

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN EDUCATION

February 28, 2011

Prepared by:

Kathleen M. Brown (Chair)
University of North Carolina

Gail Dickinson
Texas State University-San Marcos

**LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND TRADITIONAL
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FY 2010-11**

**PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE EDUCATION DISCIPLINE
INTRODUCTION**

An education review panel consisting of Drs. Kathleen M. Brown (Chair), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Gail Dickinson, Texas State University at San Marcos, met on February 28, 2011 to review proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents Support Fund Traditional Enhancement Program.

Prior to the review, panel members were sent the following materials:

- Twenty-four (24) Education Enhancement proposals submitted to the Board of Regents;
- A summary list of Education Enhancement proposals to be reviewed;
- The Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals (RFP) for FY 2010-11;
- The final panel's report for the FY 2007-08 Education Enhancement competition; and
- Rating forms appropriate to each of the submitted proposals.

Panel members received and studied all materials prior to the meeting. During the review process each proposal was analyzed and discussed by the two reviewers. In each case, unanimous agreement was reached following a thorough and fair evaluation, based on the criteria established in the FY 2010-11 RFP.

The twenty-four (24) Education Enhancement proposals submitted in the FY 2010-11 competition requested a total of \$2,686,728 in first-year funds and \$61,973 in second-year funds. Panelists determined that there were nine (9) proposals qualified to receive funding and recommended a total expenditure of \$792,738 in first-year funds. In those cases in which partial funding was recommended, that determination was made after a careful review of each proposal's budget and determination of an award amount to meet the project's urgent needs.

Table I contains rankings and established monetary recommendations for the nine (9) proposals highly recommended for funding. Table II contains a listing of the fifteen (15) proposals not recommended for funding. Detailed reviews of all proposals follow immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations are attached at the end of the report as Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The panel looked closely at all proposals to determine that required elements were included and appropriately described. Proposals which did not include or provided minimal evidence of attention to the required elements or to the spirit of the Education component of Traditional Enhancement were not likely to receive funding according to the RFP guidelines and scoring mechanisms.

As reflected in the rating forms for Traditional Enhancement proposals provided to the panel and to applicants in the RFP, proposals were expected to clearly demonstrate their attention to each of these elements and were scored, per the provided scoring matrix, to reflect their success in combining these

elements into a coherent, cohesive plan to build and enhance education infrastructure. Proposals that omitted or did not fully engage these requirements were scored accordingly.

In addition, this year the review panel noted several errors and problems in proposal submissions that were general across institutions and substantially weakened and sometimes eliminated proposals from competition. The following headings provide information on these general problems, and should be studied by all investigators who were not recommended for funding this year and who plan to submit proposals for consideration in the next Education Enhancement competition, or any prospective applicant considering submission in the future.

A. Project Goals and Objectives

On page 2 of the RFP it states that “Based on Constitutional and legislative mandates and policies adopted by the Board, proposals will be considered in the Enhancement Program whose objectives are to enhance the infrastructure of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units and to promote economic development. The impact of the proposed project on the enhancement of departments and units--and on the State's economy--may be subtle, indirect, and delayed, or pronounced, direct, and immediate. Special consideration will be given to:

1. imaginative projects which seek opportunities not otherwise available;
2. projects which will be funded in part by an external agency; and,
3. projects which have a broad impact, strengthening the infrastructure of departments/units”.

With this in mind, the reviewers were surprised that a number of the proposals this year did not directly, or even indirectly, address the second priority of “promoting economic development.” As a result, many of the proposals lost significant points because the rationale for the project did not match the Board of Regents request. Likewise, the reviewers found that a number of proposals lacked innovative projects funded in part by external agencies and having broad impact.

Overall, the proposals were of higher quality than in previous years. There was wide diversity, from projects focused primarily on increasing the research capacity of the institution with side benefits for instruction to those focused almost entirely on instruction. The instructional proposals with outreach components were strongest as the funds were leveraged for greater effect and long term benefits.

