



Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program

**FY 2015-16 LaSIP REVIEW
FINAL REPORT**

April-May, 2015

Prepared by:

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

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

INTRODUCTION

A. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND REVIEW PROCESS

On Friday, February 13, 2015, the Louisiana Systemic Initiatives Program (LaSIP) staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to fund Mathematics, ELA/Literacy, and Science K-12 teacher professional development (PD) projects. In response to the RFP, thirteen (13) proposals were submitted requesting a total of \$2,026,930. An out-of-state review panel was sent the following to read and review: (1) the FY 2015-2016 LaSIP RFP; (2) the thirteen proposals; (3) rating forms for each proposal; and (4) a summary sheet of all of the LaSIP proposals with proposed funding amounts.

Each reviewer completed a preliminary review of the proposals by Sunday, April 19, 2015 and met via conference call with the LaSIP program manager to determine which proposals would advance to the second, interview stage of the review. Of the original thirteen (13) proposals submitted, nine (9) projects were invited to participate in Skype-based interviews.

The reviewers convened in Baton Rouge during April 23-24, 2015 to interview, via Skype, prospective project directors, university staff and K-12 partners in order to further assess the merits of the proposals. The reviewers agreed that this interview process provided extremely valuable information and the clarity needed to properly rank the proposals and recommend funding. On May 3, 2015, the reviewers submitted funding recommendations for each project along with numerical ratings and rankings and written accounts of strengths, concerns, recommendations and funding stipulations.

B. RANKINGS AND FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Table I contains a rank-order list of projects recommended for funding. A total of \$976,255 was recommended for six (6) projects. Table II contains a rank-order list of projects not recommended for funding. Stipulations for budget reductions or increases, project content and timelines are included in this report.

C. REVIEW CRITERIA

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

- Determining if the project was developed out of a real need identified by the school district and if the partnership was authentic, or if the project was built by the institution of higher education (IHE) and the local education agencies (LEAs) were merely recipients of service;

- How findings from previous PD projects, LaSIP or otherwise, conducted by the project team influenced the development of the proposed project;
- Specific academic content that participating teachers would learn, how this content was identified, and methods for assessing the degree to which the participating teachers mastered the new academic content;
- Specific research-based instructional strategies (pedagogy) the participating teachers would learn and be able to implement as a result of participating in the project, the measures to be used to assess the degree to which this was accomplished, the methods and timeline for supporting teachers in implementing these new strategies throughout the academic year, and strategies for preparing and ensuring school leadership will monitor, support, and evaluate implementation;
- A contemporary research base to support the project design;
- Specific activities in which the IHE and the K-12 school district engaged to collaboratively develop the proposal, as well as specific participants and the timeline; and
- The method of collaboration that led to the identification of participants (schools, and specific participating teachers) to assure that the schools and teachers with the greatest need are being served.

2015-16 LaSIP Panel Review

TABLE I

Proposals Recommended for Funding

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
1	93	12LaS-15	NIC	Plaisance	\$159,590	\$189,590
2	88	11LaS-15	LaTech	Talton	\$160,337	\$160,337
3	85	02LaS-15	LSU-A	Eason	\$145,424	\$157,924
3	85	03LaS-15	LSU-A	Lueder	\$145,424	\$157,924
3	85	13LaS-15	SLU	Williams	\$139,402	\$151,902
6	84	01LaS-15	CEN	Vetter	\$160,268	\$158,578
					\$910,445	\$976,255

TABLE II

Proposals Not Recommended for Funding

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Principal Investigator	Requested Funds	Recommended Funds
7	77	09LaS-15	LaTech	Manning	\$167,027	\$0
8	73	04LaS-15	LSU-BR	Gregg	\$212,593	\$0
9	57	05LaS-15	LSU-BR	Mooney	\$192,178	\$0
10	38	10LaS-15	LaTech	Romer	\$111,804	\$0
11	30	08LaS-15	LaTech	Lvov	\$166,785	\$0
12	17	07LaS-15	LaTech	Johnston	\$157,763	\$0
13	N/A	06LaS-15	LaTech	Crittenden	\$108,335	\$0
					\$1,116,485	\$0

Proposal Number	01LaS-15
IHE	Centenary College
Title	Northwest Louisiana Professional Development Project: Bridging the Gap and Making Connections between Middle and High School Life Science Teachers
PI	Scott Vetter
Focus	Science
Requested Funding	\$160,268
Determination	Fund, With Stipulations
Recommended Funding	\$158,578
Score (out of 100)	84
Ranking	6 out of 13

Strengths

- The project incorporates 120 hours of PD for participants across the summer institutes and academic year, as suggested by current research. This includes a 10-day summer institute at the beginning and a five-day institute at the end.
- The end-of-year follow-up workshop is an excellent method to wrap up a project that gives participants a chance to reflect on their progress and for the project team to collect final evidence for project objectives.
- This project plans to use a feeder school model, where 7th-grade teachers will be paired (when possible) with 10th-grade teachers. These connections create an opportunity for fostering leadership, collaboration and discussions around standards articulation.
- The project team recognizes that teacher participants need to understand the articulation and progression of content and skills at a level higher than the grade level in which they teach.
- All project team members recognized areas in which they would improve the project plan, clearly articulated their challenges, and stated reasonable ways to address those challenges.
- It is evident that the district and IHE project team have worked together for many years, and their level of collaboration and overall enthusiasm to serve teachers is commendable.
- Specific time during the academic-year sessions will be devoted to analyzing student work.

