

FY 2010-11 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND REVIEW OF TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

Introduction

A two-member Two-Year Enhancement Program proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Katherine A. Boswell (chair), consultant on community college policy issues, and Dr. Russell E. Hamm, consultant on workforce issues, formerly with the U.S. Department of Labor, met January 24-26, 2011, in Baton Rouge to evaluate thirty-four (34) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, a component of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund. Both individuals had participated on several previous Two-Year Enhancement proposal review panels.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) all thirty-four (34) Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposals to be evaluated with their rating forms; b) a summary of all proposals listing titles, investigators and institutions involved, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2010-11 Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the previous year's Two-Year Institution Enhancement Program Final Report.

Prior to the meeting each member read the materials, assessed the proposals, and tentatively completed a rating form for each proposal. At the meeting in Baton Rouge, the panel thoroughly discussed all proposals, ranked them according to priority, and transformed the individual tentative ratings into a composite panel rating. Each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria in the RFP. The panel made a conscious effort to provide thoughtful feedback and suggestions on how each proposal might be improved. Budgets were carefully reviewed and items viewed as unjustified, unnecessary, or inflated were reduced or eliminated as appropriate. The panel then prepared comprehensive ratings and drafted this final evaluation report.

A total of \$3,011,502 was requested by all proposals. After careful review, the panel recommended full or partial funding for seventeen (17) proposals for a total expenditure of the \$1,072,017 that is anticipated to be available for the program during this cycle.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the seventeen (17) proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. The panel set the funding bar at 80 points (out of 100) since the quality of the proposals as a whole increased this year. Table II lists the seventeen (17) proposals that were not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal follows the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating form used by the evaluators (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

General Recommendations for Improvements to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions

The panel was encouraged by continuing and significant improvement in the overall quality of proposals this year as compared to previous years. Many proposals were resubmissions and specifically addressed the recommendations and concerns contained in the panel's comments last year. Proposals had a stronger focus on measurable outcomes and virtually all of the proposals addressed tangible and significant documented needs. It made our job as reviewers more difficult than ever in determining which proposals to recommend for funding. However, designing an evaluation component that addresses impact on student learning outcomes rather than mere completion of process objectives continues to be the major weakness found in many

proposals. We recommend that LCTCS take greater advantage of the significant experience of the Board of Regents or other external training resources to provide grantsmanship training specifically targeted at faculty and staff from the community and technical colleges.

In the past we have expressed concern that many of the proposals are prepared by dedicated faculty members who are appropriately anxious to enhance the quality of their respective academic programs and seek significant investments in equipment, in new personnel, and/or to establish new academic programs. We note, however, the restriction in the RFP that once the one-time funds are gone, the institution must pledge to continue to maintain the new positions and/or programs, sometimes at significant cost. While the panel has not wanted to discourage faculty from being entrepreneurial, we urge consideration of a letter from the Academic Vice President as part of the proposal process ensuring that the proposal has the full support of the institution and detailing its commitment. We were pleased to see far more letters of support from the appropriate Dean or Academic Vice President in this year's submissions, which assure us that the proposal has the full support of the institution, and if funded the project will be institutionalized for at least one year after grant funds are expended.

We admit as reviewers we are mystified by and disappointed in the lack of proposals from a few eligible institutions that seem not to be taking advantage of the opportunities provided by this Enhancement Program. In fact, we are surprised by a decline in the total number of submissions this year given the severity of budget cuts across the State. It seems that the opportunity to access these funds would be an even greater priority at cash-strapped community colleges.

Commendations and Recommendations of the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Review Panel to the Louisiana Board of Regents

We commend the Board for its continuing commitment to invest in improving higher education at a time of significant fiscal constraints. The team has long held up the Louisiana model of program enhancement to many other states where we work as an outstanding example of good public policy that supports improved educational outcomes and achievement. Given our collective decades of experience with community and technical colleges on the national, state, and local scenes, we are pleased with the support this Enhancement Program is providing to the Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS) and its sister two-year institutions in the LSU and Southern University systems. We are also pleased to observe that there is growing evidence that this public investment in enhancing two-year colleges is having a concrete impact on the quality of instruction and student services in the sector.

However, we continue to have a number of concerns that we would like to share.

A) As reviewers, we take our responsibility to balance the numerous requests and ensure an equitable distribution of limited funds seriously, but decisions are difficult and troubling. We recognize the significant fiscal crisis that is facing Louisiana and indeed the entire nation, the difficult decisions that elected officials must face in determining how to balance budgets in a time of declining revenues and the challenges the Board faces in trying to balance the legitimate needs of a wide range of postsecondary institutions. However, we would strongly urge State policymakers to preserve this important Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions. We have been struck by the overwhelming needs of many of the institutions that participate in the competition. Given that nearly one third of all postsecondary students in Louisiana are currently attending two-year colleges, and many of these institutions are new and incredibly underfunded for even the most basic academic support and supplies, we strongly

recommend that the Board continue to seek additional resources to support the needs of these new institutions.

B) For many years we have expressed our concerns regarding the need to ensure and encourage more articulation among Louisiana's postsecondary institutions. If Louisiana is going to meet its goal of a well-educated populace, it will be important to have seamless systems that encourage the easy movement of students from the technical colleges to the community colleges and from the community colleges to the four-year colleges and universities. We are very pleased to see increased evidence of cooperation between and among institutions and sectors in current proposals. While we recognize that additional resources are probably not presently available, we would like to continue to recommend, for Board consideration when budgets do return to normal, that a new Enhancement Program be adopted that would specifically encourage and target partnerships and articulated programs between educational sectors in the interests of creating a true K-16+ educational system. Perhaps the partnership could be a 2+2+2 partnership between a high school, a community college, and the regional four-year campus, or a pre-engineering program at a community college that is fully articulated with the engineering department at one of the State's universities. Such a program might encourage joint admissions by which the community college student who participates is jointly admitted to the two- and four-year college and advised appropriately, ensuring a smooth transition between both institutions. This model has been successful in other states (e.g., Rutgers University and New Jersey Community Colleges). In creating a new Enhancement program that would require true partnerships among differing institutions, there is potential for significant benefits for students and the State. Given the extreme needs of two-year institutions, we would not recommend such a change to the present Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions but, if at all possible as resources become available, a new Enhancement Program that has the potential to benefit both two- and four-year institutions, or technical and community colleges, or high schools and community colleges, etc.

