

# **FY 2005-06 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

## **I. Introduction**

A four-member Two-year Enhancement Program proposal review committee consisting of Dr. Katherine Boswell (chair), consultant on community college policy issues, Education Policy Associates; Dr. Russell Hamm, consultant on workforce issues, formerly with the U.S. Department of Labor; Dr. Suzanne Beal, professor of English at Frederick (MD) Community College; and Ms. Susan Henderson, Associate Executive Director of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium, met February 12-14, 2006 to evaluate thirty (30) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Program for Two-year Institutions, a component of the Louisiana Board of Regents Support Fund. All four individuals had previously participated as members of one or more of the past three Two-year Enhancement Program review committees.

The committee received the following materials prior to the visit: a) all 30 Two-year Institution Enhancement proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators and institutions involved, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2005-06 Enhancement Program for Two-year Institutions Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) a copy of the previous year's Two-year Institution Enhancement Final Report.

Prior to the meeting each member read the materials, assessed the proposals, and tentatively completed a rating form for each proposal. At its meeting, the committee thoroughly discussed each proposal, ranked them according to priority, and transformed the individual tentative ratings into composite ratings. Committee members made a conscious effort to provide thoughtful feedback and suggestions for how each proposal might be improved for future consideration. They then completed comprehensive ratings and drafted this final evaluation report.

A total of \$1,956,062 was requested by the 30 proposals that were submitted. After careful review, the committee recommended full or partial funding for 17 proposals, for awards totaling \$884,835. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Because of the limited funds available in the current funding year, and partially as a result of the devastation and subsequent fiscal crisis caused by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the committee did not identify a secondary list of proposals that could be funded if additional funds became available. Table II lists proposals not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal immediately follows the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating form used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

All proposals recommended for full funding must maintain the levels of institutional matching funds pledged. If reduced funding was recommended, the committee noted if the pledged match must be maintained or can be proportionally reduced.

The committee assures the Board of Regents and community and technical college campuses that each proposal was reviewed and discussed in great detail. Each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated. Proposal budgets were carefully reviewed and any items viewed as unjustified, unnecessary, or inflated were reduced as appropriate.

## II. Commendations and Recommendations of the Enhancement Program for Two-year Institutions Review Committee to the Louisiana Board of Regents

The review committee for Two-year Enhancement proposals once again commends the Louisiana Board of Regents for its continuing commitment to investing in the improvement of higher education at a time of significant fiscal constraints. We continue to hold up this Louisiana model of program enhancement to other states as an outstanding example of good public policy that encourages improved educational outcomes and student achievement. Given our collective decades of experience with community and technical colleges on the national, state, and local scenes, we are particularly pleased with the support this most recent Enhancement Program is providing to the new and emerging Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS), particularly in light of the significant fiscal needs linked to the devastation caused by the hurricanes.

## III. General Recommendation for Improvements to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions

The committee was heartened by the overall improvement in the quality of proposals submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-year Institutions. The members worked closely with Board of Regents' staff this past year to significantly revise the Request for Proposals for this program, adding many examples of how certain pertinent information could be phrased, and it was clear that these revisions have made a discernable difference. The committee was pleased to note that there has been significant improvement in the quality of the proposals submitted under the new guidelines. Many proposals included concrete student demographic data for the first time and incorporated a much stronger emphasis on student outcomes than ever before. While the overall quality is improving, we continue to be frustrated by the inadequacies found in many submissions. Too many of them continue to lack information on student learning outcomes and present inadequate data to support their requests, or do a poor job in establishing how the investments will actually enrich the curriculum or contribute to improved economic development—the two core purposes of the Enhancement Program. Given the overwhelming needs of these emerging institutions, the committee in the previous three years has been somewhat generous in looking beyond the inadequate documentation and poor writing to provide what we perceived as critical support. Each year we have provided detailed feedback to submitting institutions with suggestions regarding how the proposals could be strengthened and encouraging resubmission in the future. However, given the detailed feedback on rating forms and more stringent guidelines complete with examples of model language, we are no longer inclined to give “the benefit of the doubt” to seemingly worthy projects presented in weak proposals.

The review committee for the Two-year Institution Enhancement Program would like to make the following important recommendation to the Board:

Given that the review committee recommended nearly \$300,000 less than we had been allocated for this cycle, we would strongly urge that \$20,000 of these funds be set aside to conduct a series of grantsmanship workshops across the State for participating two-year colleges. We feel so strongly about its importance that two members of the review committee who have significant grant-writing experience at the State and Federal levels have offered to come to Louisiana to conduct the training. This is of particular importance at the current time, given the recent announcement of tens of millions of dollars that the Federal government and national foundations, such as the Ford Foundation, will be making available to community and technical colleges across Louisiana in response to post-hurricane devastation. Louisiana's two-year institutions need to improve their grant-writing skills if they are going to be able to secure badly needed external resources.

**The committee is unanimous in its desire to put the colleges on notice that we will no longer be as tolerant of poorly written and conceived proposals simply because the need is so great.** Academic institutions receiving public funds have an inherent responsibility to be accountable for use of those dollars. If a proposal cannot articulate even the most basic information about what differences the investment will make in terms of student learning or how the project can be evaluated in measurable terms, then we have no confidence that the proposed product will be any better conceptualized or successful.