Concerns

- The project was created to replicate the model of previously funded LaSIP science PD proposals. However, there was neither evidence of the incorporation of “lessons learned”, nor adoption of previous reviewer recommendations that would have strengthened the current submission.
- The PI stated that the rationale for the subject matter content of the project (life science) was selected because it is the last of the sciences to be addressed in a PD program, rather than being based upon analysis of available or collected student and teacher data.
- The subject matter content taught and assessed during the summer institute will be 3rd-8th grade content, and the assessment tools will be developed from released State science assessment questions for grades 3-8. While it is understood that K-12 educators need to know the content that they teach, this approach is not likely to expand or deepen their own science content knowledge on a post-secondary level.
- This plan does not address opportunities for redelivery of program content by participants to teachers who are not participants in this project.
- There is no one on or outside of the proposed project team identified as the project evaluator.
- Most of the data referenced in the narrative, outside of the summer institute pre/post-tests, are qualitative in nature (i.e., teacher observations, teacher surveys, daily teacher feedback).

- It is stated that past programs have had an impact on student outcomes in statewide test results. However, no school- or class-level assessment results, specifically for related science content for the classes taught by project participants, are included.
- The team plans to use portions of the academic-year workshops to investigate student work, share experiences, and discuss how lessons were/might be modified. However, there are no formalized processes and protocols for analyzing student work, providing structure for these analyses or documenting these crucial teacher activities.
- It is unclear what the specific role of the master teacher will be during and after the summer institute.
- The project budget includes funds for substitute teacher pay. This is a cost share item that should be provided by the district.

Recommendations

- Formalize the analysis of student work process and collect artifacts (analysis session notes, protocols and anonymous student work, etc.) to document this portion of the academic-year workshop activities. A resource that may be of use to the project team is the website lasw.org (Looking at Student Work) or similar.
- In order to improve the participants' subject-specific content knowledge, the summer institute content should be taught and assessed on a post-secondary level.
- To help provide inter-rater reliability for IHE team members observing participants, the project team should consider doing classroom observations for a select sample of teachers simultaneously.
- Formally design a redelivery plan that participants would implement as a required component of the project.
- Formally gather feedback forms, agendas and attendance forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate feedback electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.
- Consider having participants do two "Hots, Gots and Nots" feedback forms: one for science content and one for pedagogical content (instructional strategies).
- Strongly consider collecting teacher data from the science probes referenced in the narrative and used during summer institutes and any academic-year workshop sessions. Model how the data from these probes is to be collected, analyzed and used to inform instruction.

Stipulations

- Identify a project evaluator and provide a detailed evaluation plan which includes a timeline for data collection (quantitative and qualitative) and analysis throughout the project.
- Provide a detailed description of the role of the master teacher as well as when/how this person will serve the project as a paid consultant.
- The review panel recommends a reduced funding amount for this proposal, with no funding for substitute pay.
- The revised budget reflecting all of the changes made to arrive at this lower funding amount must be submitted by the PI to LaSIP staff prior to funding.

RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01-LaS-15

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 Life
Science Teachers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Scott Vetter

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

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 7
(of 10 Points)

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

iii. Delivery Method 18
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 7
(of 10 Points)

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

Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$160,268</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$158,578</u>

Proposal Number	02LaS-15
IHE	LSU-Alexandria
Title	Math CCSS and Assessment Professional Development with Rapides Parish, Grades 3-5
PI	Mitzi Eason
Focus	Mathematics
Requested Funding	\$145,424
Determination	Fund, With Stipulations
Recommended Funding	\$157,924
Score (out of 100)	85
Ranking	3 out of 13

Strengths

- The project was developed in partnership with the Rapides Parish School District and was driven by needs identified by the Deputy Superintendent of Teaching and Learning, the District’s grant writer, and through feedback gathered from teachers and principals at meetings, in informal conversations, through surveys, and through data collected from University partners in the course of their work with the teachers and administrators throughout the year.
- The project is well conceived and throughout the interview all participants were able to speak fluently and confidently about the project’s inception and development, its goals, its strengths, and areas that could be strengthened.
- This project has a unique strength, as one of the Co-PIs is a member of the community and has children in the district. As such, there is great potential for the project team to benefit from the various perspectives gained through her multiple roles as a mother of students in the District, professor, and community member, which can allow her to be a conduit for insights and information, and a strong positive influence throughout the community to enhance likelihood of success of the project.
- The project is designed to support the schools and teachers in the District with the greatest need.
- There is a plan for project content redelivery through a “family night”, as well as in-school and district level workshops. These activities will be developed during the summer institute.

Concerns

- The purpose of LaSIP is to fund projects that “will enhance the core content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge of teachers” (RFP, Section III A). The written proposal for this project implies, but does not fully define, the specific adult/college-level content knowledge that teachers will be expected to learn, nor does Goal 2 include objectives for this. This persisted throughout the interview, as well. While it is understood that teachers cannot learn how to teach fractions, for example, without deepening their knowledge of fractions, the lack of clearly stated content expectations makes it impossible to measure program effectiveness.
- There is not a clear plan to develop teacher leaders and administrators as leaders to assure the project can continue beyond the funding.
- A project evaluator is not named.
- There is no course for which participating teachers can earn graduate credit.
- There is no cost sharing by the IHE.

Recommendations

- In conjunction with the complementary proposal submitted by PI Lueder, consider implementing two strands (Operations and Algebraic Thinking, and Numbers and Operations in Base 10) so teachers can participate in the strand addressing their area of greatest need. Allow teachers who wish to participate in both strands to do so, even if funding is not available for “dual enrollment” stipends.
- Explore ways to develop math content courses specifically tied to the domains (i.e., Understanding Operations and Algebraic Thinking, Numbers and Operations in Base 10, etc.) with specific adult/college level content for teachers to learn. Progressions documents can serve as the foundation for such courses.
- Explore opportunities for University cost sharing by offering tuition waivers.
- While developing teacher pedagogical knowledge in conjunction with the implementation of the Eureka math curriculum, strongly consider purposeful incorporation of the recommended manipulatives and materials tailored for the curriculum by the Eureka writers as listed per grade level.