In conclusion, we acknowledge and commend the Board and Sponsored Programs staff for your commitment to improving Louisiana's two-year community and technical colleges and for giving us the opportunity to participate in this important Enhancement Program review process. 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
2011 TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	98	001PEN-11	BRCC	\$149,869	\$131,000
2	96	007PEN-11	BPCC	\$47,233	\$47,233
3	95	014PEN-11	FLETCHER	\$42,238	\$42,238
4	94	012PEN-11	FLETCHER	\$117,764	\$45,000
5	93	005PEN-11	BPCC	\$45,780	\$45,780
6	92	009PEN-11	BPCC	\$76,990	\$59,239
7	91	019PEN-11	NUNEZ	\$148,200	\$51,000
8	89	016PEN-11	LSU-E	\$17,464	\$12,464
9	88	013PEN-11	FLETCHER	\$150,000	\$100,000
10	87	018PEN-11	NUNEZ	\$147,737	\$103,360
11	86	023PEN-11	RPCC	\$148,941	\$65,000
12	85	026PEN-11	SU-S	\$87,702	\$75,307
13	84	030PEN-11	SU-S	\$72,810	\$72,810
14	83	006PEN-11	BPCC	\$99,076	\$94,076
15	82	028PEN-11	SU-S	\$66,821	\$23,000
16	81	034PEN-11	SOWELA	\$113,323	\$80,400
17	80	017PEN-11	LSU-E	\$24,110	\$24,110
			TOTALS:	\$1,556,058	\$1,072,017

TABLE II
2011 TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
18	78	004PEN-11	BPCC	\$10,015	\$0
19	77	008PEN-11	BPCC	\$121,551	\$0
20	76	032PEN-11	SU-S	\$86,630	\$0
21	75	033PEN-11	SU-S	\$25,000	\$0
22	74	024PEN-11	RPCC	\$91,818	\$0
23	73	003PEN-11	BRCC	\$149,020	\$0
24	72	010PEN-11	BPCC	\$27,017	\$0
25	71	011PEN-11	DELGADO	\$79,150	\$0
26	70	015PEN-11	FLETCHER	\$129,494	\$0
27	69	020PEN-11	RPCC	\$148,720	\$0
28	68	021PEN-11	RPCC	\$149,606	\$0
29	67	025PEN-11	SU-S	\$99,135	\$0
30	66	027PEN-11	SU-S	\$33,777	\$0
31	64	031PEN-11	SU-S	\$46,290	\$0
32	62	002PEN-11	BRCC	\$82,372	\$0
33	53	022PEN-11	RPCC	\$143,849	\$0
34	47	029PEN-11	SU-S	\$32,000	\$0
			TOTALS:	\$1,455,444	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rebecca Adcock

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementation Funding for Veterinary Technology Program at BRCC

A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of project need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 25 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 29 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 5 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 9 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 98 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$149,869 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$131,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

Baton Rouge Community College seeks funds to procure basic and required equipment to launch the Veterinary Tech Program (VTP). The review panel congratulates the PI of this well-written proposal and recommends that it be funded partially at the level of \$131,000, subject to the budget adjustments noted below. We noted a compelling use of data in the need statement, although a sounder case regarding the positive workforce and economic *impact* of the VTP was lacking. This impact might have been better described in the evaluation section of the project. The panel is curious about the number of graduates who will enter the local workforce and the further impact on local economic development. We also note the collaborative nature of the project evidenced in the letters of support. This was a well-crafted proposal to support an exciting new venture. However, the expenditure of recommended funds should not include costs for recruiting/promoting (\$5,392), professional development (\$4,254), and program accreditation (\$8,330). Likewise, we recommend a reduction of \$893 for the laptop computers. The pledged institutional match should be maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ana Boone

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: BRCC's International Education Center

A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of project need 7 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 3 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 15 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 21 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 5 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 6 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 62 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$82,372 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

While the goals of this application are worthy, the panel cannot recommend funding for the BRCC International Education Center at this time. The proposal lacks measurable objectives related to improved student outcomes and is vague in terms of specifics about how the goals of improving students' secondary and foreign language skills and intercultural understanding would be accomplished. The proposal suggests that there is need for courses in Spanish targeted to the legal and construction industries, but there are no data to indicate either the level of need or interest on the part of the business community.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shelly Martinez

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Today's Opportunities - Healthcare Education for All Louisiana (TO-HEAL)

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 4 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 23 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 1 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 5 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 73 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$149,020 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

To support the Patient Care Technician Program with equipment and personnel, a PI from BRCC seeks BoRSF funding. The reviewers recommend that this proposal not be funded because the case for funding is weak. While the panel notes the use of data and tables, little of that information applied to the needs of the targeted service area. It is unclear what the local needs really are. The goals for this project were explained well, but the resulting impact also remained a point of speculation since no data reflected how this project would impact the economy or the students. Is there a strong benefit to adding another certification level between the CNA and the LPN programs? That case was not made, nor were there letters from local health providers to support the need for the new certification. Additionally, a major portion of the budget underpinned staffing for this program, and that approach appears to leave the program vulnerable to budget problems in the future.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynn Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding High-Stakes Testing Center Capacity to Meet Emerging Opportunities

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 7 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 2 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 25 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 9 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 78 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$10,015 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

The panel reluctantly concluded that we cannot recommend funding the High Stakes Testing Center proposal at this time. The proposal is well written, concise, and contained demonstrative letters of support from the academic leadership, although it would have been stronger had it had more information about how many students would be impacted by the Testing Center's increased capacity. While this project might have been fundable in another year, given the significant statewide demand for the very limited resources in the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions and the fact that a related (and larger) Bossier Parish request dealing with improved capacity for testing was recommended for funding, the panel decided it could not afford to support this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynn Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Adobe Skill Validation through Certification