B. The Enhancement Plan

Although some proposals provided well conceived and very thorough work plans, the majority of proposals lost points in this area because they lacked sufficient detail. The reviewers were constantly seeking clarification, specifics, and particulars regarding named activities, stated objectives, and project ideas. Related to this concern was a similar lack of specifics regarding performance measures and evaluation plans. Just naming a type of survey and/or a course grade is insufficient to adequately judge the degree to which a project has (or has not) achieved its goals. Likewise, attendance lists are not evaluation tools and published instruments are better than ones written by the researcher. Within this same section, most of the proposals did not provide sufficient evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence at the regional, national, or international level.

C. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

The reviewers found this section difficult to rate. For most proposals, this section was sparse, at best. Proposals that had the potential to significantly impact the future workforce were rated by the panel as promoting economic development. Also, some of the lab proposals could promote economic development directly if they produced a patent or product that could be developed locally.

D. Budget and Budget Narrative

Most proposals provided a detailed budget, followed by a budget narrative that partially to fully explained every item for which the expenditure of Support Funds was requested. Where this explanation was lacking, the reviewers noted it in the Comments section of the proposal rubric. The proposals that received the most favorable rating with regard to budget were the ones that provided both effort and evidence of a commitment of matching funds from the home institution and/or private donors. Eight of the nine proposals (89%) recommended for funding this year indicated additional funding sources from 16% to 79% (average of 46%) of the total request. From the perspective of reviewers, these pledges indicated good faith on the part of the applicants and their respective institutions.

**Traditional Enhancement Education Table I
Highly Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
1	93	12EDU-11	SLU	\$70,220	\$70,220		
2	87	04EDU-11	LaTech	\$166,647	\$97,127		
3	86	16EDU-11	UL-L	\$84,420	\$84,420		
4	85	21EDU-11	UL-M	\$65,977	\$65,977		
5	84	18EDU-11	UL-L	\$146,230	\$122,871		
6	83	11EDU-11	SLU	\$7,763	\$7,763		
7	82	13EDU-11	SLU	\$122,124	\$119,976		
8	81	20EDU-11	UL-L	\$157,089	\$106,853		
9	80	01EDU-11	LSU-BR	\$128,775	\$117,531		
Totals				\$949,245	\$792,738		

**Traditional Enhancement Education Table II
Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
10	79	02EDU-11	LSU-BR	\$121,904	\$0		
10	79	07EDU-11	LaTech	\$102,360	\$0		
10	79	17EDU-11	UL-L	\$104,848	\$0		
13	78	19EDU-11	UL-L	\$229,094	\$0		
14	77	24EDU-11	UNO	\$323,980	\$0	\$49,973	\$0
15	68	08EDU-11	LaTech	\$139,752	\$0		
16	67	06EDU-11	LaTech	\$29,125	\$0		
17	65	05EDU-11	LaTech	\$72,134	\$0		
17	65	23EDU-11	UL-M	\$68,217	\$0		
19	64	10EDU-11	Nicholls	\$134,365	\$0		
20	61	03EDU-11	LSU-S	\$79,774	\$0		
21	60	22EDU-11	UL-M	\$18,000	\$0		
22	57	14EDU-11	SU-BR	\$92,890	\$0	\$12,000	\$0
23	56	09EDU-11	McNeese	\$140,375	\$0		
24	53	15EDU-11	SU-NO	\$80,665	\$0		
Totals				\$1,737,483	\$0	\$61,973	\$0

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

01EDU-11

Additionally, the measurable objectives, assessments, and professional services provided are broadly described but not fully developed. Will the exhibits be interactive and/or hands-on? How will the professional design company actually utilize the allocated funds? How will this project promote economic development within Louisiana and have a broad impact beyond the regional level? Although many of these elements are still unclear, the panel does recommend partial funding for this proposal with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment Support for the Implementation of a State of the Art
Sedimentology Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Graziela da Silva