Stipulations

- Change the grade levels of participants to teachers in Grades K-2 to provide a comprehensive support system to address the overwhelming need to improve the mathematics content knowledge and pedagogy of K-2 teachers articulated by the team during the interview. Given that the team demonstrated high interest in participation among these teachers, the likelihood of affecting change and building systemic capacity for teachers to teach math conceptually will be significantly increased by concentrating all available resources within a single grade span rather than across two separate projects.
- Define in measurable terms for Goal 2 the specific **adult/college-level** content knowledge and specific pedagogical knowledge teachers will be expected to acquire as a result of completing this project.
- Identify an external project evaluator to assess both LSU-Alexandria projects who is not associated with any of the institutions involved and provide a detailed evaluation plan with a timeline for data collection and analysis. (Note: an additional \$12,500 is awarded to support this.)
- Provide a structured plan, including training and support, to develop teacher leaders who will be able to provide “on the ground” support, guidance, and leadership in the K-2 Mathematics Programs in their schools and throughout the district beyond the life of the funding.
- Assure that the majority of participants are the lowest performing teachers with the greatest potential for growth who work in the lowest performing schools in the District and provide objective evidence to show this in the interim and final reports.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Mathematics

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Math CCSS and Assessment Professional Development with Rapides
Parish, Grades 3-5

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mitzi Eason

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

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 8
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies 8
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 17
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 7
(of 10 Points)

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

Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$145,424

RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$157,924

Proposal Number	03LaS-15
IHE	LSU-Alexandria
Title	Math CCSS and Assessment Professional Development with Rapides Parish, Grades K-2
PI	Tanya Lueder
Focus	Mathematics
Requested Funding	\$145,424
Determination	Fund, With Stipulations
Recommended Funding	\$157,924
Score (out of 100)	85
Ranking	3 out of 13

Strengths

- The project was developed in partnership with the Rapides Parish School District and was driven by needs identified by the Deputy Superintendent of Teaching and Learning, the District’s grant writer, and through feedback gathered from teachers and principals at meetings, in informal conversations, through surveys, and through data collected from University partners in the course of their work with the teachers and administrators throughout the year.
- The project is well conceived and throughout the interview all participants were able to speak fluently and confidently about the project’s inception and development, its goals, its strengths, and areas that could be strengthened.
- This project has a unique strength, as one of the Co-PIs is a member of the community and has children in the district. As such, there is great potential for the project team to benefit from the various perspectives gained through her multiple roles as a mother of students in the District, professor, and community member, which can allow her to be a conduit for insights and information, and a strong positive influence throughout the community to enhance likelihood of success of the project.
- The project is designed to support the schools and teachers in the District with the greatest need.
- There is a plan for project content redelivery through a “family night”, as well as in-school and district level workshops. These activities will be developed during the summer institute.

Concerns

- The purpose of LaSIP is to fund projects that “will enhance the core content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge of teachers” (RFP, Section III A). The written proposal for this project implies, but does not fully define, the specific adult/college level content knowledge teachers will be expected to learn nor does Goal 2 include objectives for this. This persisted throughout the interview, as well. While it is understood that teachers cannot learn how to teach (as an example) fractions without deepening their knowledge of fractions, the lack of clearly stated content expectations makes it impossible to measure program effectiveness.
- There is not a clear plan to develop teacher leaders and administrators as leaders to assure the project can continue beyond the funding.
- A project evaluator is not named.
- There is no course for which participating teachers can earn graduate credit.
- There is no cost sharing by the IHE.

Recommendations

- In conjunction with PI Eason who submitted a complementary project, consider implementing two domains (Operations and Algebraic Thinking, and Numbers and Operations in Base 10) so teachers can participate in the strand addressing their area of greatest need. Allow teachers who wish to participate in both strands to do so, even if funding is not available for ‘dual enrollment’ stipends.
- Explore ways to develop math content courses specifically tied to the domains (i.e., Understanding Operations and Algebraic Thinking, Numbers and Operations in Base 10, etc.) with specific adult/college level content for teachers to learn. Progressions documents can serve as the foundation for such courses.
- Explore opportunities for University cost sharing by offering tuition waivers.
- While developing teacher pedagogical knowledge in conjunction with the implementation of the Eureka math curriculum, strongly consider purposeful incorporation of the recommended manipulatives and materials tailored for the curriculum by the Eureka writers as listed per grade level.

Stipulations for funding

- Define in measurable terms for Goal 2 the specific **adult/college-level** content knowledge and specific pedagogical knowledge teachers will be expected to acquire as a result of completing this project.
- Combine resources with the project submitted by PI Eason to provide a comprehensive support system to address the overwhelming need to improve the mathematics content knowledge and pedagogy of K-2 teachers articulated by the team during the interview. Given that the team demonstrated high interest in participation among these teachers, the likelihood of affecting change and building systemic capacity for teachers to teach math conceptually will be significantly increased by concentrating all available resources within this single grade span rather than fund two separate projects.
- Identify an external project evaluator to assess both LSU-Alexandria projects who is not associated with any of the institutions involved and provide a detailed evaluation plan with a timeline for data collection and analysis. (Note: an additional \$12,500 is awarded to support this.)
- Provide a structured plan, including training and support, to develop teacher leaders who will be able to provide on-the-ground support, guidance, and leadership in the K-2 Mathematics Programs in their schools and throughout the district beyond the life of the funding.
- Assure that the majority of participants are the lowest performing teachers with the greatest potential for growth who work in the lowest performing schools in the District and provide objective evidence to show this in the interim and final reports.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Mathematics

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Math CCSS and Assessment Professional Development with Rapides
Parish, Grades K-2

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tanya Lueder

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

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 8
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies 8
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 17
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 7
(of 10 Points)

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

Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$145,424

RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$157,924

Proposal Number	04LaS-15
IHE	LSU-Baton Rouge
Title	Peer Coaching in Close Reading and Critical Content Monitoring
PI	Christopher Gregg
Focus	Science/Social Studies
Requested Funding	\$212,593
Determination	No Funding Recommended
Score (out of 100)	73
Ranking	8 out of 13

Strengths

- The project focus is timely and valuable with regard to meeting existing district needs that are supported by key stakeholders in the partner district.
- The LEA administrators were engaged in the development of the proposal.
- The project staff includes individuals who are accomplished and highly recognized in their fields.
- The project focuses on enhancing student formative assessment and progress monitoring.
- The evaluation plan is strong and clear.

