Hart, Ph.D., Professor of Mathematics and Mathematics Education, Grand View University, Iowa (Panel Chair)
- Catherine A. Rosemary, Ph.D., Professor of Education and Chair, John Carroll University, Ohio
- Cynthia C. Minchew Deaton, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Science Education, Clemson University, South Carolina

The review panel received the following materials prior to the review: a) the seventeen (17) LaSIP proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2017-18 LaSIP Request for Proposals; and e) the FY 2016-17 LaSIP Review Panel Final Report.

Prior to the review, each panelist independently evaluated and annotated each of the seventeen (17) proposals. During the review process, each proposal was thoroughly and fairly evaluated based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP, with individual reviewers leading the discussion on proposals within their content area of expertise. In each case unanimous agreement was reached.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. A detailed review of each proposal, including written comments and a scored rating form, follows immediately after the tables.

Total requests of \$3,940,541 were received by the panel. The panel recommended awards totaling \$2,242,113 for ten (10) proposals.

## 2017-18 LaSIP Panel Review

**TABLE I**  
**Proposals Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Discipline	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
1	92	16LaSIP-17	UNO	Germaine-McCarthy	Math	\$262,792	\$222,852
2	90.4	04LaSIP-17	LSUAM	Tullos	Math	\$266,704	\$256,552
3	86.6	15LaSIP-17	ULL	Ruiz	Math	\$256,057	\$217,987
4	86.11	03LaSIP-17	LSUAM	Mooney	ELA	\$278,340	\$269,990
5	83.8	17LaSIP-17	UNO	Gill	Science	\$298,208	\$251,768
6	82	02LaSIP-17	LSUAM	Bach	ELA	\$280,343	\$271,933
7	81.7	08LaSIP-17	LaTech	Kimbell-Lopez	ELA	\$182,169	\$176,704
8	81.4	13LaSIP-17	LaTech	Weiss	Science	\$149,992	\$145,492
9	81.2	05LaSIP-17	LaTech	Clark	Math	\$278,226	\$269,879
10	80.6	07LaSIP-17	LaTech	Deese	Science	\$163,872	\$158,956
						<b>\$2,416,703</b>	<b>\$2,242,113</b>

**TABLE II**  
**Proposals Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Discipline	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
11	76	12LaSIP-17	LaTech	Keith Vincent	Science	\$276,744	\$0
12	75.7	06LaSIP-17	LaTech	Crittenden	Science-Math	\$240,714	\$0
13	74.9	09LaSIP-17	LaTech	Lvov	Science-Math	\$149,914	\$0
14	74.3	10LaSIP-17	LaTech	Manning	ELA	\$182,169	\$0
15	72.52	01LaSIP-17	CEN	Vetter	Science	\$222,395	\$0
16	72.2	11LaSIP-17	LaTech	Morgan	Science-Math	\$176,134	\$0
17	70.9	14LaSIP-17	SLU	Williams	Science	\$275,768	\$0
						<b>\$1,523,838</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Proposal Number:** 01LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Centenary College  
**Principal Investigator:** Scott Vetter  
**Discipline:** Science  
**Funding Request:** \$222,395  
**Funding Recommendation:** \$0  
**Rating:** 72.52

- Collaborative and mentoring relationships are important aspects of developing an effective community of learners. This is especially true for those trying to interpret and implement new State and national standards.
- It is not clear why there are so few academic-year (AY) meetings. This project would benefit from more contact with participants, such as monthly or every other month.
- The focus of the project is very broad and not very clear. There is no specific content or aspect of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), a common theme mentioned, that could be used with the many grade levels noted. How will project leaders narrow it down and address all NGSS strands for all grade levels of teachers represented? At the end of the rationale section, Life Science was mentioned but it was not clear if that is the common theme being used to organize activities. A narrower thread to help plan project activities, teacher products, etc. would benefit the facilitators and participants of the project.
- In the objectives section, it is not evident why student data is not being collected and analyzed.
- It is not evident why middle school teachers are not part of the project from the beginning. Also, are only 12 elementary teachers allowed to continue for the second summer? Why not continue with all of the participants, or all that can?
- It is not clear if practices encouraged by national standards are going to be implemented and modeled. There are some inconsistencies in how facilitation of project activities will be accomplished. While inquiry-based practices are mentioned, there are sections that either state or hint that more traditional practices will be used. These practices often contradict those mentioned in NGSS and A Framework for K-12 Science Education.
- The actual duties and time spent for team members are not clearly established.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 01LaS-17  
**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science  
**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Centenary College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Elementary Science Teachers Enhancement Program (ESTEP): STEM  
Life Sciences and Bridging the Elementary-Middle School Gap