In conclusion, we would like to again commend the Board of Regents and the Sponsored Programs Division for their commitment to improving Louisiana's two-year community and technical colleges and for giving us the opportunity to participate in this very important Enhancement Program review process. The proposal writers are also to be commended for their efforts to align with the new (FY 2005-06) guidelines. We consider it an honor and privilege to work with you and hope that these observations will be helpful in your deliberative processes.

**TABLE I**  
**PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
1	96	018PEN-06	DELTA	\$70,564	\$70,564
2	95	002PEN-06	BRCC	\$15,372	\$15,372
2	95	005PEN-06	BPCC	\$50,327	\$50,327
4	94	017PEN-06	DELTA	\$150,000	\$150,000
5	93	016PEN-06	FLETCHER	\$92,331	\$66,331
6	92	004PEN-06	BPCC	\$65,724	\$65,724
6	92	006PEN-06	BPCC	\$79,000	\$71,000
8	87	001PEN-06	BRCC	\$72,960	\$72,960
9	86	013PEN-06	BPCC	\$31,906	\$31,906
9	86	014PEN-06	DELGADO	\$19,500	\$19,500
9	86	027PEN-06	SUSLA	\$51,552	\$51,552
12	85	009PEN-06	BPCC	\$34,435	\$34,435
13	84	030PEN-06	SUSLA	\$38,164	\$38,164
14	83	007PEN-06	BPCC	\$70,036	\$47,000
15	82	003PEN-06	BPCC	\$46,855	\$40,000
15	82	019PEN-06	DELTA, LTC	\$97,513	\$50,000
17	80	010PEN-06	BPCC	\$10,000	\$10,000
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$996,239</b>	<b>\$884,835</b>

**TABLE II**  
**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
18	69	025PEN-06	SLCC, BRCC, ULL	\$162,126	\$0
19	68	024PEN-06	SLCC, ULL	\$161,431	\$0
20	67	012PEN-06	BPCC	\$26,314	\$0
21	63	029PEN-06	SUSLA	\$86,160	\$0
22	62	008PEN-06	BPCC	\$53,155	\$0
23	58	028PEN-06	SUSLA	\$52,450	\$0
24	57	015PEN-06	DELGADO, SLU	\$113,480	\$0
24	57	020PEN-06	LSU-EUNICE	\$44,066	\$0
26	55	022PEN-06	RPCC	\$75,000	\$0
27	54	011PEN-06	BPCC	\$114,872	\$0
28	51	026PEN-06	SUSLA	\$22,269	\$0
29	46	021PEN-06	RPCC	\$37,000	\$0
30	42	023PEN-06	RPCC	\$11,500	\$0
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$959,823</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 001PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Baton Rouge Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Baton Rouge Community College Teacher Preparation Program

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 22 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 9 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$72,960</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$72,960</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This is a strong, well-written proposal addressing an area of critical need for Louisiana. The Baton Rouge Community College is to be commended for its efforts to establish a seamless transfer program with SLU, SUBR, and LSU for its elementary education students while simultaneously collaborating with the LCTCS in its efforts to develop a statewide Associate of Arts in Teaching degree. The proposal did a particularly good job of following the new guidelines in the RFP and describing a well-conceived work plan. The panel recommends full funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 002PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Baton Rouge Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Blueprint for Success: Using Learning Communities in Content and College Reading Courses

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$15,372</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$15,372</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This well-written, modest proposal provides solid arguments for funding. The pairing of developmental reading with a curriculum offering in learning communities appears to have significant merit and potential to improve student performance, retention, and success. It is noted that BRCC is making considerable in-kind contributions to this project. In terms of project dissemination, the results of the project should be presented at the statewide fall convocation of the Louisiana Community College and Technical System so that duplication is a viable option. The committee strongly recommends full funding for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Workforce and Academic Testing and Training Center

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 4 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$46,855</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$40,000</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

Based on evidence from the proposal, the ACT Center provides an important workforce service to the community and the College presented in online training and testing for a variety of technology certifications. This proposal seeks to expand the quality and quantity of the testing services to include academic tests as well. Additionally, the Center plans to pilot an IC3 certification class. The committee commends the author of the proposal for identifying student learning outcomes as part of the evaluation. While the committee lauds the success of the Center and supports the goals of the project, several aspects of the proposal were either unclear or inappropriate for this funding source. The need for the specific academic tests identified is not clear (i.e., what is the relationship between the College's skill placement process and COMPASS and Accuplacer)? Further, while the need for CLEP testing is clear, would the ACT Center be the only place where this test is available locally? Finally, the case for support for an IC3 instructor is not adequately made. The reviewers recommend that the College provide this support. The committee recommends partial funding of \$40,000 for computer stations, software, and associated costs, but not for the instructor's fee and fringe benefits.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: BPCC Honors Program: Challenging Tomorrow's Leaders

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$65,724</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$65,724</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

A compelling argument is made to establish the BPCC's Honors program. Excellent demographic information and details are provided in the Needs of the Project, Impact on Strategic Goals, as well as in the Plan. The concept of this project is strong, supported by a well-written proposal. The need was well explained, reasoned, and documented. A noted strength of the plan is to extend and develop existing courses in the curriculum with the addition of selected external experiences and activities. The added experiences and site visits tend to support student recruitment and retention. The pledge of matching funds, though minimal, adds a dimension of support and validation from off-campus. The budget and narrative are clear and effective in supporting the case for the concept and the expenditures. All in all, this proposal was very well done and is recommended for full funding. However, a discrepancy between the amount of equipment and supplies requested exists. Page 11 shows a total amount of equipment, software, and supplies as \$63,824 and the budget on page 28 lists a more modest total of \$59,994 for those items, a difference of \$3,830. This discrepancy will need to be corrected during contract negotiations.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 005PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Bossier Parish Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** A Grand Addition to the Music Program