Concerns

- The RFP requires that funded proposals “enhance the core content and pedagogical knowledge of teachers”. While this is an otherwise strong proposal, the specific content teachers will learn through this project is not specified. As such, the goals of the funding initiative are not met.
- The proposal language suggests that teachers were not engaged in the planning process, which is required by the RFP.
- There is no evaluator named.
- There is no plan for redelivery of project content to non-participating teachers.
- Detailed calculations for items to be purchased were not included for budget lines 20 and 21.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Sci/Social Studies

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Peer Coaching in Close Reading and Critical Content Monitoring

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christopher Gregg

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

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 7
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies 8
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 15
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 8
(of 10 Points)

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

Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$212,593
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

Proposal Number	05LaS-15
IHE	LSU-Baton Rouge
Title	Data-Based Individualization for Students with Severe Learning Needs
PI	Paul Mooney
Focus	ELA/Mathematics
Requested Funding	\$192,178
Determination	No Funding Recommended
Score (out of 100)	57
Ranking	9 out of 13

Strengths

- The project is designed to meet a defined need that exists in the school district and there is evidence of collaborative planning and support among key stakeholders.
- The project focuses on enhancing student achievement for special needs students, a group often not addressed through similar projects.
- There is an intent to follow students to measure growth.
- The evaluation plan is strong and clear.
- The level of project cost sharing is commendable. The district's investment is substantial and demonstrates a high level of commitment.

Concerns

- The RFP requires that proposals “enhance the core content and pedagogical knowledge of teachers” (Section III A, RFP). While this is an otherwise strong proposal, this project is not designed for the purpose of funding as shown in the opening sentence of the proposal abstract, which reads “The overall vision of the project is for a finite number of students with histories of academic failure, including students with disabilities, to experience academic success as a result of their efforts as well as the explicit efforts of school-based teams designed to meet their academic and/or behavioral needs.” While laudable and valuable, the specific content teachers will learn through this project in Science, Mathematics, and/or ELA/Literacy and the pedagogical knowledge they are to gain in these areas are not specified. As such, the goals of the funding initiative are not met.
- Objectives do not demonstrate intents of the funding.
- The summer institute focuses on professional skills and practices (i.e. progress monitoring, intervention intensification, DBI process, diagnostic assessment, CICO process, etc.).
- The student goals do not reflect the purpose of the funding and, as presented, the number of students expected to show gains is exceptionally low (i.e., three per school).
- The budget is high for the number of students to be ultimately impacted.
- Detailed calculations for items to be purchased were not included for budget lines 20 and 21.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: ELA/Mathematics

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Data-Based Individualization for Students with Severe Learning Needs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Mooney

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

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 2
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies 2
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 10
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 10
(of 10 Points)

E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing 10
(of 20 Points)

Total Score: 57 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$192,178</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

Proposal Number	06LaS-15
IHE	Louisiana Tech
Title	Project Fuel-Fostering Understanding and Engagement in Learners
PI	Kelly Crittenden
Focus	Math/Science
Requested Funding	\$108,335
Determination	No Funding Recommended
Score (out of 100)	Unable to Score
Ranking	13 out of 13

A review of this project could not be completed. While it appears that the proposal body was to include 55 pages, the Principal Investigator submitted only 26 pages (i.e., odd numbered pages from Pages 1 through 55). As such, reviewers were unable to evaluate the project.

Proposal Number	07LaS-15
IHE	Louisiana Tech
Title	Enhancing STEM Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Practices through Dual Enrollment Programs
PI	Kathleen Johnston
Focus	Science/Math/Computer Science
Requested Funding	\$157,763
Determination	No Funding Recommended
Score (out of 100)	17
Ranking	12 out of 13

Strengths

- There is a desire to enhance dual-enrollment course delivery in the high schools.
- The project is developed to create opportunities for collaboration among high school teachers and IHE instructors of record as a means of improving instruction in dual enrollment courses for high school students.
- A project evaluator is named.

Concerns

- The RFP requires funded proposals to “enhance the core content and pedagogical knowledge of teachers” (Section III A, RFP). The specific content and pedagogical knowledge teachers are expected to gain relative to their individual disciplines is not defined for physics, mathematics, chemistry, and computer science teachers teaching in dual enrollment courses. Given that each of these areas has its own unique body of content knowledge and pedagogical practices, reviewers are unclear how this goal could be met through a 40-hour summer institute in which all teachers will participate simultaneously, particularly when two-thirds of the project is not directly related to the content or pedagogy of these disciplines or specific college course requirements for which students will earn credit.
- The proposal identifies an individual as a Co-PI to “assume administrative responsibilities pertaining to budget management, reporting, and logistics”. As the US Department of Education defines a Principal Investigator as “the individual designated by the grantee ...responsible for the scientific or technical direction of the project”, this individual is improperly classified. Even though the salary for this individual is shown as “in-kind”, this improper classification likely has budgetary implications given that a Co-PI and clerical staff are compensated at vastly different rates.
- The absence of objective data about the local schools, teachers targeted for participation, and the dual enrollment students makes it impossible to know if there is a demonstrated need for this project.
- While the proposal states that computer science teachers will participate, there are no dual enrollment computer science classes identified in Table 5.
- The pre-summer institute course is generic and includes a variety of disparate topics that include: 1) Introduction to MakerSpaces, 2) Project-Based Learning, 3) Design Thinking for Educators, 4) Common Core State Standards, and 5) Next-Generation Science Standards. There is no defined relationship of this content and the needs of teachers teaching dual enrollment courses.
- The relationship of the above-referenced content to the needs of teachers teaching CHEM 120 (Inorganic Chemistry), CHEM 121 (Organic Chemistry), MATH 100 or 101 (College Algebra), MATH 112 (Trigonometry), and STAT 200 (Statistics) is not defined.
- Providing teachers with MakerSpace Thingery training does not have a relationship to achieving the project goal of providing collaborative planning time between dual-enrollment high school teachers.

