



Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program

**2012-13 LaSIP REVIEW  
FINAL REPORT**

**April 4-6, 2013**

**Prepared by:**

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

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

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

## **INTRODUCTION**

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

On January 21, 2013, LaSIP issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to fund projects focusing on Mathematics, ELA/Literacy, and Science K-12 teacher professional development (PD), as well as Informal/Formal Science Learning PD Initiatives (PDIs) in support of the collaboration of Southern University- Baton Rouge (SUBR), LIGO, and the Exploratorium in an NSF grant to support LIGO SEC Outreach. In response to the RFP, thirteen (13) proposals were submitted. The reviewers were sent the following to read and review before the April 4-5, 2013, interviews in Baton Rouge, LA: (1) 2013-14 LaSIP/LA GEAR UP Professional Development RFP for PK-12 Teachers of ELA/Literacy, Science, LIGO Science & Mathematics; (2) the thirteen proposals; (3) the Appendix L revised Reviewer Rating Forms for each proposal; and (4) a summary sheet of all of the LaSIP proposals with requested amounts. Each proposal was assigned a primary reviewer based on the reviewers' professional expertise. Each reviewer completed a preliminary review and rating of each proposal by March 28, 2013. Each proposal was reviewed on its own merits.

The reviewer panel met via Skype with LaSIP personnel on Thursday, March 28, 2013 to discuss the selection of proposals to participate in interview sessions. Of the original thirteen (13) proposals submitted, eight (8) project teams were invited to participate in face-to-face interviews for funding consideration. Review materials were submitted for the five (5) eliminated proposals, including rating forms and written comments concerning strengths and concerns, and are included in this final report.

The reviewers convened in Baton Rouge on April 4-5, 2013 to interview prospective project directors, university staff and K-12 partners in order to further assess merits of the proposals. The sessions were structured to allow the panel to meet with a team from each invited project and glean details concerning their professional development project design. At the same time, reviewers also met with the K-12 partners, when possible, in order to clarify their level of understanding about the project and determine expectations, impact, and whether the project will be beneficial for teacher participants. Throughout the interviews the reviewers asked numerous clarifying questions and sought a culminating overview of the potential effectiveness of each project. The reviewers agreed that the interview process provided extremely valuable information and the necessary clarity needed to properly rank the proposals. The panel feels that this interview process is unique to proposal review compared to the review processes used by other states and granting agencies, and is a very progressive approach on the part of LaSIP.

On April 5-6, 2013, the reviewers prepared written comments detailing strengths, concerns, recommendations, stipulations, an overall funding recommendation for each project, a recommended funding amount for each project, and a ranking for each project granted an interview.

### **B. FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

For the seven (7) proposals that requested total funding of \$1,164,638, the panel recommended total funding of \$1,149,638. For three of the seven recommended proposals, the panel also recommended additional funding in varying amounts if those funds become available.

To ensure strict budgetary control and the highest level of fiscal responsibility, the reviewers recommended a lower-than-requested amount for one project recommended for funding. For this

project a lump-sum budget reduction was indicated. The principal investigators of this project have discretion to identify the area(s) in which reductions will be applied, with the stipulation that no funding be removed from participant costs.

### **C. REVIEWER CONCERNS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE OVERALL IMPROVEMENT OF THIS PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS**

The reviewers would like to compliment the LaSIP staff for design improvements made to the RFP. There is a marked improvement in the development of measurable objectives in FY 2013-14 proposals in comparison to proposals submitted in previous cycles. The LaSIP staff should be commended for facilitating this.

Following are concerns and recommendations to LaSIP for improving the review process, strengthening the ongoing projects, increasing the cost-effectiveness of the projects, and increasing the impact of the LIGO-LaSIP partnership:

- Provide a specific budget cap for projects.
- Evaluation instruments to be used by project staff should continue to be specifically identified in the proposals, and instruments need to be matched with specific objectives.
- Comments such as “research shows . . .” should continue to require proper citation. That is very helpful to the reviewers.
- Consider creating a bank (with a free tool such as Google Docs) of valid/reliable formative assessment instruments available for use (with or without modification) by applicants. This may make it simpler to collect data across projects at the classroom/student level during the life of the project. The RFP should include specific requirements that formative data be collected on both participating teachers and their students.
- Consider requiring that applicants provide clear documentation of the collaborative proposal development meetings/process such as meeting agendas, meeting minutes, full meeting descriptions, etc., in addition to providing the sign-in sheets that are included now. Those sign-in sheets only confirm who was present at a meeting, not what the substance of that meeting was, and therefore, are not useful to reviewers. Also, consider including a requirement in the RFP that PIs and project teams hold and document at least one “focus group” session with all university and K-12 partners prior to submitting the proposal (for all applicants) and another just after the commencement of the project (for all funded projects).
- The applicants need to clearly indicate in paragraph form in the proposal the process for identifying the participating schools and the process and outcomes for working with those schools to create the proposal and program plan. Few proposals had a truly collaborative relationship, and this could be improved across all projects by asking applicants to provide more details about the collaboration.
- Any teams who wish to use communication technologies such as speakerphone, Skype, FaceTime, etc., to include in interviews member(s) of the project team who will not be present in person with the review panel, should be required to submit a request to LaSIP

staff at least 24 hours in advance of the interview day/time. Upon consultation with the review panel, this request can either be confirmed or denied by LaSIP staff.