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Scott Vetter

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 7.2  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 5.3  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 12.5  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 12.52  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3.7  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.9  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 5.5  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 16.9  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 72.52 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$222,395  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

**Proposal Number:** 02LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** LSU and A&M College  
**Principal Investigator:** Jacqueline Bach  
**Discipline:** ELA  
**Requested Funding:** \$280,343  
**Recommended Funding:** \$271,933  
**Rating:** 82

- This project has the potential to build leadership capacity by pairing cohort 1 with cohort 2, which supports a strong model of peer coaching.
- The process involved in videotaping and analyzing teaching examples is a well-researched, collaborative inquiry practice that supports professional growth.
- One of the project outcomes is a video collection of effective teaching for ongoing use in the schools and for wider dissemination.
- The project promises a strong set of deliverables to improve teaching of writing, including lesson plans, effective strategies, and rubrics for assessment.
- The content of the PD aligns specifically to the appropriate Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and reflects a strong research base on the teaching of writing.
- Beyond the highly qualified University faculty, the project staff includes instructional specialists who can provide the day-to-day support of the implementation.
- The project design integrates technology in the PD delivery through modules and feedback on individual teachers' videos of writing instruction.
- The plan does not specifically describe how the project team will work individually with teachers in establishing site-based peer coaching.
- The plan does not specify how individual content needs are identified and how that information is applied in the PD content.

**Stipulations:**

- Goal 3 is unclear; as stated, it seems to relate to the plan for professional development delivery. Clarify this goal in relation to the LaSIP goals, e.g., building leadership capacity.
- Specify in the project evaluation the degree of expected change in teacher performance.
- Provide details on the principals' recommendations as part of the selection criteria for participation.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 02LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Literacy/ELA

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Writing that Works: Ongoing Professional Development to Improve  
Students' Argumentative Writing Using Informational Texts

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Jacqueline Bach

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 7.8  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 5.3  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 13.7  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 16.8  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.1  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.9  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.4  
(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:** \$280,343  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$271,933

**Proposal Number:** 03LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** LSU and A&M College  
**Principal Investigator:** Paul Mooney  
**Discipline:** ELA  
**Requested Amount:** \$278,340  
**Recommended Amount:** \$269,990  
**Rating:** 86.11

- The PD design and delivery reflect a strong research base in all components of the project: data-based individualization, effective reading comprehension strategies instruction, and performance feedback.
- The project builds on the schools' existing System for Teacher and Student Achievement by: (a) filling gaps in knowledge and pedagogy related to assessment and data-driven individualized instruction; (b) providing PD on performance feedback to mentors and master teachers; and (c) explicitly aligning the PD with the #1 priority of the middle schools' improvement plans, which is reading comprehension.
- The project identifies and addresses the need for new-teacher support through a triadic model of assisted performance.
- The Consultative Framework builds capacity for ongoing job-embedded PD and teacher leadership by making a strong investment in the development of master teacher expertise.
- The project implementation design clearly describes the interrelatedness of the three PD components, fidelity of implementation, and intended outcomes.
- The project builds in diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments of reading and describes the steps to be taken when performance outcomes are not met, e.g., use of diagnostic assessment when student progress is insufficient.
- The PD targets the knowledge and skills that teachers need to effectively address individual student needs through explicit instruction in the processes of a response-to-invention model. It focuses on targeted, data-driven instruction through benchmarking and frequent progress monitoring of student performance in relation to learning goals and performance expectations.
- The project's deliverables are clearly specified, e.g., tangible records of implementation of DBI and performance feedback.
- Pre/post teacher assessment of teachers' knowledge of reading comprehension strategies is not well defined.
- The proposal addresses the importance of relationships in mentoring, although it does not specifically describe how it includes relationship building in the mentor training.

**Stipulation:**

- Identify the evaluator and specify the particular duties and amount of time on project evaluation per the evaluation criteria.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 03LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** ELA/Literacy

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Writing that Works: Data-Based Individualization for Students with  
Severe Learning Needs

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Paul Mooney

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 9.15  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 8.04  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 14.58  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 14.54  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.63  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9.43  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.41  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18.33  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 86.11 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$278,340  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$269,990

**Proposal Number:** 04LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** LSU and A&M College  
**Principal Investigator:** Lynne Tullos  
**Discipline:** Mathematics  
**Requested:** \$266,704  
**Recommended:** \$256,552  
**Rating:** 90.4