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 25 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$50,327</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$50,327</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This is a nicely written proposal with a well-conceived justification for Enhancement Program support. The project's potential impact on the curriculum is particularly well articulated. A top-of-the-line Yamaha grand piano is a significant investment, but after much extended discussion, reviewers determined that the applicant and the College had made their case justifying the investment, and the committee recommends full funding for the proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 006PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Bossier Parish Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Partnerships to Impact Communities in North Louisiana

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$79,000</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$71,000</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This proposal provides targeted and appropriate information regarding the demographics and need for Project Super Moms in North Louisiana. Goals, objectives, and benefits for the project plan are succinctly expressed. On-site and off-site support for the adult service leaders and teams should have been more fully described. BPCC should be commended for adopting the community impact model and expanding the role of the institution in an area of great need. The utilization of an external evaluator will provide objectivity to project results. The memoranda of understanding among the twelve institutions demonstrate the scope of and commitment to this project. The amount of \$8,000 must be disallowed since the Enhancement Program's guidelines do not permit payment of more than 100% of a full-time administrator's salary. The institutional match for that portion of the line item may be dropped, or the College may elect to fund the entire amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Providing Educational Resources for Rural Northwest Louisiana

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 4 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 9 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 83 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$70,036</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$47,000</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The committee applauds project MOMS and believes it is worthy of support. The proposal does an excellent job of documenting the enhanced educational achievement of project participants. However, the evaluation section should have identified more specific learning outcomes, both in terms of numbers of students and levels of educational attainment. While the Enhancement Program does not support ongoing operating expenses, the addition of new computers significantly enhances the programs that the Center can offer. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the College will assume responsibility for the instructor's salary after the grant period. Therefore, we cannot recommend funding that position. The committee does recommend partial funding of \$47,000 for equipment, software, supplies, and expenses associated with installing the laboratory.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Crafting a Movie

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 2 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 12 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 62 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$53,155</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The case of need for this project was not persuasive. Essentially, requested funds would be expended to establish a mobile kitchen to prepare food for movie crews. The need assumes that (1) many movies will be filmed in Louisiana, (2) producers will select this kitchen to prepare food, and (3) the "craft" will be competitive with others. All assumptions appear too risky for this level of investment. The committee acknowledges the strength of this program and of the faculty and leadership, but the proposed project does not appear to contribute to the essence of the overall program. No funding is recommended, but the committee provides some specific suggestions for the proposal's improvement and examples on the next page.

The term "craft services" is defined and the rationale for the program and its impact is explained. The stated goal--"To purchase culinary arts supplies and a craft services mobile lab"--should be more global and the applicant should list measurable objectives for it. The goal's three objectives all begin with the verbal phrase "To enable." It is impossible to measure an objective that begins with *enable*. A more appropriate goal would be "By 200?, 'craft services instruction' will be taught using appropriate culinary arts supplies and a craft services mobile lab as integral parts of the Telecommunications Film Division and Culinary Arts Department." Next the applicant should provide clear, measurable objectives that provide numeric data, such as: How many faculty/students will be trained? What is the impact of including craft services as part of the curriculum? How many students obtain employment or internships? How many relationships will be/are established with the many professional companies that film in Louisiana? How are faculty trained to meet the diverse needs of an eclectic and demanding clientele? The lack of a clear goal with supporting objectives reduced the 25-point score on the Plan of Proposed Project section of this proposal.

The committee is also concerned about the lack of detail regarding how the Culinary Arts Department will be involved in this project. There are no Culinary Arts Department faculty listed on the proposal. Instead, reviewers found only an extensive list of supplies. How will these supplies be provided after the grant money is expended? It is also confusing that, in the budget, salary and fringe benefits are listed for a chef and assistant that were not mentioned anywhere else in the narrative. And, yet, training is intended for the two faculty/staff members. These are the types of discrepancies that need to be addressed before the committee could support this request.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Definition Upgrade for the Avid Non-Linear Editing (NLE) System

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 9 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 9 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 9 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 85 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$34,435</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$34,435</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This proposal does a good job of establishing the positive impact that an investment in this digital editing system will have on the quality and relevance of instruction in the Telecommunications Division at Bossier Parish Community College. The proposal would have been stronger if it had more clearly written objectives that were tied to measurable student outcomes. Nonetheless, the committee recommends full funding for this project because the applicant convinced us of the importance of and need for the upgrade.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 010PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Bossier Parish Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Science and Allied Health/Computer Information Systems Materials for the Library

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 6 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 7 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 80 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$10,000

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$10,000

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The demographic data provided snapshots of both faculty and students, and the profiles of the library and affected departments were well done. The narrative discussed how the proposed project will positively affect the institution and departments, but does not list or relate the impact of the project on specific measurable objectives. The project plan appears comprehensive and should result in an improved library for the two targeted fields of Science and Allied Health and Business and Computer Science. It appears that Objective 1— "Select 200 science and computer information systems items"— is too precise and restrictive. A tighter focus is needed regarding how this award would assist in attracting or retaining high-quality students. The project evaluation should provide additional information and details. It would be helpful to invite the faculty of the two targeted disciplines to discuss, in a forum or electronically, the books that have been previously used and how the new resources will be used. The committee recommends full funding for this modest proposal, contingent upon written assurance that the project team will heed these recommendations.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Theatrical Lighting Equipment