- All proposals that involve a project that had been funded previously by LaSIP must continue to include an appendix section specifically identifying the results of previous iterations of those projects (including student and teacher impacts) and how those results informed the development of the current proposal.
- Continue to require PIs to submit interim reports with specific data/information on the progress toward reaching specific goals and objectives for those projects that have been funded previously.
- Consider restricting funding for participant travel to include:
  - Double-occupancy for hotel rooms, instead of single-occupancy
  - If an entire group of participants travels to a specific site as part of a grant-funded experience (workshop, institute, etc.), selection of the least expensive option for travel (e.g., van, bus, etc.) rather than reimbursing each participant for mileage as the primary travel reimbursement option (i.e., whichever option is least expensive, depending on distance traveled). Include calculations and justifications of travel options in the Budget Justification Worksheet to show that all potential options were considered.
- Consider using extra available funding to bring all funded PI/Co-PI staff together to share with each other any suggestions, tips, and/or good results related to controlling grant costs, improving student/teacher outcomes, and gathering documentation and evidence of program outcomes and impact.
- Consider using extra available funds to hold a culminating conference/summit where project participants can do presentations based on project professional development experiences, as well as sessions for PIs/Co-PIs to have roundtable discussions.
- Consider using available funds to hire an external evaluator who will compile the results of all FY 2013-2014 funded projects and publicly share the results. Ideally, the evaluator would also compile the results for as many previously-funded projects in prior years for which summative reports and project data are available. It would be ideal to track teachers who have participated in more than one year of the same project or who have participated in various LaSIP-funded projects.
- Create a statewide list of project participants across all projects whom the project teams feel would be appropriate selections for redelivery of science, mathematics, and/or ELA content and pedagogy. This list could be made available to any districts in need of a qualified, trained person to visit and make presentations to school staff.

**2013-14 LaSIP Panel Review Final Report**

**Table I  
Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	PI	Focus	Funds Requested	Funds Recommended
1	98	12LaS-13	UL-M	Clark	Science/Math/ELA	\$103,270	\$118,270
2	96	04LaS-13	LaTech	Manning	ELA-Literacy	\$154,132	\$154,132
3	95	07LaS-13	Nicholls	Plaisance	Mathematics	\$145,038	\$165,038
4	89	01LaS-13	Centenary	Vetter	Science	\$132,425	\$157,425
5	87	05LaS-13	LaTech	Talton	Mathematics	\$195,322	\$195,322
6	82	13LaS-13	UNO	Jensen	Math/Science	\$209,441	\$209,441
7	72	05LaS-13	SU-BR/LaTech	Meynsse	LIGO Science	\$210,010	\$165,010
<b>Totals</b>						<b>\$1,149,638</b>	<b>\$1,164,638</b>

**Table II  
Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	PI		Funds Requested	Funds Recommended
8	63	06LaS-13	LaTech	Keith-Vincent	Science	\$194,262	\$0
9	62	03LaS-13	LSU-BR	Neubrandner	Mathematics	\$159,603	\$0
10	54	02LaS-13	LSU-BR	Mooney	Literacy/Science	\$167,279	\$0
11	46	08LaS-13	Nicholls	Turner	Literacy	\$184,794	\$0
12	46	10LaS-13	SLU	Williams	Science/Math	\$154,650	\$0
13	44	09LaS-13	SLU	Autin	LIGO Science	\$167,902	\$0
<b>Totals</b>						<b>\$1,028,490</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**University of Louisiana at Monroe**  
**Lynn Clark**  
**Focus: Science/Math/ELA**

**Out Standing in a TEAM: Interdisciplinary Teaming in Support of Field-based ISTEM Education**

**Determination: Recommended for funding, with additional funding if available**

**Points awarded: 98 out of 100**

**Ranking: #1 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- This project team is highly collaborative with each other and with their school partners.
- The PI and team have demonstrated an exceptional sense of fiduciary responsibility.
- The PI and team are committed to demonstrating the success of their projects. This project has an identified project evaluator. The evaluation plan identifies specific data analysis tools, and data analysis will be done at statistically significant levels. Pre-post test questions are directly connected to content, and valid and reliable test questions are selected from an AAAS item pool.
- The team is clearly focused on the potential of the project to make an impact beyond the actual participants for redelivery of teacher professional development, but there is no formal plan to increase the “multiplier effect” of the project. There is support at the district level for redelivery for an audience of other teachers at project showcases at the end of the school year.
- The need for this project is demonstrated based on results from previous projects.
- The use of probes as a formative evaluation tool is excellent.
- The PI’s intimate understanding and knowledge of all components of the program and the proposal were evidenced by the seamless references to specific pages and sections of the proposal during the interview.
- While the project’s science content is very strong, the team has captured ideas for incorporating mathematics. The ELA component to the project was added to accommodate specific needs identified by schools.
- Units developed for this project will be uploaded to the Louisiana Environmental Education Association website and will be available for other teachers to utilize.
- Project participants are expected to present their units at the ULM STEM Showcase.

**Concern(s):**

- The project team should consider developing a formal plan or platform for participants to redeliver content.

**Recommendation(s):**

- The team should review Common Core State Standards with respect to writing and incorporate them into this project. If the team does incorporate relevant writing standards, it will have a foundation for a project addressing Common Core State Standards that would be a model for others.
- The team should require and document teacher redelivery of project content. This may occur in several formats such as in-school PD sessions, grade-level or team meetings, district PD events, etc., in order to maximize the impact of the project.

**Funding Recommendations;**

- If funds are available, an additional \$15,000 is recommended for the PI to pursue one or more of the following options:
  - Incorporate more teacher participants in the project;

- Provide supplies for teacher participants, with grantees and amounts chosen by the project team from the project participants (selection method, such as “mini-grants”, to be determined by the project team); and/or
- Purchase an additional PhenoCam to be used for project data collection.

# RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 12-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** science/math/ELA

**INSTITUTION:** University of Louisiana at Monroe

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Out Standing in a TEAM: Interdisciplinary Teaming in Support  
of Field-based ISTEM Education

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Lynn Clark

<b>A. Rationale and Need for the Project</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>10</u>
<b>B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)</b>	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	<u>10</u>
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	<u>14</u>
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	<u>19</u>
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	<u>5</u>
<b>C. Quality of Key Personnel</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>10</u>
<b>D. Project Evaluation</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>10</u>
<b>E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing</b> (of 20 Points)	<u>20</u>

**Total Score:** 98 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$103,270</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$103,270</u>
	<b>Recommended Amount, if funding is available</b>	<u>\$118,270</u>

**Louisiana Tech University  
Libby Manning  
Focus: ELA-Literacy**

**Powerful Instruction through Interactive Read Alouds, Literary Stations, and Workshop**

**Determination: Recommended for funding**

**Points awarded: 96 out of 100**

**Ranking: #2 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- There is a long-term overall program plan. This funding will support a larger effort that is already in motion. The long-term programmatic plan is not entirely dependent on this funding. The district and the University are committed to seeing this project through.
- The team is morally grounded and committed to effecting change in the lives of students directly impacted by this grant and beyond.
- The project was collaboratively developed and initiated at the grassroots school level. The project team showed specific evidence of planning for this project with the school and the school district.
- The panel applauds the team's plan to have outside teachers visit classrooms at Glen View Elementary--the project participant school, and the flagship school for Lincoln Parish--to learn how to implement powerful instruction in their own classrooms. The team is clearly focused on the redelivery of professional development to other teachers outside of the chosen group of participants.
- The project exhibits strong potential for a school improvement model that includes changing culture, changing the system, capacity building, and relationship building.
- The team has identified one focused "studio" teacher for the project. Project staff will go into the same classroom each time and capture progress data to see how students have progressed from month to month.
- This project team is highly collaborative with each other and with their school partners.

**Concern(s):**

- The project team members all need to progress to the same level of knowledge concerning the Common Core State Standards.

**Recommendation(s):**

- The University and school teams need to have formal sessions together to assure common language, depth of knowledge, and understanding of Common Core State Standards among all members of the team.
- The team should require and document teacher redelivery of project content. This may occur in several formats such as in-school PD sessions, grade-level or team meetings, district PD events, etc., in order to maximize the impact of the project.

**Funding Recommendation:** Fund at level requested in proposal.

## RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04-LaS-13

PROJECT FOCUS: ELA-literacy

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech Univerity

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Libby Manning

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

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

i. Measurable Objectives 10  
(of 10 Points)

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

iii. Delivery Method 18  
(of 20 Points)

iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment 5  
(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** 20  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 96 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$154,132</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$154,132</u>

**Nicholls State University**  
**DesLey Plaisance**  
**Focus: Mathematics**

**Project NUMBER 2013-14**

**Determination: Recommended for funding, with an additional funding if available**

**Points awarded: 95 out of 100**

**Ranking: #3 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- Participant work for the purpose of receiving graduate credit is required.
- The project team will provide a Promethean board workshop for teachers, whether the project is funded or not.
- The team is actively pursuing knowledge about CCSS and PARCC.
- This project team shows a clear, strong partnership: a model which reflects the aims of LaSIP. The project is one component of an outreach program. The team has amazing abilities to impact pre-service teachers, principals, and classroom teachers through various undergraduate/graduate programs.
- The team is using valid and reliable qualitative and quantitative measures.
- The PI and the project team exercise exceptional fiduciary responsibility. For example, the budget for travel for this year's proposal was reduced based on the lower amount the team spent for travel in the 2012-13 project.
- The team is amenable to expanding its data collection to gauge the redelivery of content to teachers outside of the project.

**Concern(s):**

- The rigor of the mathematical content of the program is not evident.
- When the panel asked if the team can measure the "ripple effect"--the impact of this program on teachers and administrators beyond the participants and their immediate teams--the project team said they are not currently doing this.

**Recommendation(s):**

- To create greater impact in developing leadership, the team should set an expectation that participating principals must accompany project staff for a minimum number of classroom observations.
- Increase the mathematical rigor of the content of the project.
- Require and document teacher redelivery of project content. This may occur in several formats such as in-school PD sessions, grade-level or team meetings, district PD events, etc., in order to maximize the impact of the project.

**Funding Recommendation:**

- If funding is available, the reviewers recommend an additional \$20,000 for the PI to pursue one or more of the following options:
  - Hire an external evaluator;
  - Incorporate more teacher participants in the project;
  - Purchase more supplies for project participants; and/or
  - Hire a staff person to provide Moodle data extraction and report generation support.

## RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07-LaS-13

PROJECT FOCUS: mathematics

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project NUMBER 2013-14

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: DesLey Plaisance

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

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

i. Measurable Objectives 10  
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies 13  
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 18  
(of 20 Points)

iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment 5  
(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** 20  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 95 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$145,038

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$145,038

**Recommended Amount,  
if funding is available** \$165,038

**Centenary College**  
**Scott Vetter**  
**Focus: Science**

**Northwest Louisiana Professional Development Project: Bridging the Gap and Making  
Connections between Middle and High School Physical Science: Year 2**

**Determination: Recommended for funding, with an addition to the recommended funding amount,  
if additional funding is available**

**Points awarded: 89 out of 100**

**Ranking: #4 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- This proposal included evidence of data and other evidence which proves the effectiveness of previous programs conducted by this PI (such as commentary and other types of data).
- There are multiple assessment techniques, including formative assessment measures, student surveys, classroom observations, daily feedback collected during the summer institute, and probes, which are especially beneficial.
- The teachers will be using the NSTA SciPaks during the academic year. This is an excellent use of online learning technology.
- The mentoring approach to this project is excellent.
- The end-of-year follow-up workshop is a phenomenal example of how to wrap up a project. It gives participants a chance to reflect on their progress and for the team to collect evidence of project success.
- Specific content for the project has been identified.
- Participants will receive 120 hours of direct instruction, which is outstanding.
- The district's willingness to support this project in multiple ways was evident, including release time for teachers to do peer observations, providing substitutes and "additional assistance as deemed necessary."

**Concern(s):**

- There is no project focus on redelivery by participants. All redelivery examples given during the interview were anecdotal, not intentional.

**Recommendation(s):**

- The team should engage in an extensive process to learn and analyze CCSS, NGSS, and PARCC to assure consistent and accurate information among all project personnel, including site coordinator(s).

**Funding Recommendation:**

- If funding is available, the reviewers recommend an additional \$25,000 for the PI to pursue one or more of the following:
  - Hire an external evaluator;
  - Incorporate more teacher participants in the project; and/or
  - Purchase more supplies for participants.

## RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01-LaS-13

PROJECT FOCUS: science

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Northwest Louisiana Professional Development Project:  
Bridging the Gap and Making Connections between Middle  
and High School Physical Science: Year 2

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Scott Vetter

<b>A. Rationale and Need for the Project</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>8</u>
<b>B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)</b>	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	<u>10</u>
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	<u>13</u>
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	<u>18</u>
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	<u>4</u>
<b>C. Quality of Key Personnel</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>9</u>
<b>D. Project Evaluation</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>8</u>
<b>E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing</b> (of 20 Points)	<u>19</u>

Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	Requested Amount:	<u>\$132,425</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$132,425</u>
	Recommended Amount, if funding is available	<u>\$157,425</u>

**Louisiana Tech University**  
**Carolyn Talton**  
**Focus: Mathematics**  
**Project PAT – Promoting Algebraic Thinking, Grades 6-8**

**Determination: Recommended for funding**  
**Points awarded: 87 out of 100**  
**Ranking: #5 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- The PI's knowledge of the CCSS is extensive. She knows where to go to obtain high-quality sources of information.
- There is a stated intention to redeliver professional development to teachers outside of this project.
- Superintendents will identify participants to serve as mentor-coaches to go back to school systems and share what they have learned. District leaders will conduct five after-school hours of system-level professional development.
- The team is vigilant about finding free quality websites, such as DropBox, Live Binder, and others, to allow all participants to have access to project content and options for sharing materials and ideas.
- A "Moodle Mentor" is already available to the team to obtain information from Moodle for evaluation purposes.

**Concern(s):**

- The project team is not well structured for collaboration. The PI appears to fully direct the action of the team, rather than some of the direction coming from the districts and schools intended to be served by this project.
- The use of technology for instructional purposes is weak. There is no evidence of the use of instructional strategies that directly align with the intent of specific CCSS.
- The remaining members of the project team could be more proficient with regard to CCSS.

**Recommendation(s):**

- The team should engage in an extensive process to learn and analyze the CCSS, NGSS, and PARCC to assure consistent and accurate information among all project personnel, including site coordinator(s).

**Funding Recommendation:** Fund at level requested in proposal.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 05-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** mathematics

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech Univerity

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Project PAT - Promoting Algebraic Thinking, Grades 6-8

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Carolyn Talton

<b>A. Rationale and Need for the Project</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>8</u>
<b>B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)</b>	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	<u>10</u>
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	<u>13</u>
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	<u>18</u>
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	<u>3</u>
<b>C. Quality of Key Personnel</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>9</u>
<b>D. Project Evaluation</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>8</u>
<b>E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing</b> (of 20 Points)	<u>18</u>

**Total Score:** 87 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$195,322</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$195,322</u>

**University of New Orleans**  
**Craig Jensen**  
**Focus: Mathematics/Science**

**Inquiry-Based Wetlands Science and Mathematics in Middle and High School 2013**

**Determination: Recommended for funding**

**Points awarded: 82 out of 100**

**Ranking: #6 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- There is evidence of redelivery of professional development to colleagues by the project participants.
- A project evaluator has been identified.
- The team has been successful in getting principals to attend the summer institute. Setting aside a day of professional development for school leadership staff is excellent.
- Schools have committed \$150 for participant materials.
- The project team is knowledgeable, well versed, proficient, and resourceful relative to technology. This expertise will provide rich experiences for participants.

**Concern(s):**

- A pre- and post-workshop assessment more specifically aligned to the content to be covered during the summer institute needs to be identified and used (e.g., customized from pre-developed question banks, valid and reliable).
- The team needs to document the scope of redelivery for the project.
- While substantial teacher data were presented from the summer institute, there is no analysis to show that shifts were statistically significant. For example, the difference on pre-post COMPASS scores shows a 9 percentage point gain, approximately. However, the standard deviation is virtually unchanged. The reasons for this need to be explored.
- The team should identify a specific rubric by which teacher lessons are gauged.
- The specifications for the lesson development need to be shared, explained, and analyzed with participants so they understand team expectations.
- As one of the measures by which the project would be evaluated, the team identified a 10% increase in critical thinking time during classroom instruction. The expectations for the percentage of time students are highly engaged in high cognitive activities are inconsistent with the mathematical practices of the Common Core and the trends in research for the last 30 years.
- The full team is not equally fluent in CCSS, PARCC and NGSS.