- This is a solid project targeting a content domain for which there is great PD need: statistics and probability.
- The multi-dimensional approach is well grounded in research on effective PD, reflected in the iterative processes of deepening content knowledge, engaging in collaborative problem-solving activity, and analyzing and reflecting on teaching with feedback based on student performance.
- The project holds promise for enhancing the teacher preparation program through the strategic selection of mentors for teacher candidates during clinical practice.
- The competencies expected from the statistics and probability PD activities are clearly described.
- There are well-developed and tight connections among LaSIP goals, project design and objectives, and the evaluation plan.
- The project proposes laudable use of "Japanese-style lesson plans." However, this is an intensive process and details are lacking on planning. The implementation during the summer workshops and in the AY teaching and PD must be carefully orchestrated.
- Similarly, the project is commended for the proposed use of active learning, efforts to empower teachers, "clinical interview" teaching methodology, application of the GAISE report and the CCSSM Standards for Mathematical Practice, use of real-world data and "outstanding websites." To achieve the expected benefits, however, the project must make sure to carefully design and implement how, when, and with what activities and materials all this will be carried out.

**Stipulation:**

- Staff costs are high and should be reduced by 10%.

# RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 04LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Mathematics

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Statistics to Accelerate Teachers & Students (STATS) for the 21st  
Century: Activities & Technology for the Statistics Domain &  
Foundational Skills

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Lynne Tullos

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 9.7  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 8.9  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 14.2  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 18.4  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.9  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.9  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.4  
(of 10 Points)

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

**Total Score:** 90.4 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$266,704

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$256,552

**Proposal Number:** 05LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Lynn Clark  
**Discipline:** Mathematics  
**Requested:** \$278,226  
**Recommended:** \$269,879  
**Rating:** 81.2

- The summer and AY workshops are well designed and described in detail. In particular, the Summer 2017 workshop is described in detail day by day, including content, teacher activities, duties of project personnel, evaluation activities, and connections to the rest of the project. This bodes well for the success of the project.
- The PD incorporates a collaborative approach, which includes not only grade-level teams of classroom teachers but also the media specialist in the design, implementation, and assessment of classroom-based projects. The team approach can help establish the Makerspace as a vital component of the science program in early education.
- The project addresses the critical need in early education to bridge Preschool to K-2 through the partnership work with the Children's Coalition on teacher and media specialist recruitment and dissemination of the program to child care centers.
- The cost-per-participant given in the proposal budget appears incorrect. The proposal states several times that there will be 30 participants, yet the cost-per-participant is computed in the proposal budget based on 20 participants.
- The budget justification needs to be more detailed.
- There appear to be discrepancies between the total requested on the cover page and the total requested in the proposal budget.

**Stipulation:**

- The PI must establish that there are actually 30 participants, and must reconcile this with the budget.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 05LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Mathematics

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Making Maker-Spaces Work: Early Childhood Education PK-2

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Lynn Clark

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 6.1  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 6.1  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 14.2  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 15.1  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.5  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9.1  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 8.1  
(of 10 Points)

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

**Total Score:** 81.2 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$278,226

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$269,879

**Proposal Number:** 06LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Kelly Crittenden  
**Discipline:** Science/Mathematics  
**Requested:** \$240,714  
**Recommended:** \$0  
**Rating:** 75.7

- This is an intriguing proposal. Unique features include teachers and students working on the “builds” side-by-side in the summer day camp, integration of the projects into various subject areas, and exploring uses and educational benefits of computers (e.g., building hardware, CAD, and affective/motivational benefits) beyond the typical applications in classrooms.
- The project does not fit the goals of the 2017-18 LaSIP program sufficiently. The three goals are to increase teachers' content knowledge, increase leadership capacity and pedagogical skills, and increase student achievement. Despite other merits and the creativity of the project, it does not adequately align with these goals of this program (as further described below).
- The objectives are weak as related to goals and design of the program, as is the evaluation plan. For example, for the student achievement goal, a stated objective is to increase student scores in the area of Algebra 1, and yet algebra is not the content focus of this project. For the pedagogical skill goal, the stated objective targets participants' perceptions of the project, which is not an indicator of change in their own pedagogical skills. The objective for the final stated goal in the proposal is to show that 85% of the teachers redeliver the material to their peers. None of the goals and objectives adequately address the LaSIP goal of increasing teacher content knowledge.
- Each goal does not include two objectives as stipulated in the RFP.
- Two of the three targeted schools are not considered high need.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 06LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science/Math

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** One Day Builds for Junior High STEM Teachers

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Kelly Crittenden

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 5.8  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 5.5  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 11.2  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 18.2  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3.9  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9.1  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 4  
(of 10 Points)