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 24 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 29 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 93 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$45,780 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$45,780 </u>

COMMENTS:

BPCC seeks funds for equipment, software, and supplies to support training and certification for Adobe applications. The panel believes this proposal is well written and recommends that this request be fully funded at \$45,780. The panel acknowledges the strong collaboration with Bossier Parish Technical School and the LTC Shreveport-Bossier campus. These partnerships support all the schools and assure good use of funding and good support for the program(s). The panel also notes the project's impact on economic development and its benefits to local employers who need workers with the Adobe skill set are apparent. This proposal would have benefited from letters of support from employers. We commend the PI for forward-thinking regarding the evaluation of benefits since ACA campus licenses will be renewed in the future, and for considering the potential for adding more partners. Overall, this is a good project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alisha Crowder

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: AutoCAD Software Training at Bossier Parish Community College

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 5 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 25 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 20 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 83 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$99,076 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$94,076 </u>

COMMENTS:

BPCC seeks funds to procure basic, required equipment and software to deliver AutoCAD training. The panel commends the PI for a well-written proposal and recommends that this request be funded at a level of \$94,076, subject to the budget adjustment noted below. The panel acknowledges the widespread use of AutoCAD software for drafting and design in many fields. We would have liked to read a more compelling need statement, though the letters of reference from local firms needing AutoCAD-prepared employees were good. We were also curious to learn if AutoCAD can be comfortably learned on laptop computers since most electronic drafting appears to be done on large computer screens. The strong evaluation section addressed both the procurement of the equipment/software and the intent to monitor the numbers of students taking the training. We recommend that the expenditure of funds not include the costs for marketing (\$5,000). The pledged institutional match for equipment should be fully maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Jones

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Technology into The Learning Center Tutoring Program

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 25 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 28 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 96 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$47,233 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$47,233 </u>

COMMENTS:

BPCC seeks funds to procure required equipment and software to transform the Learning Center tutoring initiative to an electronic format with online student access. The panel recommends that this proposal be fully funded (\$47,233). We were impressed with the practical nature of this plan and are convinced of the need to use technology to provide access. The plan's real strength was the fact that some pilot testing has occurred, thus providing the team with a good idea of what is needed for success. The reviewers also noted, however, that while the case for this project was generally well made, the information and arguments were mislocated throughout the proposal. For example, the need case was found primarily in the impact statement, which made reading the proposal difficult. Overall, the panel believes this to be a strong project that will provide many good lessons and insights for others, and we encourage a wide dissemination of its lessons and findings.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jonathan Posey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Definition Telecommunications Training at Bossier Parish
Community College

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 8 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 4 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 21 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 77 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$121,551 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal at this time. The proposal contained a good discussion of the need for the training, the available jobs in the region and an established articulation agreement with a four-year partner. In previous years this proposal might have been recommended for funding and we would in fact encourage the PI to resubmit it in the future. We have recommended several times over the years that significant funds be awarded to BPCC's outstanding telecommunications program. Given the reduced resources available through the BoRSF and the significant needs across the State coupled with a dramatic improvement in proposal quality this year, it was difficult to justify this proposal's very large price tag when weighed against other compelling needs that had more direct impacts on student success and improved learning outcomes. While the focus on measurable outcomes was much improved from past submissions, the proposal would have been more competitive if it had defined stronger student learning outcomes and a more detailed evaluation plan. Additionally, the student satisfaction survey mentioned in the narrative as being attached appeared to be missing.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charlotte Ware

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Curricular Revisions to Expand Access to Health Information
Management Training

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 8 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 25 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 27 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 92 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$76,990 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$59,239 </u>

COMMENTS:

BPCC seeks funds to procure required supplies and training to transform the Health Information Management program, responding to worldwide changes in the systems to manage health care information. The reviewers congratulate BPCC for a very high-quality proposal and recommend that this request be funded at a level of \$59,239, subject to the budget adjustments noted below. The panel members agree with the team that changing the health information system is not optional, and both students and health care employers will depend on BPCC to provide state-of-the-art training. We note a very compelling need statement but also note that the “need” was argued in the design section, making for somewhat challenging reading. Reviewers recommend that the expenditure of BoRSF monies reflect a reduction of personnel training from \$38,637 to \$25,886 and the elimination of all marketing materials (\$5,000). We do support training of all staff, but lack of sufficient funds limits our ability to cover the costs of the three professionals. The institutional match for equipment should be maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lisa Wheeler

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Supporting Student Success Through Institutional Accountability

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 6 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 3 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 19 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 21 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 72 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$27,017 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

This proposal had a good concept that, unfortunately, missed the mark. Although well written and justified, it demonstrated lack of understanding of the challenges and opportunities inherent in a college's creating measurable knowledge and process indicators. Simply hiring a vendor to develop the mechanics of posting a dashboard of institutional indicators on the campus website is just frosting on a cake. The real substance is engaging the campus community in designing and supporting an appropriate set of metrics for the college. The proposal lacked evidence of any campus engagement strategy. If the metrics had previously been developed, the proposal should have included them. There seemed to be more thought put into the development of a log to track IE requests than to a major activity like developing institutional performance indicators. It also was unclear how participating in the proposed professional development meetings would contribute to the project's strategic goal. Professional development and conference attendance are both worthwhile, but a stronger case for their relevance needed to be made in a time of limited resources coupled with high demand. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lorraine Zeringue

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Business and Technology Career Pathways to Success

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 16 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 17 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 5 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 71 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$79,150 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