**Recommendation(s):**

- During the classroom observation sessions, collect data on a) the amount of time that teachers are engaging in direct instruction (teacher-delivered content) versus the amount of time that students are leading discussions and interactions, b) the types of questions students are asking, and c) the types of activities in which teachers and students are engaged.
- The project team should collect data on teacher talk vs. student talk, the types of questions students are asking, and the types of activities they are engaged in.
- Engage in an extensive process to learn and analyze CCSS, NGSS, and PARCC to assure consistent and accurate information among all project personnel, including site coordinator(s).

**Funding Recommendation:** Fund at level requested in proposal.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 13-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** math/science

**INSTITUTION:** University of New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Inquiry-Based Wetlands Science and Mathematics in  
Middle and High School 2013

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Craig Jensen

**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** 13  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 18  
(of 20 Points)

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

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

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

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$209,441  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$209,441

**Southern University and A&M College and Louisiana Tech University**  
**Joseph Meynsse, Luria Young, Lindsey Keith-Vincent**  
**Focus: LIGO Science**

**Project MISE/RIPPLE**

**Determination: Recommended for funding but only at the reduced funding amount**  
**Points awarded: 72 out of 100**  
**Ranking: #7 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- The inclusion of informal education and field trips as aspects of the project is excellent.
- It is the project team's expectation that the teachers participate in the project for the purpose of receiving graduate credit.
- Advance planning with LIGO SEC has already been done. It was very helpful to have a LIGO SEC staff member present at the interview. LIGO SEC has stated that it can identify supplemental funds to take one or two project participants to the LSTA. Two LIGO SEC staff will visit Louisiana Tech University to work with participants.
- Teacher participants will keep a paper/pencil mentoring log. Each participant will spend 3 hours in the fall and 3 hours in the spring demonstrating a LIGO-related activity to another teacher.
- While the proposal states that project staff is involved in multiple proposed LaSIP projects and that their duties can be achieved without conflict, this needed to be spelled out exactly as to dates and time allocations. While it would have been ideal to include this information in all of the relevant proposals, the review team appreciated the chart shown during the interview which specified team responsibilities with respect to dates and times.
- There is a much better "we" aspect to the team during the interview compared to the prior year's project.

**Concern(s):**

- This project is composed of two separate teams (MISE and RIPPLE) that, in several prior years, submitted competing projects. With the merger of the projects, though, difficulty seems to have arisen since the two projects are centered in vastly different parts of the state. The number of project staff essentially doubled while the number of project participants stayed the same. The project is extremely staff-heavy in terms of the project team. This is an expensive project because there are two widely separated full project teams in northern and southern Louisiana. Ultimately, while it is admirable that the teams want to collaborate, this has not resulted in either a reduction in staffing or an increase in project participants.
- Roles for project staff are weakly defined in the proposal. There appears to be a significant overlap of roles, especially for those directing the project.
- It is unclear how the selected parishes/schools were involved in the development of the proposed project. Many of the letters of commitment are exactly the same, except for the signatures.
- It has been suggested to principals that teacher participants redeliver content, but this has not been mandated by the project staff. For this project to have been rated more highly, the team needed to work with district and school administrative staff to identify ways that redelivery could occur within districts and/or in nearby districts.
- The project staff's knowledge of CCSS and NGSS was average.

**Recommendation(s):**

- The team should engage in an extensive process to learn and analyze CCSS, NGSS, and PARCC to assure consistent and accurate information among all project personnel, including site coordinator(s).

**Funding Recommendation/Stipulation:**

- To address the problem of high project staff costs, the recommended funding amount has been reduced by \$45,000. Project reductions may be made at the discretion of the PIs and project staff, but no cuts should be made to participant costs.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 11-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** LIGO science/math

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Project MISE/RIPPLE

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Joseph Meyinsse, Luria Young, Lindsey Keith-Vincent

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

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

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

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

**iii. Delivery Method** 18  
(of 20 Points)

**iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment** 1  
(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** 7  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 72 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** **Requested Amount:** \$210,010  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** **Recommended Amount:** \$165,010 (if funds are available)

**Louisiana Tech University  
Lindsay Keith-Vincent  
Focus: Science**

**C3: Chemical Concepts and Connections – Year 2**

**Determination: Not recommended for funding**

**Points awarded: 63 out of 100**

**Ranking: #8 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- The team should be applauded for the use of social media tools such as Facebook for some communications with participants.
- The teacher who was Skyped into the interview helped to address questions from the review team.
- Teachers can participate in the project for the purpose of receiving graduate credit.
- The use of previous Avogadro tests for the purpose of testing participants is good. (University of Waterloo, Dr. C. Bissonette)

**Concern(s):**

- Only goal 1, objective 1 is stated in measurable terms. Several other objectives are not written in proper form.
- Goal 2, objective 1 is not an objective. This sentence refers to something that should have been done to write the rationale.
- There is no plan or interest in redelivery. During the interview the team noted that it is difficult to mandate certain types of redelivery and they encouraged participants to do redelivery at conferences. This shows short-sightedness as to the variety of redelivery options available and also shows that adequate discussions of options with district representatives were not undertaken.
- The topics for Day 1 or 2 of the summer institute have not been determined, and, according to the project team, will be decided by the team but not by using any needs assessment data from the participants and/or the participating schools/districts. This proposal does not currently show evidence of collaborative project development with the districts or schools to be served.
- Appendix J includes a list of standards the project will address, but the team could not adequately reference and discuss CCSS and PARCC.
- The project rationale fails to explain or elaborate on the needs of teachers for any of the parishes listed on page 2. The rationale and needs statement includes a quote from the President and reflects statistics and information about the State as a whole. These projects are not intended to be statewide, but a response to the identified needs of the parishes/districts with which the University has been collaborating over time.
- The stipend selection sheet in the proposal was for another project submitted by Louisiana Tech rather than this one, which displays careless proposal preparation.