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

**Total Score:** 75.7 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$240,714  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

**Proposal Number:** 07LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Bill Deese  
**Discipline:** Science  
**Requested:** \$163,872  
**Recommended:** \$158,956  
**Rating:** 80.6

- Thorough, specific, measurable objectives that are related clearly to the LaSIP goals are presented.
- A strong list of example activities, some of which are inquiry-based, is provided.
- The project incorporates the 5E learning cycle, which is a solid research-based strategy.
- Some of the language used in the proposal contradicts the idea of inquiry. For example, when describing project design, the idea of something being presented is noted. This seems to hint at more traditional approaches of teaching and learning.
- There also seems to be a space for looking at this project through a more culturally relevant lens. How could approaches and activities used in this project highlight these lenses and make the content more relevant and meaningful to participants and their students?
- Details are lacking on the external evaluator. On the timeline, it needs to be clear when the external evaluator is completing tasks, what the external evaluator is actually collecting and how, and what contact he/she will have with the participants.
- The budget justification and budget appear to not match in some instances. There are sections that show a disconnect.
- The budget justification needs to clearly identify what materials are being purchased and the reasoning behind them. For example, what is the purpose of webcams and how are they being used for this project?

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 07LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science

**PROJECT TYPE:** 11.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** C3

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Bill Deese

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 5.5  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 8.3  
(of 10 Points)

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

**iii. Delivery Method** 14.9  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3.9  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.9  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 8.5  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18.6  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 80.6 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$163,872

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$158,956

**Proposal:** 08LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez  
**Discipline:** English Language Arts  
**Requested:** \$182,169  
**Recommended:** \$176,704  
**Rating:** 81.7

- The project builds on prior PD focused on the PI’s “powerful instruction” model to improve reading and writing instruction in the elementary schools.
- Emphasis is placed on content and pedagogical content knowledge, standards-based lesson design, and data-driven decision making using an assess-plan-teach-evaluation instructional framework.
- Collaboration between K-12 schools and the University includes increasing the number of placements of preservice candidates with mentors, which helps build leadership capacity within the schools and has the potential to strengthen the teacher preparation program.
- The materials include the State’s ELA guidebooks for Grades 3-5, which provide a specific content focus aligned to the state’s summative assessments and are the primary resources used in the project.
- The intended outcomes of the PD are teachers’ increased knowledge and skills in teaching reading and writing through a close analysis of units in the ELA curriculum.
- The project aims to address a need for common language and shared understanding of the ELA CCSS and emphasizes the interconnectedness of content, instruction, and assessment in effective teaching.
- The “powerful instruction” components, which the PIs label as tenets, are a combination of teaching strategies, i.e., interactive read aloud; instructional setting, i.e. literacy stations; and instructional framework, i.e. reading-writing workshop. Clearly defining these components and how they fit within the standards-based ELA curriculum would be important at the outset of the PD, which has a central focus on helping teachers “unpack” the units in the State’s ELA guidebooks (i.e., integrate rather than layer).
- The evaluation plan is weak; levels of expected change are not specified and no details are provided on observation protocols, yet observation data are collected. Specific measures used to evaluate goals/objectives are not identified, e.g., “immersed in PD” (Objective 2.1) is in part measured by “handouts,” and outcome in 2.1 is participant satisfaction, which does not align with the objective.
- The project includes teacher candidates but does not specifically describe their participation and how this relates to the Educator Preparation Program.

**Stipulations:**

- Clarify the role of teacher-leader participants and how they are identified.
- Specify measures in the Evaluation Plan and align project outcomes to the goals and objectives.
- Provide appropriate ELA standards for G3-G5 in Appendix I.

# RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 08LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Literacy/ELA

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Grades 3-5 Curriculum Connections:  
Content→Pedagogy→Assessment→Teach

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 6.1  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 6.1  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 13.7  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 15.5  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.3  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9.4  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.4  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 19.2  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:**

81.7
------

 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$182,169  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$176,704

**Proposal 09LaSIP-17**  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Yuri Lvov  
**Discipline:** Science/Math  
**Requested:** \$149,914  
**Recommended:** \$0  
**Rating:** 74.9