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 2 (of 5 points)  
A.b 2 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 10 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 0 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 7 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$114,872</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The committee commends Bossier's Theater Department for its continued excellence and success in high-quality productions. However, this proposal does not make the case that this level of sophisticated lighting is truly needed in the context of a college theater program. Additionally, the evaluation section of the proposal is weak. While student satisfaction is an important indicator, it is not equivalent to learning outcomes. The committee does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Theatrical Sound Equipment

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 3 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 18 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 67 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$26,314</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The demographic data provide detail regarding the institution as a whole; however, the need for the investment in theatrical sound equipment was not persuasive to the committee. Thirty theatre majors is less than 1% of the student population. Wage data were useful, but no information was provided demonstrating the numbers of jobs/openings that are available or going unfilled. The applicant did not adequately describe project needs or relate them to the goals or measurable objectives as required in the RFP, and the project plan was very general. The committee acknowledges the strength of the overall program and the faculty. The faculty and staff expertise listed, however, does not directly relate the skills of the faculty to the technology and pedagogy required to teach students the use of the sophisticated sound equipment requested in this proposal. While it appears that the equipment would be useful to the overall theater program, it is not critical to the program's growth or expansion. The budget section was clear and well explained. The proposal would have been stronger with some level of matching funds from local businesses or theaters to demonstrate their support of the project. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 013PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Bossier Parish Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Northwest Louisiana Work Skills Enhancement Project

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 19 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 9 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 9 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 9 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 9 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 86 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$31,906</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$31,906</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The proposed work skills project, potentially important for workplace literacy, demonstrates outstanding collaboration with local business and industry. The committee is genuinely excited about the project and commends the College for its outreach efforts in partnering with local businesses to enhance the basic skills of employees. The proposal has ambitious but measurable student outcomes. We would have liked to have seen more detail in the work plan about how the education would be delivered. Will all courses be taught online? Who will do the instruction? Despite these questions, we are confident the project can make an important contribution in addressing regional skills deficits. Therefore, the panel recommends full funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Rapid Response Approach to Healthcare Workforce Development

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 18 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 8 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 86 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$19,500

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$19,500

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The proposed project's demographic data are targeted, relevant, and represent up-to-date information pre- and post-Katrina with recommendations from NCHEMS. The project plan appears achievable, but lacks details related to describing the template and how it will be made available to students. Also, there is little information describing "work keys" in the project plan. The stated alignment with the RFP's Guiding Principles should be moved to the project plan section as required by the new guidelines. The section on Faculty and Staff Expertise would have benefited from additional detailed information about the expertise of the individuals listed as it related to the proposal. The dissemination plan will be helpful to all two-year campuses in the State. Much thought and planning are evidenced in the writing of this proposal, yet additional focus on the programmatic guidelines would have benefited the application. The committee recommends full funding for this proposal despite these minor criticisms.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 015PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Delgado Community College; Southeastern Louisiana University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Using Collaboration, Conference and Continued Support to Impact  
Excellence in Teaching with Technology on the Northshore

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 5 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 3 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 57 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$113,480

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$0

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The committee would like to commend Delgado for its leadership in developing cross-campus collaboration. The Northshore Excellence in Teaching with Technology (NETT) conference is clearly an important faculty development initiative in terms both of the need for technology training and the significance of the collaboration. While we would like to support this proposal, the committee found that construction of the website and digital communications were the only specifically identifiable items in the request. The equipment, software, supplies, and personnel were not specified; all are to be determined later. There was insufficient information in this proposal to make a reasonable judgment, and no funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 016PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Fletcher Technical Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Development and Implementation of a Geographic Information Systems  
(GIS) Course and GIS Learning Laboratory

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 4 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 4 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 93 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$92,331

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$66,331

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

L. E. Fletcher Technical Community College is to be commended for this outstanding proposal. The writer responded well to all the requirements of the guidelines for the program. Reviewers consider it a model that should be shared with other two-year campuses. The GIS real-life learning experiences component of the project is its strength; the GIS field is growing in the United States and enjoys a very strong emerging job market. Other strengths of this proposal include evidence of need, evidence of collaboration, and the project plan. Additionally, the committee acknowledges the strengths of the faculty and the academic leadership. The budget is clear and well explained.

The funding level of \$66,331 is recommended. The committee recommends that computers be procured for \$2,500 rather than \$4,500, knowing that models are currently available at this price that meet the needs of the program. The \$1,000 institutional match for supplies should be maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development and Implementation of Process Technology Training in the Louisiana Delta Region

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 25 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 9 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 9 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 94 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$150,000

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$150,000

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This proposal does a superb job of making a strong case for the development and implementation of process technology training at Louisiana Delta Community College. The needs statement is compelling. The significant in-kind, private-sector match demonstrates the great value that local industry places on this project. The work plan is comprehensive and includes well-thought-out goals, objectives, and activities. The committee's only criticism is that, as an ongoing project, it is somewhat difficult to discern from the narrative section precisely what the Enhancement Program's contribution will add to the project. The budget narrative helped clear up the confusion, but the proposal would have been even stronger if this component of the proposal had been clearer. The committee recommends this proposal for full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creating a Chemistry Laboratory and Prep/Storage Facility for Delta