- It is not clear how planning time between college professors of record rather and high school dual-enrollment course teachers will develop content and pedagogical knowledge of teachers.
- The vast majority of the Needs and Rationale section of the proposal presents generic information about dual-enrollment programs, with the exception of the numbers of students enrolled in dual-enrollment programs in the participating schools.
- There is no evidence of collaboration; as the proposal states “[f]ive Louisiana high schools in five high needs districts have been selected to serve. Schools were selected after analysis of enrollment data for existing dual enrollment numbers at Louisiana Tech University” (Proposal, Page 9).
- While a number of well-credentialed individuals are named among the key personnel, the proposal does not clearly specify each individual’s role in the project and his/her responsibilities as required in the RFP. The roles of four of the key personnel are not defined in the Quality of Personnel Section, including the PI. The use of a number of vague terms and phrases relative to the work of personnel, including “spearhead”, “ensure progress is closely monitored”, “serve in an advisory capacity ensuring that staff use appropriate...”, “critically important to the logistical aspects of the project”, and other similar phrases raises concerns.
- The only requirement of the RFP Project Evaluation section that was met was the naming of a project evaluator. The project-designed assessment plans did not identify diagnostic, formative and summative evaluations of how the project will meet the goals of the RFP. In addition, measurement of the project’s success in increasing student achievement through participating teachers’ PD is not defined. Evaluation instruments are not identified and matched with the specific proposal objectives.
- The adequacy and the appropriateness of the budget is impossible to determine because the project is not clearly designed. All required budget documents were not submitted and poor scanning of the one that was submitted (Budget Request) made those pages difficult to read.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Science/Math

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing STEM Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Practices
through Dual Enrollment Programs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Johnston

A. Rationale and Need for the Project 3
(of 10 Points)

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 3
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies 0
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 4
(of 20 Points)

iv. Collaborative Partnerships/Participant Recruitment 1
(of 5 Points)

C. Quality of Key Personnel 3
(of 10 Points)

D. Project Evaluation 1
(of 10 Points)

E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing 2
(of 20 Points)

Total Score: 17 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$157,763
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

Proposal Number	08LaS-15
IHE	Louisiana Tech
Title	Making Things Small and Simple: Practical Nano/Micro Technology
PI	Yuri Lvov
Focus	Science/Math
Requested Funding	\$166,785
Determination	No Funding Recommended
Score (out of 100)	30
Ranking	11 out of 13

Strengths

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

Concerns

- The project is not designed to serve the schools with the greatest need. The schools identified for participation are three schools among the highest rated in the district, with “B” ratings.
- The proposal identifies an individual as a Co-PI to “assume administrative responsibilities pertaining to budget management, reporting, and logistics”. As the US Department of Education defines a Principal Investigator as “the individual designated by the grantee...responsible for the scientific or technical direction of the project” this individual is improperly classified. Even though the salary for this individual is shown as “in-kind”, this improper classification likely has budgetary implications given that a Co-PI and clerical staff are compensated at vastly different rates.
- The Rationale and Needs section does not explain why this project is needed. Composite ACT scores, graduation rates, and dropout rates were presented. However, the proposal does not address the specific content needs of teachers and students to be served by the project.
- Goal 1, Objective 1 states that students will show a 10% increase on test scores in State’s End-of-Course Assessment for Algebra I. However, Algebra standards listed in the Northwestern University Materials Research Institute Intro to Nanoscale Module table included on page 12 do not align to the project components, to specific Next-Generation Science Standards and the Common Core State Standards.
- The 30-hour course to be delivered in Moodle prior to the start of the summer institute is not defined nor is the course currently approved by the University for credit, as was stated by the team during the interview. Though questioned in the interview, the team was unable to assure the reviewers that the basic components of a full course design exist beyond the identification of unit titles. Given the short time between contract award and start-up, and the need to secure course approvals, the reviewers are unclear how the State can be assured that a high-quality course could be developed and approved in a timely manner (i.e., course description, outcomes, types of assignments, methods of evaluation, and instructor of record).
- There was no method to determine how teachers would be evaluated as successfully completing the 30-hour pre-Summer Institute course.
- Specific subject matter content to be learned by the participants was not defined and, as such, it will not be possible to measure and evaluate program effectiveness.
- The proposal states “at least 80% of the participants will rate the project as good or very good at enriching content knowledge by the end of the project”. This is not an effective measure for determining what content was learned, and how well.