Delgado Community College seeks funds for equipment and materials to support the marketing of Business and Technology Division programs. The panel agrees with the PI that recruitment efforts are critical, but is hesitant to fund marketing in light of the competitive needs of other proposals that were focused more on direct student education. It is also unclear that the planned expenditures would, in fact, improve recruitment since there are many ways to engage and enroll students. Further, the panel concluded that the retention goal for the college's first-time freshmen was modest (52% to 58%). The proposal argued that many students come to Delgado for the nursing program, but when they cannot gain admittance they drop out. While this is true of many colleges, it appears to be more of a career counseling/retention challenge than a marketing challenge. The panel does not recommend this proposal for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Terry Authement

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Outcomes With Mobile Computer Labs

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 9 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 23 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 28 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 94 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$117,764 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$45,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

We commend Fletcher Technical Community College for the outstanding quality of this year's proposals. This request is well written and documented, incorporating strong evaluation and measurable student outcomes data. However, the proposal would have been stronger if there had been additional information on the number of students who would be served by the initiative to justify the purchase of 96 computers. While the panel does not question the level of need for three mobile labs, with the limited funds available to be distributed statewide and the decision to also fund other FTCC projects, we were forced to recommend only partial funding of \$45,000 for this project to be used at the PI's discretion. The institutional match of \$2,903 should be fully maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alyson Blythe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Opportunities through Studio Art Courses and a Multipurpose Classroom

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 8 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 4 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 23 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 27 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 9 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 88 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$150,000 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$100,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

As this panel has done in previous years, we commend FTCC faculty and staff for the campus's rapid and impressive transformation from a technical college into a comprehensive institution offering general education courses leading to a university transfer degree. The panel was particularly gratified to hear of the success of the FY 2009-10 funded project, *Studio Symposium – A Multidimensional Cultural Event for a College and Its Community*. We would like to recommend continued funding to support the expansion of FTCC's humanities and cultural offerings. This proposal requesting support for studio art courses and a multipurpose classroom was well written and supported by measurable objectives. Unfortunately, given the limited funds available to the Enhancement Program this year, the significant needs statewide and the funding recommended for other Fletcher requests, we are unable to recommend full funding. While the desire to incorporate state-of-the-art technology into the classroom and on the campus is understandable, the panel is unable to recommend funding for the \$37,000+ multimedia platform and \$1,500 projection screen, which we feel are not essential to accomplishing stated project goals. Other cuts to the budget may be made at the discretion of the project team, and the pledged institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the reduced BoRSF funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ryan LeCompte

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhance Student Engagement and Outcomes Through Technology
Upgrades in an Academic Learning Resource Center

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 24 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 28 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 9 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 95 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$42,238 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$42,238 </u>

COMMENTS:

This proposal is extremely well written, and given the relatively ordinary nature of a request for technology upgrades for the Learning Resource Center, compelling. The staff is clearly well versed in the needs of students and the team made a strong, documented case that is aligned with measurable outcomes. Full funding of \$42,238 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Fathia Williams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding Collaboration Between a Community College and a University
for Enhanced Professional Development and Student Engagement

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 6 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 3 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 15 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 18 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 70 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$129,494 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

Fletcher seeks funds for equipment and materials to develop a collaborative faculty development initiative with Nicholls State University. We fully support the college's goal of providing high-quality faculty development opportunities, and we agreed the need statement was effective. However, reviewers concluded that the limited number of development events did not warrant the sizeable expenditures. It appears that most of the equipment sought by Fletcher would be located at Nicholls and unavailable for use by FTCC faculty for further initiatives. It is simply not a good investment relative to the modest outcomes. Further, the request for iPads did not make much sense. If faculty members really support development opportunities, then the iPad "motivator" would be unnecessary, as well as very expensive. There did not appear to be a plan to encourage the use of iPads for better methods of development or improved teaching. The panel believes that there are more effective ways to bring about good faculty development and thus does not recommend that this proposal be funded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016PEN-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Orlando Dalmasi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of Network Administration Certificate Program

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 9 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 23 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 27 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 5 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 9 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 6 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 89 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$17,464 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$12,464 </u>

COMMENTS:

The principal investigator at LSU-Eunice has written a proposal that makes a strong case for support of the new certificate program in Network Administration for which the panel recommends partial funding of \$12,464. We are not able to support the request for attendance at the MERLOT conference. Although we understand and support the need for professional development, given the limited resources available in the Enhancement Program this year, the panel was unable to support a travel request that was not better justified with budget details and direct links to program outcomes. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the reduced funding recommendation.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017PEN-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joshua Fontenot

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Successful Outcomes in LSU Eunice Mathematics Courses

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 22 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 23 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 5 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 80 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$24,110 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$24,110 </u>

COMMENTS:

LSU Eunice seeks funds to provide tutoring and student support to students in math programs. The panel commends LSU Eunice and the PI for writing a good proposal and recommends that this request be fully funded. We agree that direct student assistance in the form of counseling and tutoring is often effective. We note the strength of the need statement and the local data that helped make it compelling. However, both the “design” and “impact” sections were less well written and less convincing. Missing from the proposal was a description of how the PI intends to convince students to take advantage of tutoring since many students will not do so if they believe they can succeed in some other way. Overall, the need was persuasive, the solution was straightforward and affordable, but the proposal could have been much stronger.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jodi Morgan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Technology Training and Laboratory Equipment for Practical Nursing and Allied Health Students

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 4 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 22 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 25 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 5 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 9 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 87 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$147,737</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u><u>\$103,360</u></u>

COMMENTS:

This is a strong proposal that makes an excellent case for the need for the requested equipment, backed up by citations from the State about the need to better integrate technology in healthcare. The only serious proposal component missing that kept it from getting a truly outstanding recommendation was the lack of measurable objectives projecting what the impact on student learning should be. The letter of support from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs refers to previous concerns about student completion and success rates for students in the program. The new program director is commended for turning the program around. She presented a well-conceptualized plan to upgrade the laboratory facilities and integrate technology into the classroom. Given that turn-around, it should not be difficult to compare previous completion rates with reasonable goals projecting what improved student outcomes are anticipated as a result of this investment. Unfortunately, given the limited funds available to the BoRSF this year and significant needs statewide, the panel was unable to recommend full funding for the project. We are, however, pleased to recommend partial funding of \$103,360 with any revisions to the budget made at the discretion of the project team. We wish you success in undertaking this important initiative. The pledged institutional match, which is very generous, may be reduced proportionally to the reduced budget.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christine Thomas