**Recommendation for future proposals:**

- The reviewers are concerned that there may be insufficient IRB approval and/or parental consent for videos posted to Facebook that show students while at school. While this is a closed, moderated group, the review team has grave doubts that the protocols on Facebook allow for proper security of students' identifiable information and likenesses. In the future, please ensure that proper IRB approval has been obtained for posting videos such as these. If IRB approval is not obtained, videos can only be shared in a manner that is in accordance with IRB stipulations.

**Funding Recommendation:** No funding.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 06-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** science

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech Univerity

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** C3: Chemical Concepts and Connections - Year 2

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Lindsey Keith-Vincent

<b>A. Rationale and Need for the Project</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>7</u>
<b>B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)</b>	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	<u>4</u>
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	<u>10</u>
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	<u>12</u>
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	<u>2</u>
<b>C. Quality of Key Personnel</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>6</u>
<b>D. Project Evaluation</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>6</u>
<b>E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing</b> (of 20 Points)	<u>16</u>

**Total Score:** 63 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$194,262</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

**Louisiana State University/Cain Center**  
**Frank Neubrandner**  
**Focus: Mathematics**

**Transforming Schools through STEM Leadership**

**Determination: Not recommended for funding**

**Points awarded: 62 out of 100**

**Ranking: #9 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- The project targets three schools from the East Baton Rouge parish school system, a pattern of “feeder” schools that enroll students from a single area.
- The team has procured a cost share from Exxon Mobil for five months of the site coordinator’s salary and to pay tuition for an on-line course for each participant.
- One objective of the project is for participants to redeliver content at their schools.
- It is stated that literacy strategies will be emphasized during professional development training. It is also clearly stated that a well-qualified literacy specialist will provide the literacy training.
- The proposal identifies an evaluator, though not external to the project, and states that a mixed-methods model, CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product), will be used for project evaluation.

**Concern(s):**

- There is no evidence of collaboration between the University team and partner school/district representatives during the planning and proposal writing stages. It is stated that the project team/partners met with district personnel to present the plan for the projects. The proposal also states “...the basic tenets of the professional development would be followed without deviation...”
- Choice of content focus (Number System and Number and Operations) is not tied directly to or informed by school-level assessment data.
- Content for the summer institute is not described. The proposal states that teacher content knowledge will be improved in the areas of number systems and number operations, though no rationale is given for choosing these topics that are related to the specific needs of the district participants or students to be served. There is no connection of this particular content choice to school-level data or needs assessment.
- There are no details or data explaining why the three schools chosen are the targets in this district.
- It is stated that participants will work in Critical Friends Groups (CFGs) during the summer institute. However, there is no connection of CFGs to the specific content knowledge or any specific pedagogical knowledge participants will attain (besides the ability to work within a network/community).
- The proposal states there will be an 8-hour online course titled “Using Formative Assessment to Enhance Instruction in Mathematics”, though no details (syllabus, course objectives, course content focus, etc.) of the course are described. It is unclear why the course was chosen or how it would further the project goals and objectives, particularly improving teachers’ mathematics content knowledge.
- The role of Exxon Mobil is unclear, other than cost sharing to provide site coordinator salary and tuition for an online course. There is brief mention of activities for students and parents, but the types and numbers of activities are not detailed. It is not evident that Exxon Mobil will participate in family activities. The letter of support states only that the company will provide \$43,000 in match to the project.

- Proposal Goal 2, Objective 6 states that participant value-added scores will be increased, but the project neither directly describes what components of value-added measures will be addressed in order to contribute to the increase, nor how proposed activities will effect this change.
- The panel is concerned that the project co-director is the project evaluator.
- None of the budgeted personnel are listed as being responsible for training on mathematics content and mathematical pedagogical content during the summer institute.
- There is no detailed plan or outline of activities for the summer institute or the academic year follow-up sessions.

**Funding Recommendation:** No funding.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 03-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** mathematics

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Transforming Schools through STEM Leadership

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Frank Neubrandner

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 5  
(of 10 Points)

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

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

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 6  
(of 15 Points)

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

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

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

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

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

**Total Score:**

62
----

 (of 100 points)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$159,603  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$0

**Louisiana State University and A & M College**  
**Paul Mooney**  
**Focus: Literacy/Science**

**Engaging Teachers and Students in Content Learning**

**Determination: Not recommended for funding**  
**Points awarded: 54 out of 100**  
**Ranking: #10 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- The project is designed to target identified needs in a single parish.
- The project includes a focus on a strong, research-based strategy that has potential to yield positive student gains: *Questioning the Author*.
- Training the *LEAP* Summer School teachers and using them as teacher leaders can be valuable in building internal capacity and creating impact,
- The video-recording of teacher practice has the ability to potentially be valuable (possibly of leading to a strong peer review process).