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

### Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

### Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

### Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

### Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (of 7 points)

### Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

### Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

### Impact on Community and Economic/

### Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

### Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

### Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

### Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

### Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 

96
----

 (of 100 points)

(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,564

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,564

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This is a well-written proposal establishing significant need for a chemistry lab and prep room for LDCC based on student, institutional, and economic development needs. A timeline provides an overview of the project and the budget details information on the equipment that is needed for the facility. An appropriate narrative supports the need for and benefits of a chemistry lab. The in-kind funding from business and industry is significant. Project evaluation could easily be expanded to evaluate student learning gains utilizing the chemistry lab and any increase in enrollment. The panel recommends full funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 019PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Delta Community College; Louisiana Technical College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Development and Implementation of the "Center for Learning and Academic Support Services" - CLASS

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 6 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$97,513

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$50,000

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

In order to support the community college mission to promote student success, providing adequate academic support services is critical. As a relatively new community college, Delta is just beginning to build the support necessary to help students acquire and enhance college-level skills. The committee is pleased to support this request for equipment, software, and supplies at a reduced level. While faculty and staff development are critical, the proposal does not adequately justify the amount of the request; thus, we recommend disallowal of the \$24,900 requested for personnel training. While the proposal does an excellent job of describing the student population and documenting the need for academic support, greater emphasis on student outcomes in the evaluation section would have substantially enhanced it. The committee recommends partial funding of \$50,000 for this proposal. The institutional match of \$530 for personnel training may be dropped, and the remainder of the match pledged may be reduced proportionally with other reductions in the Support Fund budget.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Eunice

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Integrated Science Enhancement Program for Secondary School Teachers

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 2 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 10 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 0 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 57 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$44,066

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$0

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The proposal's concept was of genuine interest to the committee, but was judged not to meet the criteria or intent of the Enhancement Program. Data describing the readiness and competencies of current high school science faculty were not persuasive; the committee was left wondering if the high school teachers really needed the training. Also, would the targeted teacher population participate fully in the project? The plan did not include a description of how high school faculty would be recruited and engaged in professional development. Additional information on the survey of superintendents regarding their interest in improving science education, teacher in-service, and teacher input into the plan would have been helpful. Letters of support and partnership from the targeted school districts would also have strengthened the proposal. The budget lacked detail to adequately describe the equipment and materials to be used and how they would be used. For these reasons, no funding is recommended for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021PEN-06

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enriching the Laboratory Courses in Science

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 3 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 10 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 4 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 4 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 8 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 2 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$37,000</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

While the committee does not doubt the significant value of enrichment materials in science laboratory courses, there was not enough information presented in this proposal to be able to make a recommendation for funding. There were no details on what materials would be ordered, how they would be used, or what they would cost. Broad statements regarding the potential impact of such enhancements are fine, but there were no data or discussion of potential student outcomes to substantiate any assertions. We urge all proposal writers to read carefully and follow the new guidelines in the Enhancement Program RFP if they want to be successful in this competitive program. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022PEN-06

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing a Mathematics Laboratory and Improving the  
Mathematics Courses

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 4 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 10 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 4 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 6 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 1 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 3 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 55 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$75,000

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$0

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

“Currently, the institution is not in a position to be able to fully utilize the technology available.” This statement and others in the proposal leave many questions unanswered. What software is selected and why was it selected? Why is wireless technology the priority? Sufficient detail is missing from the plan of proposed project and other sections to make a decision as to the merits of the proposal. The committee suggests that the applicant carefully review the grant application criteria and follow the guidelines carefully. The committee does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023PEN-06

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Providing Resources to Invoke Critical Thinking Among the Students

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 2 (of 5 points)  
A.b 2 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 5 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 42 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$11,500</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

It is evident that RPCC is in serious need of library materials. It is impossible to have a high-quality institution without providing sufficient library resources. However, the responsibility for this lies with the College administration as an ongoing operating expense. This proposal does not adequately convince the reviewers that the request is an enhancement to the program rather than a routine operating budget category. In addition, the proposal does not address how the addition of library resources will result in the development of critical thinking skills. Circulation statistics are an unconvincing way of evaluating student outcomes. Thus, the committee cannot support the proposal in its present form and funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 024PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** South Louisiana Community College; University of Louisiana at Lafayette

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Faculty Development and Curriculum Enhancement for Two Year Institutions by Incorporating Lean Manufacturing and Digital Manufacturing

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 1 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 6 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 2 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 6 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 68 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$161,431

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$0

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The concept of this proposal was of genuine interest to the committee. Additionally, the focus on training in "lean" manufacturing and related content is certainly supportable. However, the proposal lacked significant details and, further, a persuasive case for need. The needs section largely described the intent of the project and overlooked the needs of regional businesses and the desire to raise the skill levels of new and current employees. Leadership for this project was ambiguous, and the committee was unsure of the critical involvement of the two-year colleges. The committee recommends that the project be resubmitted, with the roles and expectations of all partners fully described and the budget adjusted to request no more than the maximum funding per project (\$150,000). The leadership and roles of the community colleges should have been the proposal's primary foci. The committee noted that some matching funds and contributions from industry were discussed in the narrative, but we were unable to find these in the formal budget. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 025PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** South Louisiana Community College; Baton Rouge Community College;  
University of Louisiana at Lafayette