- The reviewers were unable to determine exactly what content teachers were targeted to learn, what they were to implement in their classrooms, how the project team would support the participating teachers during the academic year, or how any aspect of the project would be evaluated objectively.
- No specific science and/or Algebra content that teachers are to learn is defined for the pre-Summer institute course or the Summer Institute.
- Participants are not required to redeliver the PD to other teachers, though 33% of the project delivery contact hours are specified as redelivery. This raises concerns.
- The proposal reads, “Participating educators are encouraged to redeliver the revised course for credit or an abbreviated training to 10 additional participants from their respective schools. The redelivery can be informal or through coursework they facilitate as an adjunct.” Even if each participant was required to redeliver the project’s PD activities, there is no evidence supplied to explain where 300 teachers would be found to allow the goal to be achieved.
- There is no mechanism/plan to support teachers in developing plans for redelivery to assure success for those who will redeliver. To achieve this vision for redelivery, individuals must have skills, incentives, resources, and an action plan.
- There is no plan for project staff to support the teachers during the redelivery process.
- There is no evidence of how the school district will provide the necessary time for redelivery (release time, etc.)
- While the proposal states teachers “may” work as adjuncts, there is no evidence to indicate how many will. Further, basic staffing plans for IHE’s make it unlikely that more than a few participants actually would be able to do this.
- Given that teachers are not learning science and/or math content during the Summer Institute, it is unclear what professional development exactly would be redelivered if redelivery actually took place.
- During the interview it was mentioned that the teachers would redeliver the ten-module/30-hour pre-institute course, with no explanation of how minimum competency levels of these teachers would be determined in advance.
- No data from the project currently being implemented were presented to support the merits and efficacy of the proposed model
- The inclusion of an option for participants to “redeliver” the project content in their own classrooms suggests that the project team is not aware of the intended definition of redelivery.
- There is no rationale provided in the proposal for having participants develop a book about nano/micro technology for pre-school students, nor is there any instructional need in Early Childhood education known to the reviewers to support this activity. It is highly questionable that this was included in the proposal since, during the interview, one of the PIs stated that it was thought to be “a good idea that we would try”. A plan, time, resources, and human capital are not assigned to this activity nor is there any apparent alignment of this activity with CCSS, State Science Standards, or even the project goals which are targeted for high school teachers.
- A number of individuals with impressive credentials specifically related to the project are named among the key personnel; however, the proposal does not clearly specify each individual’s role in the project and his/her responsibilities as required in the RFP.
- The role of the project evaluator is minimized. The proposal states that “She will assist project leaders with development of and administration of surveys and tools to determine the effectiveness and impact of the proposed project.” A budget of \$1,000 for evaluation is insufficient for an evaluation of a project of the proposed scope.
- The project-designed assessment plans did not identify diagnostic, formative and summative evaluations of how the project will meet the goals of the RFP. In addition, the project’s success in increasing students’ achievement through their teachers’ PD is not defined. The appropriateness of at least some of the evaluation instruments is questionable.
- The budget is inadequate. The position assigned the most time to work in this project is the clerical position, which is budgeted for two months. The PI is only budgeted for one month of work and a Co-PI is assigned to five-eighths of one month.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Science/Math

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Making Things Small and Simple: Practical Nano/Micro Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yuri Lvov

A. Rationale and Need for the Project 2
(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 7
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 2
(of 10 Points)

E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing 3
(of 20 Points)

Total Score: 30 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$166,785</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

Proposal Number	09LaS-15
IHE	Louisiana Tech
Title	Assessment Literacy: Data-Based Instruction
PI	Libby Manning
Focus	ELA
Requested Funding	\$167,027
Determination	No Funding Recommended
Score (out of 100)	77
Ranking	7 out of 13

Strengths

- Project staff includes individuals who are accomplished and highly recognized in the field of literacy education.
- The project flows from needs identified through a strong ongoing relationship between the IHE and the school district.
- The project outlines a rich program for deepening teachers’ understanding of assessment and use of assessment data effectively to inform planning and instruction.
- A strong interim evaluation report for the previous project which included statistical analysis was included.

Concerns

- The RFP requires that funded proposals “enhance the core content and pedagogical knowledge of teachers” (Section III A, RFP). The proposal abstract states the purpose of this project is to “offer professional development to increase content knowledge around assessment literacy while building better working and learning relationships among teachers across the district”. While knowledge of assessment and assessment strategies is professional content knowledge, it is not among the content areas about which teachers are expected to gain knowledge set forth in the requirements. To be fundable, this project would have needed to define specific ELA/Literacy content knowledge the participating teachers would acquire as a result of participating in this project. While during the interview the team stated the teachers would be reading and writing, there are no defined outcomes that would assure the State would be properly allocating grant funds.
- While the stated objectives are measurable, some do not fulfill the requirements of the RFP with respect to teacher subject-matter content knowledge. Additionally, the pedagogical knowledge teachers will gain is not fully clear. Much is stated broadly rather than specifically. Finally, the intent and relationship of the “book studies” to the project goals are unclear because the book to be used is not defined.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: ELA

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Assessment Literacy: Data-Based Instruction

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Libby Manning

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

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 7
(of 10 Points)

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

iii. Delivery Method 15
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 5
(of 10 Points)

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

Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$167,027</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

Proposal Number	10LaS-15
IHE	Louisiana Tech
Title	Sport Science Discovery Programs
PI	Braden Romer
Focus	Science/Math
Requested Funding	\$111,804
Determination	No Funding Recommended
Score (out of 100)	38
Ranking	10 out of 13

Strengths

- The topic of the project is relevant and timely and offers a creative way to integrate STEM programming.
- The project team members from the IHE are accomplished in their fields, knowledgeable, and their passion was evident in the interview.
- During the interview, the PIs expressed a clear need for increasing the number of STEM graduates and the potential that achieving this goal holds for positively impacting economic advancement of the State, and Lincoln Parish, specifically.
- PIs are aware of and deeply committed to supporting and enhancing the P-20 pipeline, particularly with respect to increasing enrollment in postsecondary STEM fields.
- The project is designed to introduce teachers to a variety of tools that have the potential for enhancing integrated approaches to classroom instruction.

Concerns

- The cover page is incomplete.
- While there is merit to the work being proposed, the purpose, goals and scope do not meet most of the requirements of the RFP in general.
- Much of what is described in individual sections does not define, with specificity, exactly what content and pedagogical knowledge teachers will gain, how this will be measured, how it will be transferred into practice, how teachers will be supported throughout the year, and effective objective evaluation measures.
- The proposal states, “Given the broad nature of sport science, fully encompassing the various aspects of the field with regards to instructional strategies and classroom implementation is beyond the scope of the present project”. There is no defined relationship among what teachers are actually teaching in the Middle School science curriculum, what students should know and be able to do, and the specific GLEs or NGSS.
- During the interview no information was provided that indicated the PIs understand the requirements of the grant and the purposes of the funds which are to “enhance the core content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge of teachers in Math, ELA, and Science” (RFP, Section III A). This became readily apparent when, during the interview, one of the PIs stated “We are not teaching them [teachers] new content. We are making the assumption that they are highly qualified. We want to teach them how to teach better. We don’t want to retrain teachers in their discipline.”
- The Need and Rationale sections are very general. This section does not identify specific math and science needs that exist in the school district and the targeted school. Thus, the project is not “aligned with the assessment of needs of the local schools” (RFP, Page 12).
- There is no evidence to show how “teacher participants and administrators from the schools to be served by the project [were] involved in the planning process” (RFP, Page 12).
- The lack of a defined body of content and pedagogical knowledge that teachers are expected to acquire makes it impossible for this project to provide a viable model and vehicle to “enhance long-term, sustained, high-quality professional development... result in change of teacher practice or teachers’

content knowledge that increases student achievement in the classroom ... influence the implementation of research-based curriculum in undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs, and...strengthen collaboration between faculties of IHE's and other partners in the program [i.e., school districts]" (RFP, page 12).