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Individually Nspired Mathematical Activities Through Technology

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 22 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 26 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 91 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$148,200 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$51,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

Nunez Community College seeks funds to equip eight classrooms with calculators and other technology to support math students. The reviewers congratulate the PI for writing a quality proposal and recommend that this request be funded at a level of \$51,000, subject to the budget adjustments noted below. The proposed plan for the employment of a variety of calculators and software in math courses is a tested and sound solution with a record of success in many colleges. The panel supports this initiative but suggests that it be in a "pilot" format. Therefore, we recommend that the expenditures be limited to the costs for equipping three (3) classrooms with forty (40) handhelds each (with shipping, chargers/batteries, reference books, storage, and software) and do not support the salary/benefits expenditure of \$10,608. The institutional match for installation may be reduced proportionally to the reduced BoRSF funding recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020PEN-11

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jay Anderson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Industry Directed Applied Process Technology Pilot Curriculum

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 9 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 22 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 23 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 5 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 1 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 1 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 69 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$148,720 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

The College seeks funds for offering an Applied Process Technology program, but the panel does not recommend funding for it at this time. We very much support program development that is linked directly to industries and to local need; however, this proposal is based on data-gathering and research that are not yet completed. The instructional plans, the actual equipment to be purchased and the outreach plans are all yet to be determined. The data supporting the need for a process technology program are sound and the service area appears to be a good place to offer the program. We suggest that the planning and research be conducted, the plans be more highly formed, and the PI resubmit a well-designed proposal next year.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021PEN-11

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wendy Johnson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Information Computer Technology Specialist Program at River Parishes
Community College: Moving Emerging Technologies from Outer Space to
Campus Realities

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need

 5 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project

 3 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 17 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 15 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score:

68 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$149,606 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

River Parishes Community College seeks funds for specialized IT equipment, field experiences and instructor salaries. The panel recommends that this proposal not be funded although we fully support the goal of providing high-quality IT training for students and to serve local employers. Although the needs statement made a strong argument for IT employment generally, no compelling data for the local need were provided and there were no letters of support from local employers. Our most significant concern relates to the request for the grant to fund the IT instructor's salary. That concern is related to the sustainability issue if the award is paying all costs. We found, additionally, no plan for future support of the project and no mention of future funding in the letters of support from college administrators. If this initiative is serving local industry, then perhaps there might have been some fiscal support from them as well.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022PEN-11

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Savitha Pinnepalli

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: DOIT Dreams and Opportunities in Information Technology - Technology Enhancements for Multipurpose Labs for Business Office Technology, Instrumentation, Drafting, Process Technology, Arts and Computer Science Curriculum at RPCC

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 6 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 2 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 13 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 15 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 4 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 1 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 6 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 53 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$143,849 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

This proposal reads somewhat like a wish list for technological items, with little supporting documentation, logic, or measurable impact on student outcomes. The proposal is filled with hyperbole about the potential benefits of iPads for student learning with little or no data to support why this tool is superior to laptops. While the PI provided rhetoric about how much money will be saved by students who cannot afford expensive textbooks, the proposal did not address how students would be able to afford much more expensive iPads. The panel members are proponents of e-readers and their potential for enriching the college curriculum and contributing to improved student learning outcomes, but this proposal fails to make the case for the unique, value-added benefits of iPads.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023PEN-11

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gene Ponthieux

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Achieving Readiness in Math and Science (ARMS) Across the River Parishes

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need

 9 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project

 4 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 22 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 25 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 5 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score:

 86 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$148,941 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$65,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

The review panel particularly commends the faculty and staff at River Parishes Community College for willingness to tackle one of the most difficult challenges facing community colleges nationwide. The ARMS proposal describes an ambitious and important scope of critically important work. We were impressed with the obvious evidence of collaboration with feeder high schools across the parishes. However, as praiseworthy as the project is, the review panel -- which includes experienced community college educators with extensive experience designing, implementing and evaluating similar initiatives (e.g., Achieving the Dream) -- is concerned that the project may be too ambitious and broad to be successful in one year, particularly with the limited amount of funding available in the BoRSF. Unfortunately, some project components -- in particular, the request to contract with high school math teaching specialists to provide classroom instruction -- are ineligible for funding under BoRSF guidelines. Nonetheless, the panel believes that the proposal has enough potential that we recommend a more limited award of \$65,000 to support a focused pilot project to test the assumptions and methodology. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the reduced budget of the BoRSF. The panel discourages the PI from trying to accomplish every intervention at every high school in the parishes in one year, but instead recommends focus in a limited number of settings by leveraging interventions that the national research demonstrates impact student success. The revised work plan should be submitted, via e-mail and on University letterhead with a signature indicating approval of the College, and directed to Ms. Carrie Robison, BoR Sponsored Programs administrator (carrie.robison@la.gov) or (noreen.lackett@la.gov) by the end of April 2011. The pilot project should give the PI an opportunity to refine the design and document student outcomes. Then, with well-documented lessons learned and student outcomes data, the PI would be in a much stronger position to submit a scaled-up version of the initiative in the future. Again, we commend the PI for the commitment to serve the educational needs of the region, and we anticipate hearing about the success of this initiative in the future.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024PEN-11

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Julia Sullivan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Simulated Biology and Mobile Computing Lab Initiative

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 7 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 3 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 21 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 6 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 74 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$91,818 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