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Faculty Development and Curriculum Enhancement for Two-Year  
Institutions by Incorporating Product Realization and Virtual Reality  
Concepts

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 4 (of 5 points)

A.b 4 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 19 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 6 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 8 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 3 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 69 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$162,126</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$0</u></u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The committee commends this consortium of community colleges and one university on its efforts to provide faculty development and curricular enhancement for Louisiana's two-year institutions. Recognizing the value of creating opportunities for faculty and students to be exposed to the latest developments in fast-changing technical fields, we are encouraged to see the collaboration between the two- and four-year institutions. Unfortunately, this proposal was not fully developed to the point that it could be recommended for funding. The budget request exceeded the Enhancement Program guidelines, and the budget section was poorly written and lacked adequate justification, particularly for participant support costs. There were contradictions between the text, which suggested private matching funds had been offered, and the budget, in which no match was identified. It was also unclear from the narrative how this training would ultimately translate into improved curricula at the colleges, or what distinctions, if any, would be made between student and faculty workshop participation. The committee encourages the consortium to work in partnership this year to conduct a good needs assessment, devise a strong work plan and well-documented budget, and resubmit this proposal in next year's Enhancement competition. The committee does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026PEN-06

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Black Ethnic Archives

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 12 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 4 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 1 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 2 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 51 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$22,269</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The demographic data were well presented. While the committee believes that there is value to the community in archiving *The Shreveport Sun* newspaper, the committee concurred that the proposal provided minimal narrative and detail and did not follow the RFP's guidelines. It does not warrant funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 027PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Portable Wireless Access--Libraries Keeping Up With Technological Instruction

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 25 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 7 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 86 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$51,552

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$51,552

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The committee commends Southern University-Shreveport on the submission of this excellent proposal for a worthy project. The goals are clearly stated, the need is well articulated, and the evaluation is tied to student outcomes. There is no question of the importance of bibliographic instruction. Information literacy is increasingly critical to students' intellectual development. The amount of information available through electronic databases and the Internet can be an overwhelming challenge, and it is incumbent on colleges to provide navigational strategies. A portable laptop lab with wireless access is one flexible solution. While the case for staff development is made less effectively, we agree that conference attendance would help key personnel remain current. Although the proposal itself did not strictly adhere to all of the new formatting guidelines, the committee recommends full funding (\$51,552) because of the importance we place on information literacy. All applicants are urged to carefully follow RFPs for formatting and content in future submissions.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 028PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** "Capturing Cooper Town Historical Museum Project"

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 1 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 3 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 58 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$52,450</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The proposal's concept is of genuine interest to the committee, but the content did not follow the guidelines or intent of the Two-year Enhancement Program. The committee suggests that the project be resubmitted next year with foci on student involvement and student learning in history classes. To that end, the project's needs statement and the plan should emphasize the specific needs of students and how working on this valuable project will present them with valuable experiences. No funding is recommended for this project. However, the committee recognizes the strengths and experiences of the faculty.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 029PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Computer Assisted Music Enhancing the Quality of Learning Music  
Notation, Theory, and Software Applications

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 3 (of 5 points)

A.b 3 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 8 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 7 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

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

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$86,160

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$0

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

This proposal was at a serious disadvantage from the outset because, for whatever reasons, the applicant did not follow the Enhancement Program's new proposal guidelines as delineated in the FY 2005-06 RFP. The committee does not doubt the value of an electronic keyboard lab to enrich the music education program; however, there was not enough information in this proposal to be able to make a positive funding recommendation. There were no measurable objectives and little detail on student outcomes. Broad statements arguing the potential impact of such enhancements are fine, but there were no data to substantiate the assertions. Again, all proposal writers should read carefully and follow the guidelines in the Enhancement Program's RFP if they want to be successful in this competitive program. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 030PEN-06

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Acquiring Software Programs to Build a Multi-Use Computer Assisted Learning Lab

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)  
A.b 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 22 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/  
Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k \_\_\_\_\_ (of 0 points)

**G. Total Score:** 84 (of 100 points)

**(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)**

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$38,164

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$38,164

COMMENTS: (Discuss proposal strengths and weaknesses, particularly in those sections where significant point deductions have been made. Include suggestions for resubmission. For proposals recommended for funding, include all applicable stipulations in budgets and scopes of work.)

The committee supports the need for a writing center at Southern University-Shreveport. Demographic data was contained in the descriptive and informative narrative about the University and student body that support the significant need for remediation. The proposal relates the need for the learning lab to the Dateline 2010: LCTCS Strategic Plan. Project evaluation is an area that could have been developed further. How does the learning lab impact student performance? How many students use these software programs? Of those students that utilize the software, is there an improvement in their writing and foreign language skills and grades? The committee recommends full funding, with the stipulation that during contract negotiations in the spring SUSLA must certify in writing that the lab liaison position will be funded for at least one year beyond the term of this grant, as required by Board of Regents' policy.