- This project is mainly focused on two schools. It is not clear why participation is limited or if other participants could join. What type of equipment/materials will they receive if used materials are given to the two high schools as noted in the proposal?
- Some of the project activities seem to contradict inquiry-based methods encouraged by NGSS and A Framework for K-12 Science Education. Inquiry-based instruction and the science & engineering practices are not highlighted as much as they should be. Additionally, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learning and Career Readiness are not noted, which is surprising since they are easily a part of this project.
- In the Collaborative Partnership section, participant recruitment is not clearly described. What does it mean that preference is given to teachers in the "planning process"?
- More information is needed regarding the online courses that will be used.
- The AY follow-up and contact with participants are not clearly described. More detail is needed regarding the November and March AY follow-up. It is noted that there is one online pre-visit prep but that does not translate to a two-day AY on-campus visit that is also mentioned in the proposal. Online and on-campus visits are different. Also, are the two groups of 10 participants being trained together face-to-face in the AY or separately?
- Some of the project products and training are not clearly described. For example, participant products (e.g. children's book, e-portfolios), deliverables, and use of lab space for the entire school are not well defined. Also, training for using equipment provided is noted but not how the participants will train others and whom they are targeting to train. How will this truly sustain the project? Additionally, the purpose of creating a PreK or K level children's book is not clear. What is the purpose? How will it help the participants?
- This project would benefit from additional PD activities in May or June of 2018 to wrap up and help problem-solve in the whole group. Having a "next steps" plan for the schools and lab spaces would help assure the sustainability of the project.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 09LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science/Math

**PROJECT TYPE:** 11.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Making Things Small Count

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Yuri Lvov

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 6.1  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 5.5  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 12.1  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 15.3  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.2  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.9  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 5.9  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 16.9  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 74.9 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$149,914  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

**Proposal:** 10LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Elizabeth Manning  
**Discipline:** English Language Arts  
**Requested:** \$182,169  
**Recommended:** \$0  
**Rating:** 74.3

- The project builds on prior PD from the team focused on the PI's "powerful instruction" model to improve reading and writing instruction in the elementary schools.
- Collaboration between schools and the University includes increasing placement of preservice candidates with mentors, which helps build leadership capacity within the schools and has the potential to strengthen the teacher preparation program.
- The intended outcomes of the PD are teachers' increased knowledge and skills in teaching reading and writing through a close analysis of units in the ELA curriculum.
- The project aims to address a need for common language and shared understanding of the ELA CCSS and emphasizes the importance of the interconnectedness of content, instruction, and assessment in effective teaching.
- Emphasis is placed on content and pedagogical content knowledge, standards-based lesson design, and data-driven decision-making using an assess-plan-teach-evaluation instructional framework. However, the integration of RF CCSS is not specified nor differentiated from the G3-G5 PD, as outlined in the G3-G5 proposal submitted by the same university.
- The PD content for K-2 is not differentiated from the G3-G5 content in the proposal. How the PD will address reading foundational skills in Interactive Read Aloud, Literacy Stations, and Writing Workshop is not described specific to K-2 student developmental needs in reading and writing. The focus on comprehension strategies for K-2 is different from the CCSS for G3-G5.
- The research base for the K-2 PD is not defined specifically for these grade levels.
- The evaluation plan is weak; levels of expected change are not specified and no details are provided on observation protocols, yet observation data are collected. Specific measures used to evaluate goals/objectives are not identified, e.g., "immersed in PD" (Objective 2.1) is in part measured by "handouts," and an outcome in 2.1 is participant satisfaction, which does not align with the objective.
- The project includes teacher candidates but does not specifically describe their participation and how this relates to the teacher preparation program.

## RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 10LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Literacy/ELA

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Grades K-2 Curriculum Connections:  
Content→Pedagogy→Assessment→Teach

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Elizabeth Manning

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 5.8  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 5.3  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 9.6  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 14.1  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.2  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9.4  
(of 10 Points)

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

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18.9  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 74.3 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$182,169</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

**Proposal:** 11LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Pamela Morgan  
**Discipline:** Science-Math  
**Requested:** \$176,134  
**Recommended:** \$0  
**Rating:** 72.2

- The idea of using Gsuite for educational purposes is great and lends itself to addressing 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner Skills.
- Unfortunately, the sole training on Gsuite and the way it is discussed in this proposal do not showcase how it can be seamlessly integrated into course instruction. It goes against the use of technology to support content learning and teaching. It should be clear that it is being purposefully embedded into instruction to support teaching and learning of a content or practice. Why isn't STEAM, STEM, or another content area being noted as the context for learning Gsuite?
- Since the focus of this PD is mainly Google training and Google certification and training can be done by participants outside of the PD, there is not a strong case for this project. The focus should not be on technology training but technology training within a specific content area.
- The use of expert teachers is an important aspect of school leadership. However, it is not clear how participants are "redelivering" a 60-hour PD to other teachers in just two hours during September.
- The purpose of using Captivate is not evident. How is it being purchased and why did the project leadership select it over another piece of software?
- The reason for using some of the incorporated technology is not established. For example, two hours of video captured using an iPad (or other device) and a Swivel requires an extremely large amount of memory. How is this going to be transferred to facilitators? Why are both webcams and a tablet being used? Why are webcams being used at all? Additionally, Swivel is a hardware system that can upload video online but is not a camera system. Participants must have their own camera (e.g. built into an iPad) to use the hardware to track teacher movement. The proposal notes that this lends itself to remote observations, but to truly do remote observations, participants and facilitators will need different software, an IP camera or a tool such as a Kubi.
- As written, the project does not seem sustainable due to the type and number of devices available for teachers and their students.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 11LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science/Math