A real strength of this proposal requesting a simulated biology and mobile computing lab was the faculty survey conducted by the team to support the need for an additional mobile lab. The argument, however, would have been even stronger if the PI had provided data regarding the high demand/use of the current mobile lab to strengthen the case for why another lab is needed. We recognize that the team made an effort to develop measurable objectives. Inclusion of objectives that are measureable demonstrates a significant improvement from the Enhancement proposals submitted in previous years. These particular objectives, however, were all focused on faculty usage instead of how student performance would be impacted. There should have been a better connection between proposed curricular enhancements and improved student outcomes. Similarly, the proposal contained verbiage about the need for improved simulation technology to support the biology and allied health curricula, but for a major purchase the proposal contained no data--only broad statements--regarding the number of students who would be impacted by the additional tool and its benefits to students.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Iris Champion

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Opening the Door to Cyberspace: Increasing Student Access and Success in the Virtual World Through E-Faculty Development

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 7 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 3 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 15 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 18 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 1 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 67 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$99,135 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

Southern University-Shreveport seeks funds for equipment, salaries, software and travel to support faculty ability to monitor online and mobile learning. We do agree with the arguments of the need statement: e-learning is growing and faculty must be capable of employing it as a principal learning tool. However, our concern is that the bulk of the request is for personnel and travel. While it may be a worthy project, it is too expensive for the few specific outcomes. The participating faculty members are not required to actually develop anything. They are getting stipends for simply attending training, which is disallowed in the RFP. Conference attendance is important and valuable, but it is too much money for too little direct impact on student learning. This proposal would have benefitted from specific student learning-oriented outcomes. The panel does not recommend that this proposal be funded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Iris Champion

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Bridging the Gap: Student Access and Success in College-Level
Math Courses

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 8 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 3 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	23	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	27	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	3	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	0	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	3	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	8	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	2	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	8	of 10 points

E. Total Score: **85** of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$87,702</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$75,307</u>

COMMENTS:

The panel recommends partial funding of \$75,307 for this proposal to support student access and success in college-level math courses at Southern University-Shreveport. This is a well-argued proposal that makes a good case for piloting one math redesign class at SU-S. The Fall 2009 pilot redesign course had positive results and the PI now proposes to increase the number of college-level math courses offered using the math redesign model. One weakness was the proposal's lack of detail regarding the level of improvements in the piloted reform course. The successful pilot course was referred to several times, but no specific supporting data were provided. The panel is concerned that the lack of data might indicate that the impact was not significant enough to justify this level of expense. Nonetheless, the proposal made a strong case for the need and also described a creative approach to dealing with space problems in dedicated classrooms. Because of limited funds available in this year's program and other significant State needs, we recommend reducing the number of computers and workstations.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carneta Cooper

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquiring Funds to Help with the Enhancement of the Southern
University Upstage Drama Troupe

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 17 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 21 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 4 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 4 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 66 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$33,777 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

SU-S seeks funds for stage, primarily lighting and sound, equipment. The panel supports investments in the humanities and theater; however, it was difficult to relate the expressed need (i.e., to reverse the drop in numbers of humanities students) to improving stage equipment. Further, some of the proposed investments, such as a teleprompter, do not appear necessary for any college-level theater program. Furthermore, the stated need was not supported with data, the budget narrative was absent, and the evaluation was unrelated to the plan. The panel recommends that this proposal not be funded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joyce Cottonham

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Innovative Technology of the Smart Classroom

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 8 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 4 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 21 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 26 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: **82** of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$66,821 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$23,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

This proposal is effectively argued. Its primary goal is for supporting restructured, technology-based course delivery systems for the Department of English at Southern University-Shreveport. The panel recommends partial funding of \$23,000 to support at least one Smart classroom. With such limited funds available in Enhancement this year and the statewide demands for BoRSF dollars and in consideration of other funds awarded to SU-S in this year's competition, we are forced to reduce the budget request. The proposal would have been stronger with additional details regarding the nature of the faculty training for incorporating the new technologies and with the inclusion of measurable student outcomes objectives. Nonetheless, the panel is convinced of the need and capacity of the University to improve student learning competencies across the English curriculum.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yolanda Gilyard

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enlighten, Enhancing, Enrichment through Professional Development

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X Yes No

B. Description of Project Need 6 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 2 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 15 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 15 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 0 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 4 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 47 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$32,000 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

A PI from SU-S seeks funds to support a plan for staff and faculty development. The intent of this proposal is clear and supportable, but its overall lack of data, information, plans, budget narrative, and relative evaluation process make it non-fundable. This proposal needed to be much more responsive to the requests for information in all RFP categories. The panel does not recommend that this proposal be funded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tiffany Manning

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: From GEDs to College Degrees

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 9 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 21 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 26 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: **84** of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$72,810 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$72,810 </u>

COMMENTS:

This proposal delineates a compelling and potentially critical activity for Southern University-Shreveport. The panel particularly commends the PI for identifying actual measurable student outcomes that are too often neglected in Enhancement proposals. The reviewers also commend the institution for the large amount of institutional match. That demonstration of support leads reviewers to the conclusion that this project is a priority of the University. However, the panel wishes the proposal had more data about how many students would be recruited and impacted, how many GED students are presently enrolled and what happens to them, and the scope of need for GED services in the Shreveport region. Nonetheless, the proposed project is so promising that we recommend full funding of \$72,810. The panel, however, has two concerns that should be addressed to the satisfaction of the BoR before funding is awarded: namely, how will the PI ensure that the computers loaned to students will be returned; and what is the institutional commitment that the new positions will be sustained for at least one year after the grant is over? These two questions should be answered, via e-mail and on University letterhead with a signature indicating University approval, and directed to Ms. Carrie Robison, BoR Sponsored Programs administrator (carrie.robison@la.gov) or (noreen.lackett@la.gov) by the end of April 2011. Once that is approved, the panel wishes the PI success in embarking on this important initiative.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Beverly Parker

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Management Achievers Program

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 10 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 10 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 21 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 4 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 1 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 64 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$46,290 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