**Concern(s):**

- Letters of support from principals appear to be templates placed on school letterhead. This practice leads reviewers to question the degree to which *true engagement and collaboration* actually occurred in the development of this project.
- No evidence is provided to assure the reviewers that all 90 science, social studies, and special education teachers are committed to participating in the project. In fact, a contradiction exists in the proposal: one section states that they will all participate while another section states that recruitment will begin in spring 2012.
- The reviewers are unable to see value in having teachers maintain an offline notebook of test score summaries when they are readily available online. Including submission of this notebook as a measure of success is highly questionable. The proposal states that, "A completed notebook will be considered one in which at least six (of eight) testing occasions include summary data. The goal will be met if all teachers turn in a completed notebook." How will this change classroom practice or improve teaching and/or learning? Additionally, the reviewers are concerned that it will be "encouraged" and not required for teachers to share these data at TAP meetings.
- While the proposal initially appears to be focused on training 90 teachers to use and implement the *Questioning the Author* strategy, a shift in focus makes the intent unclear.
  - Each teacher is expected to video two classroom lessons creating 180 videos, but only 20% of the classroom videos will be reviewed by the PI/team (20% of 90 participants: 18 teachers). This suggests that this is primarily a research-oriented project rather than a professional development project.
  - The videos referenced above will be evaluated to determine shifts in the quantity of teacher and student talk with the goal that student talk will increase in 80% of the participants' classrooms. While this goal is laudable, there is no specific mention of how the level of success of implementation and use of the *Questioning the Author* strategy will be measured, particularly since the strategy goes well beyond simply increasing student talk.
- While the project scope is large (90 teachers), there is no evidence that they can all be supported. As such, the potential for significant impact and change is minimal, particularly since there are multiple foci: *Questioning the Author* (QtA), collecting data on teacher/student

talk, administering Critical Content Monitoring (CCM) eight times, maintaining a data notebook, and attending TAP meetings.

- The project proposes adding a new assessment for students (CCM) at the rate of two administrations per quarter. This would subject students in Grades 4, 8, and 9 to eight additional assessments which do not *directly* relate to curriculum, classroom instructional goals, or the *Q<sub>t</sub>A* strategy.
- There is concern that the CCM assessments are little more than a low-level assessment of basic content knowledge while the intent of the *Q<sub>t</sub>A* strategy is to cause students to make inquiries about the content they are reading and think beyond the words on the page to consider the author's intent for the selection and his or her success communicating it.
- The proposal makes a vague and passing reference to the PARCC assessments, and, as a result, reviewers are unable to determine the relationship of this project to PARCC, if any. The inclusion of this reference is questionable considering that assessment of ELA and mathematics (not science) using the yet-to-be-developed PARCC assessments will not begin until spring 2015, well after the end of this project.

**Funding Recommendation:** No funding.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 02-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** literacy/science

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Engaging Teachers and Students in Content Learning

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Paul Mooney

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 5  
(of 10 Points)

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

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

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

**iii. Delivery Method** 7  
(of 20 Points)

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

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 5  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 1  
(of 10 Points)

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

**Total Score:** 54 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$167,279</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

**Nicholls State University**  
**Keri Turner**  
**Focus: Literacy**

**Meeting Literacy Demands: The CCSS and LDC**

**Determination: Not recommended for funding**

**Points awarded: 46 out of 100**

**Ranking: #11 of 13 (tie)**

**Strength(s):**

- The project is intended to impact a specific need of a particular parish.
- The results from the most recent LaSIP-funded project were included.

**Concern(s):**

- The rationale states that the project is “intended to strengthen teachers’ content knowledge in reading and writing in ELA, science, and social studies”, but it is unclear how the teachers will achieve this by merely developing new instructional modules using an online module creator.
- The reviewers are unable to understand how the following activities outlined in the project design will lead to the stated goal:
  - Purchase a product (Module Creator) from MetaMetrics for each teacher.
  - Require each teacher to create two (2) modules.
  - Purchase additional licenses to “reach more students” when in reality the licenses will allow additional teachers to develop modules.
  - Require teachers to register on R-GroupSpace to collaborate
- Sweeping statements are included throughout the proposal. However, the reviewers are unaware of any knowledge base to suggest that these outcomes are reasonable in the absence of any intentionally designed and focused professional development, performance expectations, and/or evaluative measures. Some examples are:
  - Modules will “undoubtedly have an impact on student success” without any evidence to support this yet unproven hypothesis.
  - “...Project design provides the teachers the opportunity to work in teams at the school during the academic year to strengthen leadership capacity”.
  - “...Project is designed to prepare teachers for the instructional shifts they will be facing in the 2013-2014 school year ... at the ‘heart of PARCC’ ...[and] through participation in the LDC, using Module Creators, and content learned in the project, these teachers should be prepared for the shifts.”
  - The proposal includes a goal that teachers will achieve increased student efficacy. This is another laudable goal that lacks intentional development. Even if this was intentionally developed in the proposal, it is unclear how this would contribute to the project’s focus on increasing teacher content knowledge in ELA, science, and social studies.

**Funding Recommendation:** No funding.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 08-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** literacy

**INSTITUTION:** Nicholls State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Meeting Literacy Demands: The CCSS and LDC

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Keri Turner

**A. Rationale and Need for the Project** 4  
(of 10 Points)

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

**i. Measurable Objectives** 4  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 5  
(of 15 Points)

**iii. Delivery Method** 11  
(of 20 Points)

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

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

**D. Project Evaluation** 0  
(of 10 Points)

**E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing** 8  
(of 20 Points)

**Total Score:** 46 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$184,794</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

**Southeastern Louisiana University**  
**Dr. Troy Williams**  
**Focus: Mathematics/Science**

**Integrated Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (I-STEM)**

**Determination: Not recommended for funding**

**Points awarded: 46 out of 100**

**Ranking: #11 of 13 (tie)**

**Strength(s):**

- This proposal includes both science and math teachers.
- The enthusiasm of the Tangipahoa Parish teachers is demonstrated by an 80% return rate from one grant-funded project to the next.
- The team has a plan to use of the Turning Point system as a formative assessment tool.