- Teachers will participate in 32 total hours of programming over three days during the academic year (proposal, page 5). It is not clear how an average of over 10 hours of participant engagement per day will be scheduled.
- The project is vaguely structured and there is no evidence that the project was developed collaboratively in response to a need that exists in the targeted school district.
- The objectives are not measurable.
- Goal 1, Objective 1 does not specify what area of student achievement is to be measured.
- The PARCC assessment is identified as the instrument to measure achievement of objectives for Goal 1. However, the PARCC does not include an assessment for science and is only administered once in high school. If the PARCC is being used to measure student achievement in mathematics, there is no evidence that the participating high school teachers will be limited to the single high school grade level being tested in Louisiana.
- Though the project does not focus on developing teachers' content knowledge, the project includes an objective for this.
- An evaluation instrument is not specified for Goal 2, Objective 1.
- Neither of the objectives for Goal 2 meet the requirement that "[o]bjectives must be specific, measurable, attainable, results-focused, and timely" (RFP, page 7).
- Both objectives for Goal 2 fail to include adequate measures to determine effectiveness. The measure of success for Objective 2, Goal 1 is "teachers [rating] this project as average or above at providing effective pedagogical strategies for including STEM through sport science by the end of the project".
- The measure of success for Goal 2, Objective 2 is "teachers [rating] this project as average or above at providing effective content knowledge in STEM through sport science activities as exhibited on their responses on a staff developed Likert scale survey by the end of the project".
- While Goal 3, Objective 2 states that a measure of redelivery is the production and distribution of a "publication", the proposal contains no indication of who has responsibility for directing this aspect of the project, a timeline for its creation, and budget to support its development and distribution.
- A number of individuals with impressive credentials specifically related to the project are named among the key personnel. However, the proposal does not specify each individual's role in the project and the responsibilities as required in the RFP.
- The role of the evaluator is not defined in such a way as to assure an objective evaluation.
- Line 20 of the budget request and narrative is for specific equipment, but does not include a breakdown of the costs for each item to be purchased. It is of further concern that a set of the equipment is allocated for the campus lab instead of being installed in a participating school. The number of equipment sets should match the number of schools participating in the project.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Science/Mathematics

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Sport Science Discovery Programs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Braden Romer

A. Rationale and Need for the Project 3
(of 10 Points)

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 5
(of 10 Points)

ii. Specific Subject Matter Content/ Instructional Strategies 2
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 5
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 4
(of 10 Points)

E. Budget Request, Budget Narrative and Cost Sharing 12
(of 20 Points)

Total Score: 38 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$111,804</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

Proposal Number	11LaS-15
IHE	Louisiana Tech
Title	The Math IDEA Project (Investigate, Develop, Engage, Apply)
PI	Carolyn Talton
Focus	Mathematics
Requested Funding	\$160,337
Determination	Fund with Stipulations
Recommended Funding	\$160,337
Score (out of 100)	88
Ranking	2 out of 13

Strengths

- The project plan demonstrates a strong collaborative partnership between the IHE and Caldwell Parish. The plan is clearly designed in response to district needs and with the district/school improvement plans (DIP/SIP) taken into consideration.
- The project is designed to take advantage of and use student non-attendance days to conduct academic-year sessions hosted at school sites on a rotating basis. These full days will occur on 15 Mondays.
- There is evidence of thoughtful planning and sustained implementation of project objectives within the district beyond the life of the project.
- A minimum of 120 hours of PD will be delivered during the project.
- The project has identified an external evaluator and developed an evaluation plan and timeline.
- The project plan includes training and ongoing support for the district instructional coaches.
- Specific content that participants will learn is identified with specific methods to assess the degree to which participants master the content.
- Specific research-based instructional strategies the participants will learn and be expected to implement have been identified. The evaluation plan includes methods of measuring successful implementation of these strategies throughout the academic year.
- A contemporary research base has been referenced in support of the project rationale and design.

Concerns

- The subject matter content taught and assessed during the summer institute will be 3rd-8th-grade math content, and the assessment tools will be developed from released PARCC assessment questions for grades 3-8 and end-of-year course assessment for Algebra I. While it is understood that educators need to know the content that they teach, this approach is not likely to expand or deepen their own math content knowledge on a post-secondary level.
- Neither specific teacher needs assessment data nor performance data were collected and/or referenced during project planning process.
- The project redelivery plan only consists of development of a website for dissemination of teacher-created materials.
- The manner in which technology is proposed in this project will not prepare teachers to effectively plan and deliver mathematics instruction that will cause students to **do** mathematics at the level demanded in the State's mathematics standards. Specifically, standards for mathematical practice require students to use technology tools and consider the available tools when solving a mathematical problem: "These tools might include ... a calculator, a spreadsheet, a computer algebra system, a statistical package, or dynamic geometry software." Given that teachers will be gathering websites to document in a binder suggests that the focus will be not be on using technology as a tool for problem solving.
- The continued plan to have teachers develop binders raises great concerns given the wide array of free and open-source web-based tools for promoting collaboration (such as Google Drive, Google Pages, etc.).

The failure to use these continues to promote a reliance on paper and encourage individuals to operate in a vacuum in their classrooms.