**PROJECT TYPE:** 11.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Using Google "GSuite" to Develop Effective STEAM eLearning  
Environments

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Pamela S. Morgan

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

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 6.7  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 9.6  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 10.5  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3.7  
(of 5 Points)

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

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.4  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18.3  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 72.2 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$176,134  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

**Proposal:** 12LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Lindsey Keith Vincent  
**Discipline:** Science  
**Requested:** \$276,744  
**Recommended:** \$0  
**Rating:** 76

- The idea of providing teachers with time and support in unpacking standards is critical to teaching. However, the approach described is overly broad and lacks details.
- This project focuses on breadth and not depth and could lead to not providing an adequate amount of support for the unpacking of the standards.
- Additionally, this is something that should be supported initially at a State level, especially with the scope and sequence noted in this proposal in connection to the State-level team that is part of this project.
- To make a case for this project, the proposal should showcase how the project team is scaffolding the unpacking grade level by grade level or topic by topic. Grades 6-8 feature an excessive number of standards and target content areas. To bridge this, the project could focus on the Science & Engineering practices as a way of easily and quickly integrating other subjects through argumentation and debate, communication, and computation; there needs to be a theme or connecting element to use when planning for overall project activities.
- A diagram of the Engineering Design Process is provided but the proposal is not focusing on this as a connecting theme. This makes the design and delivery of the project appear confusing.
- The proposal does not clearly describe the exact nature, contact time, and type of support that the CORE team and AXI are providing. Why are they lumped together in the budget but noted differently in the narrative? It is not clear if they are doing the same amount of work as the lead institution. The case for this partnership and the assignment of responsibilities are not clearly established.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 12LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** SAILing (Science Achievement through Inquiry and Leadership)  
towards Success with the New Standards

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Lindsey Keith Vincent

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 7.8  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 6.1  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 10.4  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 14.5  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.3  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.6  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.4  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 16.9  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 76 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$276,744  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

**Proposal 13LaSIP-17**  
**Institution:** Louisiana Tech University  
**Principal Investigator:** Leland Weiss  
**Discipline:** Science  
**Requested:** \$149,992  
**Recommended:** \$145,492  
**Rating:** 81.4

- The focus on STEAM afterschool programs is an exciting way to engage teachers, schools, and students in STEAM initiatives and 21<sup>st</sup> Century skills.
- The project activities are individualized but the schedule appears uniform for all participants. For example, students only get recognition after completing a challenge, but how is this done every other month when activities take five weeks? Will everyone get recognition at the same time since they will all be on the same track due to the schedule, or will it adjust to different groups of students?
- The idea of recognizing students has the potential to impact the community in multiple ways. This could be turned into a STEAM community night where the students host their families, community stakeholders, and friends. Students, along with their teachers, can share what they learned (poster session/science session where people walk around or go to different activity booths), facilitate activities, and show ownership in their learning.
- No details were provided on how the consumable products will be used and the kits will be sustained after the project.
- The parent involvement component is an exciting idea but it is poorly described. A discussion and demonstrations of the use of the resources provided would enhance it.
- A stronger rationale is needed for why only certain schools and programs are targeted. There could be more schools involved to increase the impact of the STEAM learning. Lincoln Parish and Morehouse Parish have a limited number of schools with grades 3-5. It may be possible for them all to be targeted and receive kits and support.

**Stipulations:**

- The proposal needs more information on the roles and amount of time invested for the faculty involved in the content and pedagogical project design and delivery. The role of each faculty member should be clearly described.
- More information is needed about amount of time each week/day that students and teachers spend in afterschool activities.
- More AY observations are needed in the settings to support the STEAM afterschool programs.
- External evaluation measures should be revised to meet the goals and objectives of project.
- The vitas of all of the project PIs should be provided.

## RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

<b>PROPOSAL NUMBER:</b>	13LaS-17
<b>PROJECT FOCUS:</b>	Science
<b>PROJECT TYPE:</b>	14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Grand Challenges Afterschool STEAM Academy

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Leland Weiss

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 7.5  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 7.8  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 12.9  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 14.1  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3.2  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.8  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 8.5  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18.6  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 81.4 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	\$149,992
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	\$145,492

**Proposal:** 14LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** Southeastern Louisiana University  
**Principal Investigator:** Troy Williams  
**Discipline:** Science  
**Requested:** \$275,768  
**Recommended:** \$0  
**Rating:** 70.9

- This project uses online and free resources that have been developed using NSF funding. It demonstrates how it will use an inquiry-based approach to examine how the resources align with school curricula.
- Unfortunately, the project does not follow all the RFP guidelines and does not provide clear details regarding budget, delivery, and participant recruitment.
- To make the project effective, more contact time is needed for a 14.5-month project, with support extended into the second summer and the beginning of the 2018 AY. This would help address the need to show sustainability for upcoming years by having a beginning of year observation/meeting.
- The objectives need to be revised to look for measureable changes in behavior. They should focus on the effectiveness of strategies/approaches and not simply whether they were done.
- In the delivery of the project, free online simulations are used in lieu of materials. It should also be specified how other hands-on materials are used. It is positive to provide options for teachers in making abstract concepts more meaningful to students. Also, it is not clear if participants will compare the Atlas Maps with the K-12 Framework and/or the State curriculum to analyze progression.
- It is positive that Plickers is integrated as an alternative to instant feedback items requiring classroom kits or wireless networks. However, it is not clear if teachers are required to have their own device or if one will be provided to each participant. What if a teacher does not have a smart phone or ipad/tablet?
- To provide better support in the unit plan implementation, the project team needs to make sure to observe the unit plan being implemented and give feedback on the implementation and not just the planning phase.
- It would be helpful to provide more information regarding project supplies and school resource materials that will be used and who will keep the items so that it is clear that everyone will receive the same amount/type of materials.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 14LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** Southeastern Louisiana University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Integrated Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics for  
Elementary Teachers (ISTEM-E)

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Troy Williams

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 6.9  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 6.9  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 12.5  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 13.3  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 3.3  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9.2  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 8.5  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 10.3  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 70.9 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$275,768  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$0

**Proposal 15LaSIP-17**

**Institution:** University of Louisiana at Lafayette

**Principal Investigator:** Maria Isolina Ruiz

**Discipline:** Mathematics

**Requested:** \$256,057

**Recommended:** \$217,987

**Rating:** 86.6

- This proposal is strong in several areas, including a well-designed coaching model, the focus on instructional strategies for teaching mathematics to diverse learners, and thorough and extensive AY activities.
- The coaching model reflects research-based practices to improve teaching through a well-defined process of one-on-one coaching. It is clearly described, and holds promise for building and sustaining capacity for mentoring and peer coaching.
- The PD aims to be all-inclusive of the professional and para-professional staff, which builds capacity for sustaining effective math pedagogy.
- The integration of the summer institute with the Iberia Parish School District ESL summer camp supports an immediate setting in which the participants engage in an iterative process of instructional coaching with feedback. Thus, the summer institute design is effective in closing the gap between summer learning and teaching practice.
- The proposal is weak in specifying the content of the 2017 summer institute, particularly as related to the mathematical content domain of rational numbers. What are the effective instructional practices? What will be the specific content and methods included in the presentations and workshops? It is helpful that guiding principles for teaching mathematics to English language learners are given and that Eureka Math is given as the school curriculum focus. However, what specific instructional methods, PD activities, and materials tied specifically and explicitly to the rational numbers content will be used to help teachers deepen their understanding of this important and often difficult topic?

**Stipulation:**

- Staff costs appear high and should be reduced by 25%.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 15LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Mathematics

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** University of Louisiana at Lafayette

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Improving Teachers' Mathematics Instruction of Students with Limited  
English Language Proficiency

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Maria Isolina Ruiz

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 7.8  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 7.2  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 12.1  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 19.2  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.5  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 9.4  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.8  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 18.6  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 86.6 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$256,057  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$217,987

**Proposal Number:** 16LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** University of New Orleans  
**Principal Investigator:** Yvelyne Germain-McCarthy  
**Discipline:** Mathematics  
**Requested:** \$262,792  
**Recommended:** \$222,852  
**Rating:** 92