# Appendix A

## Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the  
Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions  
for the FY 2005-2006 Review Cycle**

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>001PEN-06</b>	Baton Rouge Community College Teacher Preparation Program	Baton Rouge Community College (Liberal Arts);	Idell Wade Adams; Aimee Boyd; Daniel Simon; JoDale Ales; Kanetra Jones; Marcella Hackney; Paige Davis; Sue Avery;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 72,960</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 72,960</b>

Proposal is a **Continuation Request**

Previous Contract: LEQSF (2004-2005)-ENH-PEN-04

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships

<b>002PEN-06</b>	Blueprint for Success: Using Learning Communities in Content and College Reading Courses	Baton Rouge Community College (Liberal Arts);	Idell Wade Adams;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 15,372</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,372</b>

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>003PEN-06</b>	Enhancement of Workforce and Academic Testing and Training Center	Bossier Parish Community College (Workforce and Economic Development);	Lynn Brown;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 46,855</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 46,855</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development					
<b>004PEN-06</b>	BPCC Honors Program: Challenging Tomorrow's Leaders	Bossier Parish Community College (Liberal Arts);	Holly French; Barbara Poole;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 65,724</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 65,724</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					
<b>005PEN-06</b>	A Grand Addition to the Music Program	Bossier Parish Community College (Music);	Michael Hart;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 50,327</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 50,327</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Partnerships					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>006PEN-06</b>	Partnerships to Impact Communities in North Louisiana	Bossier Parish Community College (Grants and External Funding);	Ellen Hinton;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 79,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 79,000</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Partnerships					
<b>007PEN-06</b>	Providing Educational Resources for Rural Northwest Louisiana	Bossier Parish Community College (Workforce Development);	Della Jeter;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 70,036</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 70,036</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Partnerships					
<b>008PEN-06</b>	Crafting a Movie	Bossier Parish Community College (Telecommunications);	Larry Powell; Clif Cardin;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 53,155</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 53,155</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>009PEN-06</b>	High Definition Upgrade for the Avid Non-Linear Editing (NLE) System	Bossier Parish Community College (Telecommunications);	Larry Powell; Bill Bruce;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 34,435</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 34,435</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development					
<b>010PEN-06</b>	Science and Allied Health/Computer Information Systems Materials for the Library	Bossier Parish Community College (Library);	Teresa Rice; Paul Weaver;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 10,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 10,000</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education					
<b>011PEN-06</b>	Theatrical Lighting Equipment	Bossier Parish Community College (Theatre);	Stephen Slaughter; David White; Keith Bruce; Ray Scott Crawford;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 114,872</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 114,872</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>012PEN-06</b>	Theatrical Sound Equipment	Bossier Parish Community College (Theatre);	Stephen Slaughter; David White; Keith Bruce; Ray Scott Crawford;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 26,314</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 26,314</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					
<b>013PEN-06</b>	Northwest Louisiana Work Skills Enhancement Project	Bossier Parish Community College (Workplace Literacy);	Shelli Ulrich;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 31,906</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 31,906</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships					
<b>014PEN-06</b>	Rapid Response Approach to Healthcare Workforce Development	Delgado Community College (Community and Workforce Development);	Ashley Chitwood;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 19,500</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 19,500</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Partnerships					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>015PEN-06</b>	Using Collaboration, Conference and Continued Support to Impact Excellence in Teaching with Technology on the Northshore	Delgado Community College (Northshore Campus); Southeastern Louisiana University;	Deborah Morgan;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 113,480</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 113,480</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Professional Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships					
<b>016PEN-06</b>	Development and Implementation of a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Course and GIS Learning Laboratory	Fletcher Technical Community College (Drafting and Design Technology);	Gina Fanguy;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 92,331</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 92,331</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Partnerships					
<b>017PEN-06</b>	Development and Implementation of Process Technology Training in the Louisiana Delta Region	Louisiana Delta Community College (Industrial and Continuing Education);	Janette Bowman; Anthony Favre;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>018PEN-06</b>	Creating a Chemistry Laboratory and Prep/Storage Facility for Delta	Louisiana Delta Community College (Math and Science);	Tiffany M. Green; Barbara Jones; Buddy Barnett;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 70,564</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 70,564</b>

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships

<b>019PEN-06</b>	Development and Implementation of the "Center for Learning and Academic Support Services" - CLASS	Louisiana Delta Community College (Library and Learning Resource Center); Louisiana Technical College;	Cyndy Robertson; Barbara Jones;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 97,513</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 97,513</b>

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships

<b>020PEN-06</b>	An Integrated Science Enhancement Program for Secondary School Teachers	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Sciences);	Jameel AL-Dujaili;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 44,066</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 44,066</b>

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Partnerships

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>021PEN-06</b>	Enriching the Laboratory Courses in Science	River Parishes Community College (Mathematics and Natural Sciences);	Henry Mark Smith; Iris Henry; Thomas Henson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 37,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 37,000</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					
<b>022PEN-06</b>	Establishing a Mathematics Laboratory and Improving the Mathematics Courses	River Parishes Community College (Mathematics and Natural Sciences);	Henry Mark Smith; Thomas Henson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 75,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 75,000</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Technology and Distance Education					
<b>023PEN-06</b>	Providing Resources to Invoke Critical Thinking Among the Students	River Parishes Community College (Mathematics and Natural Sciences);	Henry Mark Smith; F. Lee Kleinpeter; Jennifer Dorhauer; Sandra Guzman; Wendy Johnson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 11,500</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 11,500</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>024PEN-06</b>	Faculty Development and Curriculum Enhancement for Two Year Institutions by Incorporating Lean Manufacturing and Digital Manufacturing	South Louisiana Community College (Applied Sciences, Business and Technology); University of Louisiana at Lafayette;	Michael A. Laman;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 161,431*</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 161,431</b>
<p>Proposal is a <b>New Request</b></p> <p>Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships</p>					
<b>025PEN-06</b>	Faculty Development and Curriculum Enhancement for Two Year Institutions by Incorporating Product Realization and Virtual Reality Concepts	South Louisiana Community College (Applied Sciences, Business and Technology); Baton Rouge Community College; University of Louisiana at Lafayette;	Michael A. Laman;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 162,126*</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 162,126</b>
<p>Proposal is a <b>New Request</b></p> <p>Guiding Principle(s) : Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Partnerships</p>					
<b>026PEN-06</b>	Black Ethnic Archives	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Library);	Jane Redden O'Riley; Orella R. Brazile;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 22,269</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 22,269</b>
<p>Proposal is a <b>New Request</b></p> <p>Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success</p>					