SU-S seeks funds to support a student management training program conducted in partnership with local McDonalds restaurants. The basis for the proposal is sound: place students in an actual management environment where they will experience firsthand the challenges of business leadership. The expenditures for this idea, however, are not supportable and do not necessarily relate to the plan. Giving twenty computers and software to students may or may not help them become better managers. Furthermore, there was no explanation of how equipment and software would be incorporated into the learning experience. It appears to us that the business owner would pay student salaries (minimum wage), but grant funds would be used for their uniforms. We were curious to know if all employees have to purchase their own uniforms. It is also unclear what the consultant(s) will contribute to the plan. The basic idea of the proposal is good, but the funds requested do not truly support the plan. The panel recommends that this proposal not be funded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raegan Stearns

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Southern University at Shreveport Black Ethnic Archives Enhancement

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)	<u> X </u> YES	<u> </u> NO	
B. Description of Project Need		<u> 4 </u> of 10 points	
C. Strategic Goals of the Project		<u> 4 </u> of 5 points	
D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)			
D.1. Design of the proposed project		<u> 21 </u> of 25 points	
D.2. Impact of the project		<u> 22 </u> of 30 points	
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise		<u> 3 </u> of 3 points	
D.4. Professional development		<u> 0 </u> of -0- points	
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration		<u> 2 </u> of 5 points	
D.6. Project evaluation		<u> 8 </u> of 10 points	
D.7. Project dissemination		<u> 2 </u> of 2 points	
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative		<u> 10 </u> of 10 points	
E. Total Score:		<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"><tr><td style="text-align: center; padding: 2px 10px;">76</td></tr></table> of 100 points	76
76			

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$86,630 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

This is a well-written proposal with clear, measurable objectives. The University Archivist who would serve as PI is clearly well qualified, and the project plan is well conceived and logical. The panel's only hesitation is whether this particular project is competitive in the Two-Year Enhancement Program competition given the overwhelming needs of the State and at Southern University–Shreveport that have a more direct impact on improving student access and success in postsecondary education. We understand and support the vital importance of preserving and investing in this archive. The project is fundable and certainly is a worthwhile project that would seem to be a natural for funding support from the National Endowment for the Humanities or the Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities. The panel strongly urges the PI to explore funding possibilities other than the BoRSF for this important project, and we wish you success.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tuesday Williams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening Freshman Students Success through a Retention Initiative

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 7 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 5 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 23 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 23 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 6 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 6 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 75 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$25,000 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

COMMENTS:

SU-S seeks funds for supplies, professional services and student transportation to support a retention initiative. The intent of this proposal is laudable and the plans to offer workshops, seminars, mentoring and support services make sense. Missing are data that delineate how many freshmen are dropping out and whether impacting 200 students will make a percentage difference. Further, the goal stated in the proposal seems very modest: increase retention by 2%. Finally, there is no explanation of what activities are planned, how many such events will be offered, and no list of speakers. Overall, this proposal's goal is worthy, but the proposal lacked detail, explanation and the budget narrative. The panel does not recommend that this proposal be funded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034PEN-11

INSTITUTION: Sowela Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Melanie McNease

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Smart Classrooms: Using Technology to Enhance Continuing Education and Instruction at Sowela Technical Community College

A. Demographic Data included, adequate (0 points)

 X YES NO

B. Description of Project Need 7 of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project 4 of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 25 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of -0- points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 9 </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score: 81 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$113,323</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u><u>\$80,400</u></u>

COMMENTS:

The panel recommends partial funding of \$80,400 for Sowela's *Using Technology to Enhance Education and Instruction* proposal. Essentially it is well-argued, although the proposal would have been even stronger with a more compelling need statement. The proposed project is comprehensive, including all-important faculty training. However, it would have been helpful to the reviewers had it contained more details about what faculty are expected to produce once they are trained and about the evaluation plan. Nonetheless, the panel believes that this is a worthy project that deserves support from this Enhancement Subprogram. Unfortunately, due to the significant needs across the State and limited funds in this year's BoRSF, the panel recommends that the PI and campus administrators prioritize how the partial funds can best be used to accomplish project goals. The institutional match for equipment may be reduced proportionally to the reduced BoRSF.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions
for the FY 2010-11 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Project Title	Institution	First Year Req. amount
001-PEN-11	Adcock,Rebecca	Implementation Funding for Veterinary Technology Program at BRCC	Baton Rouge Community College	\$149,869.00
002-PEN-11	Boone,Ana	BRCC's International Education Center	Baton Rouge Community College	\$82,372.00
003-PEN-11	Martinez,Shelly	Today's Opportunities - Healthcare Education for All Louisiana - (TO-HEAL)	Baton Rouge Community College	\$149,020.00
004-PEN-11	Brown,Lynn	Expanding High-Stakes Testing Center Capacity to Meet Emerging Opportunities	Bossier Parish Community College	\$10,015.00
005-PEN-11	Brown,Lynn	Adobe Skill Validation through Certification	Bossier Parish Community College	\$45,780.00
006-PEN-11	Crowder,Alisha	AutoCAD Software Training at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$99,076.00
007-PEN-11	Jones,Laura	Integrating Technology into The Learning Center Tutoring Program	Bossier Parish Community College	\$47,233.00
008-PEN-11	Posey,Jonathan	High Definition Telecommunications Training at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$121,551.00
009-PEN-11	Ware,Charlotte	Curricular Revisions to Expand Access to Health Information Management Training	Bossier Parish Community College	\$76,990.00
010-PEN-11	Wheeler,Lisa	Supporting Student Success Through Institutional Accountability	Bossier Parish Community College	\$27,017.00
011-PEN-11	Zeringue,Lorraine	Business and Technology Career Pathways to Success	Delgado Community College	\$79,150.00
012-PEN-11	Authement,Terry	Enhancing Student Outcomes With Mobile Computer Labs	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$117,764.00
013-PEN-11	Blythe,Alyson	Enhancing Student Opportunities through Studio Art Courses and a Multipurpose Classroom	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$150,000.00
014-PEN-11	LeCompte,Ryan	Enhance Student Engagement and Outcomes Through Technology Upgrades in an Academic Learning Resource Center	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$42,238.00
015-PEN-11	Williams,Fathia	Expanding Collaboration Between a Community College and a University for Enhanced Professional Development and Student Engagement	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$129,494.00
016-PEN-11	Dalmasi,Orlando	Development of Network Administration Certificate Program	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice	\$17,464.00
017-PEN-11	Fontenot,Joshua	Increasing Successful Outcomes in LSU Eunice Mathematics Courses	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice	\$24,110.00
018-PEN-11	Morgan,Jodi	Advanced Technology Training and Laboratory Equipment for Practical Nursing and Allied Health Students	Nunez Community College	\$147,737.00
019-PEN-11	Thomas,Christine	Individually Nspired Mathematical Activities Through Technology	Nunez Community College	\$148,200.00
020-PEN-11	Anderson,Jay	Industry Directed Applied Process Technology Pilot Curriculum	River Parishes Community College	\$148,720.00
021-PEN-11	Johnson,Wendy	Information Computer Technology Specialist Program at River Parishes Community College: Moving Emerging Technologies from Outer Space to Campus Realities	River Parishes Community College	\$149,606.00