**Concern(s):**

- The project does not mention the Common Core State Standards or the Next Generation Science Standards (or the Next Gen Framework) in any specific way, such as standards to be addressed or how the CCSS would be woven into the project. While CCSS and the NGSS are mentioned in the interim report for the current year's project, the reviewers could not extrapolate to this year's project and assume that what was addressed in prior years would be covered in the next project. The team needs to be much more specific in this area.
- The evaluation plan is not rigorous enough. While a lot of data would be collected and gains would be documented, there is no mention of how these gains will rise to the level of statistical significance or that the gains would be due to the efforts of this project and not to random factors.
- There are no credentials to show that the project evaluator has any prior evaluation experience.
- There is no stated method to document widespread redelivery by project participants.
- The rubric by which participant lesson plans would be evaluated is not mentioned.
- The major content areas to be covered in the project are listed, but no specific topics of the content to be covered were provided. There also appears to be too much content to be covered (in other words, breadth but no depth).
- It is unclear how Tangipahoa Parish was included in the planning and development of this proposal, other than to provide Ms. Lanier. According to the district's letter of support, they will be involved in the planning and development of the summer institute in the future, but it was not noted that they were involved in the development of the overall plan itself. A true level of staff-district collaboration is not demonstrated.
- The budget narrative sheet mentioned "Project IBIS" in the stipend justification section, which is not the name of this project. This is careless proposal preparation on the part of the team.
- The title of the project includes the acronym "STEM." It is unclear, though, how the T in STEM, technology, is incorporated into this project in a meaningful way, especially with regard to the CCSS.

**Funding Recommendation:** No funding.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 10-LaS-13

**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** 3  
(of 10 Points)

**ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies** 5  
(of 15 Points)

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

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

**C. Quality of Key Personnel** 5  
(of 10 Points)

**D. Project Evaluation** 1  
(of 10 Points)

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

**Total Score:** 46 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$154,650</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

**Southeastern Louisiana University**  
**Dr. Gwen Autin**  
**Focus: LIGO (Science)**

**Secondary Integrated Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (SI-STEM)**

**Determination: Not recommended for funding**

**Points awarded: 44 out of 100**

**Ranking: #13 of 13**

**Strength(s):**

- Participants would receive 90 hours of direct instruction through a 10-day institute and academic year follow-up sessions. Research suggests that 80-100 hours of professional development are needed to affect change in instructional practice, so 90 hours is in line with this.
- The proposal includes both science and math teachers as participants.
- The participation of Ms. Cecilia Lanier is a major strength for this proposal, due to her qualifications and experience.
- The pre/post tests offered at the summer workshop are reliable and proven.

**Concern(s):**

- The evaluation plan is not rigorous enough. While a fair amount of data would be collected and gains would be documented, there is no mention of how these gains will be at the level of statistical significance or that the gains would be due to the efforts of this project and not random factors.
- There are no specifics for how LIGO-SEC staff is involved in the project and/or project planning, other than that the visit to LIGO-SEC will be conducted by LIGO SEC staff. They may have been involved in the development of this plan, but this was not clear and the reviewers cannot assume it occurred.
- There are no credentials provided to show that the project evaluator has prior evaluation experience.
- The major content areas to be covered in the project are listed, but there are no specifics of the content to be covered or how it maps to the CCSS. There also appears to be too much content to be covered (in other words, there is breadth but no depth).
- The project does not mention the CCSS or the Next Generation Science Standards (or the Next Gen Framework) in any specific or meaningful way, especially the standards to be addressed by the project.
- The evaluation plan notes that an external evaluator will submit a formal report to the PI documenting recommendations for changes in the project, but the proposal does not indicate when this report will be due and how it will be used to inform the project, or even that the report would be submitted with sufficient time available to alter the course of the project if some aspect is not working well.
- It is unclear how Tangipahoa Parish was included in the planning and development of this proposal, other than to provide Ms. Lanier. According to their letter of support, they will be involved in the planning and development of the summer institute in the future, but it was not noted that they were involved in the development of the overall plan itself. The true level of staff-district collaboration evident in other projects was not demonstrated.
- There is heavy reliance on PIs and project staff to do all of the work. The teachers who have participated in previous iterations of similar projects are not being utilized as coaches, mentors, etc. It would have been ideal to utilize previous stellar participants, if possible.

- The title of the project includes the acronym “STEM.” It is unclear, though, how the T in STEM, technology, is incorporated into this project in a meaningful way, especially with regard to the CCSS.

**Funding Recommendation:** No funding.

**RATING FORM FOR 2012-2013 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 09-LaS-13

**PROJECT FOCUS:** LIGO

**INSTITUTION:** Southeastern Louisiana University

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

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Gwen Autin

<b>A. Rationale and Need for the Project</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>8</u>
<b>B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)</b>	
i. Measurable Objectives (of 10 Points)	<u>1</u>
ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies (of 15 Points)	<u>5</u>
iii. Delivery Method (of 20 Points)	<u>5</u>
iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment (of 5 Points)	<u>4</u>
<b>C. Quality of Key Personnel</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>5</u>
<b>D. Project Evaluation</b> (of 10 Points)	<u>1</u>
<b>E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing</b> (of 20 Points)	<u>15</u>

**Total Score:** 44 (of 100 points)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$167,902</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>