**\*Note: The RFP restricts requests for funding to \$150,000**

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>027PEN-06</b>	Portable Wireless Access-- Libraries Keeping Up With Technological Instruction	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Library);	Rose M. Powell; Orella R. Brazile;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 51,552</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 51,552</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					
<b>028PEN-06</b>	"Capturing Cooper Town Historical Museum Project"	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Library);	Raegan Stearns; Orella R. Brazile;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 52,450</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 52,450</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					
<b>029PEN-06</b>	Computer Assisted Music Enhancing the Quality of Learning Music Notation, Theory, and Software Applications	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Science and Liberal Arts);	Dorsey Summerfield, Jr.;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 86,160</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 86,160</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>030PEN-06</b>	Acquiring Software Programs to Build a Multi-Use Computer Assisted Learning Lab	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (English);	Wanda M. Waller; Joyce Cottonham; June Phillips; Lynn Byrd;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 38,164</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 38,164</b>

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Technology and Distance Education

<b>Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions for the FY 2005-2006 Review Cycle</b>		
<b>Total Number of Proposals Submitted</b>	<b>Total Funds Requested</b>	<b>Total First-Year Funds Available</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>\$ 1,956,062</b>	<b>\$1,187,919</b>

## **APPENDIX B**

# **TWO YEAR ENHANCEMENT RATING FORM**

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**

**ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

FISCAL YEAR 2005-06

**RATING FORM FOR TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS, FY 2005-06**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more evident that the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Director: \_\_\_\_\_

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION-Total of 10 points**

- a.          Demographic Data (5 points)  
         of 5 points     Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit/division that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of strategic goals, mission, community, faculty, students, measurable objectives, and relevant institutional or departmental resources? Has the applicant supplied an adequate amount of demographic data?
  
- b.          Needs of the Project and Impact on Strategic Goals (5 points)  
         of 5 points     Has the applicant adequately described project needs and related them to the goals and measurable objectives? To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or institution(s)?

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN-- Total of 90 points**

Plan of Proposed Project (25 points)

- of 25 points     a. Are the objectives clearly stated and measurable, and can they be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal? Is the proposal aligned with the Guiding Principles and focused on the development/improvement of the two-year institution? Are the activities designed to achieve the goals and objectives? To what extent will the project assist the division or institution strengthen the capacities of Louisiana’s two-year institutions in order to improve their academic, workforce development, missions, programs; and enhance the infrastructure of institution.

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

- of 10 points     b. To what extent will the proposed project have a positive impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected division/department/institution? Will this impact be significant? measurable?

Impact on Quality of Students

- of 10 points     c. To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the institution to attract and/or retain students of high quality? Does the applicant consider critical shortage areas in the State? Is evidence that student achievement will be favorably impacted by the project presented? Is the impact aligned with needs, key goals, and objectives?

Impact on Community and Economic/Workforce Development

- of 10 points     d. To what extent will the proposed project enhance the needs of the local community and the ability of the institution to fulfill those needs? Are the activities geared to community businesses and workforce development needs? Do the activities align with key goals and objectives?

Faculty and Staff Expertise

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points e. To what extent will the project enhance faculty and staff expertise? Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified and trained to implement this project? If special training will be required for project participants, has an appropriate plan been developed? What is the anticipated impact of professional development?

Additional Funding Sources (5 points)

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points f. To what extent will the project assist in establishing any new relationships or strengthen an existing relationship with one or more partners? Is the project likely to contribute to the economic or workforce development activities in Louisiana? Is there evidence of collaboration other than financial?

Project Evaluation

\_\_\_\_\_ of 7 points g. Does the project have an evaluation plan? To what extent is the assessment of the outcomes of the proposed project sound, clearly identified, and measurable? Does the assessment plan align to the goals, objectives, and activities?

Project Dissemination

\_\_\_\_\_ of 3 points h. Are the plans for dissemination of best practices clearly specified and attainable?

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

\_\_\_\_\_ 0 points i. To what extent will collaborative partners share the costs associated with this project? Do letters of support clearly specify financial and/or in-kind contributions of each partner? Are the support documents convincing?

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points j. Is the proposed budget reasonable for scope of work to be performed? Are personnel costs stated? Are equipment and supply costs appropriate? Is the proposed budget adequately justified in the budget justification? Have any guidelines regarding disallowed budgetary items (stated in the RFP, p. 14) been violated?

Checklist

\_\_\_\_\_ 0 points k. Is the checklist completed and signed?

**BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Recommended Amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

*I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the project director. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.*

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Consultant's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_