Proposal #	PI Name	Project Title	Institution	First Year Req. amount
022-PEN-11	Pinnepalli,Savitha	DOIT Dreams and Opportunities in Information Technology - Technology enhancements for multipurpose labs for business office technology, instrumentation, drafting, process technology, Arts and Computer Science Curriculum at RPCC.	River Parishes Community College	\$143,849.00
023-PEN-11	Ponthieux,Gene	Achieving Readiness in Math and Science (ARMS) Across the River Parishes	River Parishes Community College	\$148,941.00
024-PEN-11	Sullivan,Julia	Simulated Biology and Mobile Computing Lab Initiative	River Parishes Community College	\$91,818.00
025-PEN-11	Champion,Dr. Iris	Opening the Door to Cyberspace: Increasing Student Access and Success in the Virtual World Through E-Faculty Development	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$99,135.00
026-PEN-11	Champion,Dr. Iris	Bridging the Gap: Student Access and Success in College-Level Math Courses	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$87,702.00
027-PEN-11	Cooper,Carneta	Acquiring Funds to Help with the Enhancement of the Southern University Upstage Drama Troupe	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$33,777.00
028-PEN-11	Cottonham,Joyce	Innovative Technology of the Smart Classroom	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$66,821.00
029-PEN-11	Gilyard,Yolanda	Enlighten, Enhancing, Enrichment through Professional Development	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$32,000.00
030-PEN-11	Manning,Tiffany	From GED's To College Degrees	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$72,810.00
031-PEN-11	Parker,Beverly	Management Achievers Program	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$46,290.00
032-PEN-11	Stearns,Raegan	Southern University at Shreveport Black Ethnic Archives Enhancement	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$86,630.00
033-PEN-11	Williams,Tuesday	Strengthening Freshman Students Success through a Retention Initiative	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$25,000.00
034-PEN-11	McNease,Melanie	Smart Classrooms: Using Technology to Enhance Continuing Education and Instruction at SOWELA Technical Community College	SOWELA Technical Community College	\$113,323.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	34
Total Money Requested	\$3,011,502.00

APPENDIX B
RATING FORM

APPENDIX

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

RATING FORM FOR TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS, FY 2010-11

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 is, the more evident the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.

Proposal Number: _____ Project Director: _____

A. Demographic Data (0 points)

Has the applicant adequately described the demographic data for the campus that will benefit from the proposed project, and relevant institutional or departmental resources, if appropriate?

B. Description of Project Need (_____ of 10 points)

Has the applicant adequately described project needs and related them to the goals and measurable objectives? To what extent will the needs of the project, if funded, enhance the affected campus, entity, department or division?

C. Strategic Goals of the Project (_____ of 5 points)

What are the strategic goals of the intended project? Are the objectives clearly stated and measurable? What are the measurable objectives that will indicate that the goal(s) have been achieved? Did applicant identify outcome goals/objectives and the process goals/objectives separately. Can they be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?

D. Proposal Narrative (Total of 75 points)

1. Design of Proposed Project (_____ of 30 points)

To what extent will the project assist the applicant to strengthen the capacities of Louisiana's two-year campuses in order to improve their academic, workforce development, missions, programs, and enhance infrastructure? Is the proposal aligned with the Guiding Principles and focused on the development/improvement of the two-year institution and students' academic achievement? Are all activities designed to achieve goals and objectives? Are appropriate activities provided for each goal and objective?

2. Impact of the Project (_____ of 30 points)

To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the institution to attract and/or retain students? 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 anticipated impact aligned with needs, key goals, objectives, and the proposed budget??

3. Faculty and Staff Expertise (_____ of 3 points)

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

4. Professional Development (0 points)

Does the applicant describe the need for any professional development activities? What is the primary purpose(s) of the activities? Are the professional development activities connected to the primary activities of the project? Is faculty/staff training tied to each aspect of the proposal (need, objectives, activities, evaluation)? If special training will be required for project participants, has an appropriate plan been developed? What is the anticipated impact of professional development?

5. Additional Funding Sources and Evidence of Collaboration (0 points)

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? 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?

6. Project Evaluation (____ of 10 points)

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? Did the applicant describe in detail how he/she will measure the success of goals and objectives in the evaluation section? To what extent will the proposed project have a positive impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the institution, division, or unit? Is this impact significant? Is it measurable?

7. Project Dissemination (____ of 2 points)

Are the plans for dissemination of best practices clearly specified and attainable? Is the plan adequate to fully disseminate results of the project?

E. Budget Page and Budget Narrative (____ of 10 points)

Is the proposed budget reasonable for the scope of work to be performed? Are personnel costs, if any, stated and adequately explained? Are equipment and supply costs appropriate? Is the proposed budget adequately justified in the budget narrative? Have any guidelines regarding disallowed budgetary items (stated in the RFP, p. 5) been violated?

REVIEWER NOTES:

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 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: _____ Date: _____

Two-Year Enhancement, Rev. 8/2010)