Recommendations

- To improve the participants' subject-specific content knowledge, and for the rigor expected for graduate course credit purposes, strongly consider developing and assessing the mathematics content on a post-secondary level.
- For teachers who perform below stated proficiency levels on post-tests, strongly consider a more time- and cost-effective content redelivery/re-teaching method through monitored online means (such as Khan Academy or similar).
- Design a project redelivery plan that specifies how and when project participants will redeliver project content to non-participating teachers (for example, to nearby rural districts).

Stipulations

- Focus the summer institute content on the progressions for a single domain based on the areas of greatest district need as indicated by the latest available assessment results.
- Conduct a pre-institute teacher needs survey prior to participant selection or as part of the process to identify the content and pedagogical knowledge teachers need within the identified domain.
- Assure that teachers with the lowest evaluation ratings are targeted and the process of identifying them is documented.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Mathematics

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Math IDEA Project (Investigate, Develop, Engage, Apply)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carolyn Talton

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 12
(of 15 Points)

iii. Delivery Method 18
(of 20 Points)

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

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

D. Project Evaluation 9
(of 10 Points)

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

Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$160,337</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$160,337</u>

Proposal Number	12LaS-15
IHE	Nicholls State University
Title	Naturally Understanding Mathematics by Exploring and Reasoning 2015-16 (Project NUMBER 2015-16)
PI	DesLey Plaisance
Focus	Mathematics
Requested Funding	\$159,590
Determination	Fund
Recommended Funding	\$189,590
Score (out of 100)	93
Ranking	1 out of 13

Strengths

- The project continues to capitalize on an existing partnership with St. Mary Parish Public Schools that enhances the existing P-20 pipeline.
- The project includes an external evaluator and a clearly delineated evaluation plan that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative data sources for each objective. This plan employs a quasi-experimental design which lends validity to reported program results.
- The project includes a detailed plan and support for dissemination and participant redelivery of content as an integral activity.
- The project provided a detailed grade-level sub-analysis by CCSS math domain of student data for the parish.
- Participants who complete the project components will receive three hours of graduate credit.
- A sample syllabus for the professional development course was included. It delineates the specific subject-matter content and instructional strategies that will be employed.
- The project design includes references to a relevant, contemporary research base for content, delivery methods and instructional strategies.
- The IHE provided in-kind support for tuition waivers for the graduate course.

Recommendations

- Serve 30 teachers. The recommended funding is increased by \$30,000 above the requested amount to support this. If additional teachers are served, the proposed budget will need to be amended and submitted to LaSIP staff.
- Strongly consider focusing math content on fewer CCSS domains (i.e., Operations/Algebraic Thinking, Expressions and Equations, Functions). This will give the facilitators the opportunity to delve deeper into the content and build foundational knowledge and coherence for algebra readiness.
- Consider focusing the literacy component on CCSS Writing Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects and Reading Standards for Literacy in Science and Technical Subjects for grades 6-8 and the related literacy standards for grades 3-5. Specifically, consider WHST Standards 1, 2 and 10.
- Consider having teachers complete an action research project as part of the academic-year activities. This will enrich the informal research base for the project and give participants a self-motivated approach to implementing specific strategies and methodologies with their students. Consider using Richard Sagor's "Guiding School Improvement with Action Research" or similar as a resource.
- Formally gather feedback forms from all non-participants who attend any redelivery sessions and workshops conducted by project participants. Consider identifying ways to consolidate feedback electronically using resources such as Google Docs, Survey Monkey, Wufoo, or others.
- Consider using "Hess' Cognitive Rigor Matrix for Math and Science" to encourage/guide development of questioning strategies that promote higher-order thinking skills during instruction. This may also be useful as a guide during classroom observations.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Mathematics

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Naturally Understanding Mathematics by Exploring and Reasoning
2015-16 (Project NUMBER 2015-16)

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 10
(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 10
(of 10 Points)

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

Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$159,590
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$189,590

Proposal Number	13LaS-15
IHE	Southeastern Louisiana University
Title	Integrated Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics (I-STEM)
PI	Troy Williams
Focus	Science/Mathematics
Requested Funding	\$139,402
Determination	Fund with Stipulations
Recommended Funding	\$151,902
Score (out of 100)	85
Ranking	3 out of 13

Strengths

- The project PIs utilized findings from previous LaSIP PD grants, including summer institute data and teacher surveys, to inform the current project rationale, need and design.
- The project continues to capitalize on an existing partnership with the Tangipahoa Parish School System.
- The plan identifies specific content and instructional strategies the participants will learn during the life of the project.
- The summer institute content will be derived from a post-secondary course offered at the IHE.
- The project offers an integrated approach to teaching mathematics and science.
- Project pedagogical content includes increasing awareness of how to address student misconceptions, a sound approach to facilitating greater student conceptual understanding.
- The project has designed a 12-day summer institute.
- Project data analysis will be conducted by the IHE's Office of Institutional Research.
- The project evaluation plan defines how diagnostic, formative and summative assessment instruments will be used to measure the project's success.
- The project design includes a method of selecting participants from schools demonstrating the greatest need through student-level and teacher-performance data analysis as well as principal input.
- There is a plan for project content redelivery during district cluster meetings, for example, and for reviewed project products dissemination through an online lesson/activity repository.

Concerns

- The research base used to support the project design development was not evident.
- There is no project evaluator named.

Recommendations

- Review and reference a current research base that informs the rationale and method of delivery of project components (i.e., the use of the Turning Point response system for formative assessment, use of student attitudinal surveys, the relevance of analyzing and correcting student misconceptions).

Stipulations

- Contract an external project evaluator not associated with any of the institutions involved and provide a detailed evaluation plan with a timeline for data collection and analysis. The funding recommendation has been increased by \$12,500 over the requested amount to support this.

**RATING FORM FOR 2015-2016 LaSIP PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13-LaS-15

PROJECT FOCUS: Science/Mathematics

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 9
(of 10 Points)

B. Project Design (Total of 50 Points)

i. Measurable Objectives 10
(of 10 Points)

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

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

Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$139,402
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$151,902