- This is a strong proposal with a high potential for success.
- Project activities are thoroughly described, including materials, activities, timeline, duration, targeted objectives, and the personnel involved.
- Detailed consideration is given to both content and pedagogy in relationship to project goals.
- There is good evidence of planning with participating schools to identify participants and the PD content focus.
- The use of lesson study is a strength, as this is a means of professional learning that is powerful and proven. Importantly, evidence is provided that the process of lesson study, which is at the same time simple yet quite complex in its implementation, can be successfully carried out through the project design and staff experience and expertise.
- There is good alignment among LaSIP's program goals, specific project goals and objectives, and the project evaluation plan.
- There is a detailed account of contact hours for the project participants.
- Though the project is highly recommended for funding, a few concerns should be addressed, including the large grade span of 3<sup>rd</sup> through 9<sup>th</sup>. Project leaders should be careful to efficiently meet the needs of teachers across so many different grades.
- It appears that the Annenberg materials are central to this project, yet there is no discussion of or evidence for the effectiveness of these materials.
- The argument for cultural relevance is weak. The PD related to this aspect needs to be more clearly explained, including how the director's books will be used.
- While co-PI Gill is certainly well-qualified, his area of expertise is science and this is a grades 3-9 algebra and rational numbers project. Furthermore, his role is not specified in the project timeline (except once in a minor role). This co-PI may not be entirely relevant to project success.
- The total staff cost in the budget is high (\$146,000), especially compared to participant support.

**Stipulation:**

- Staff costs in the budget should be reduced by 25%.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 16LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Mathematics

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** University of New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Developing Leaders of Culturally Relevant and Engaging Inquiry-Based Learning in Mathematics

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Yvelyne Germain-McCarthy

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 9.2  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 8.3  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 14.2  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 17.6  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.4  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.9  
(of 10 Points)

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

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 19.4  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 92 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$262,792  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$222,852

**Proposal Number:** 17LaSIP-17  
**Institution:** University of New Orleans  
**Principal Investigator:** Ivan Gill  
**Discipline:** Science  
**Requested:** \$298,208  
**Recommended:** \$251,768  
**Rating:** 83.8

- Project activities are outlined well, including general topics, timeline, duration, targeted objectives, and personnel involved.
- There is good alignment among LaSIP goals, specific project goals and objectives, and the evaluation plan.
- There is a detailed account of contact hours for the project participants.
- There is good evidence of planning with participating schools to identify participants and the PD content focus.
- More information is needed for project delivery regarding the tentative topics for whole group sessions and connecting themes across grade levels. Are participants using Science & Engineering Practices? Also, how are they moving among and choosing between whole group and breakout sessions?
- Additionally, more information would be useful about how the sessions are organized in summer and AY. Further details could be provided on specific activities, participant products, topics for the summer institute based on assessment data related to content pedagogy and reflective practice, and tentative topics for AY meetings for different grade bands based on assessment data.
- Objectives need to be revised to look for measureable changes in behavior and focus on effective use of strategies/approaches and not just whether activities were done as well as address how participants show leadership capacity, and to what degree. It is not clear why objectives include getting letters of support and presenting at conferences.
- The section on lesson study is organized in a manner that is sometimes confusing and disconnected. More detail is needed to show how the project will explicitly weave this into the delivery.
- There are items mentioned in the proposal or budget that need more detail to clearly show the use and relevance. Some examples are: 1) How will technology be used for effective teaching and learning? 2) What is a research lesson plan? and 3) Why are the teachers only sharing impressions of the conference and counting that as a PD session? How could they do something else to make it more valuable?
- The proposal does not clearly showcase the roles of all project team members. It shows the amount of time for each member but not exactly what they are doing with that time. For example, is the mathematics professor pulling out all of the mathematics from the science activities? Is it truly that integrated in how activities are facilitated? There are not enough details explaining who is doing what, and how, and for how much time.

- While this science project will certainly make connections to mathematics, it is nevertheless unusual that two of the co-PIs on this science project have mathematics as their expertise. One has more days committed to the project than the science PI and the other has essentially the same number of days committed as the science PI. Dr. Germain-McCarthy is also the lesson study expert, so her role makes more sense. Less involvement from Dr. Wright, though he is very well qualified in his mathematics education area of expertise, may reduce costs without reducing project effectiveness.

**Stipulation:**

- The total staff cost in the budget is high (\$172,344). A 25% reduction in staff costs is recommended.

**RATING FORM FOR 2017-18 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 17LaS-17

**PROJECT FOCUS:** Science

**PROJECT TYPE:** 14.5 Month

**INSTITUTION:** University of New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Developing Teachers of Inquiry-Based Learning in Science

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Ivan Gill

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 9.2  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 6.9  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 12.5  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 15.3  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 4.2  
(of 5 Points)

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 8.6  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 7.4  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 19.7  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 83.8 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$298,208

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$251,768