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 9 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 18 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$121,904
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to upgrade and modernize the sedimentological teaching facilities of the Department of Geology and Geophysics. It is an imaginative project that will enhance infrastructure and promote economic development. Unfortunately, the proposal does not mention a connection to or with K-12 education and/or teacher preparation programs and, therefore, does not qualify in the education category. There is also a question regarding broad, lasting impact. As written, it is unclear how much the new equipment will impact the Department as the personnel may not be present to take advantage of the lab requested. The objective is to outfit a lab, which in and of itself is fairly weak. The work plan delineates using the lab for classes but that is not listed as an objective, nor is increasing the number of graduate students (even though that is identified as an outcome). This actually makes the benchmarks superficial (only purchasing and installing equipment). The evaluation of the project's success does not align with stated objectives, but there are implicit objectives that are important. The work plan describes purchasing and using the equipment but there is no real timeline for evaluation. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03EDU-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improvements and Enhancements to School of Education Student
Technology Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lawrence Garrison

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$79,774
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to improve and enhance the School of Education's Student Technology Lab and the Computer Science Department's Technology Center classroom via upgraded wiring and the installation of new equipment. The rationale behind this proposal states that, because the student body is largely supported by financial aid, students use the computer labs more than at other universities. While this may be true, an increasing number of schools are moving away from labs to more mobile computing via laptops, tablet PCs, etc. As such, the proposal request for 6 iPads would not be enough for one class. Will the students be allowed to check them out? Also, how will enhancing the labs affect other classes as the labs are already scheduled for instructional technology classes? University instructors will be able to assign homework that utilizes technology, but integrating technology into their classes is unlikely.

(Continued on the next page)

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

03EDU-11

The Impact on Curriculum and Instruction section lacks specific examples and details. Descriptions throughout the proposal are brief and repetitive, the work plan itself is not fully developed (particularly the timeline), and the performance measures are weak. The proposal asks for and describes little more than the purchase and installation of equipment. What software will be acquired? Why? How will the equipment actually be used? To what effect? This project will enhance the infrastructure of the Department but it will not catapult it to national eminence or create broad impact. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Rigor and Relevance in the Classroom: The Path to Educational Excellence

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Glenn Beer

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 4 (of 5 points)
 A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)
 D.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 D.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 21 (of 23 points)
 B.3 23 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$166,647
 Recommended Amount: \$97,127

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

This proposal seeks to improve the quality of the curriculum and the effectiveness of the faculty in all teacher preparation programs (graduate, undergraduate, and alternative certification tracks) by revising affected courses to include Common Core State Standards. The PIs also plan to develop a model professional development program in collaboration with ACT. Although the project goals are ambitious for one year, they are imaginative, admirable, involve several partnerships, and include funding by external agencies. If implemented well, this project could have a broad impact and result in the University providing training on a national level and achieving national eminence. The work plan is very thorough and detailed but more emphasis is needed on adoption of the curriculum. Two observations are not sufficient support to evaluate or adopt a curriculum. Likewise, sign-in sheets are not effective evaluation other than identifying who participated. How will the Quality Core assessments be used to improve instruction at the K-12, university, and professional development levels? PIs must address this question (how assessments are tied to research and impact) when reporting on deliverables. The panel also questions the sustainability of this project since the majority of the funds requested are for year-one salaries. Also, by law Board of Regents Support Fund monies cannot be used for stipends and travel for K-12 educators. Despite these deficiencies, the panel recommends partial funding. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately and in accordance with reviewer stipulations stated above.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Building Capacity through Collaboration and Integration to Enhance Health and Education: Moving to Live and Learn

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Tiffany Bowers

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 23 points)
B.3 15 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 1 (of 2 points)
D.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
D.2b 5 (For NS/NE)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$72,134
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to improve field placements for Louisiana Tech students by enhancing both the equipment available at the field site and the professional development of cooperating teachers. Participating teachers will receive graduate credit while learning to integrate more fully into their lesson plans the topics of health, nutrition, fitness and literacy. National and State standards are addressed and there is a strong institutional match in terms of tuition. Unfortunately, the proposal is broadly written and, as such, lacks sufficient detail. For example, what resources currently exist and how are they being used? Are the project objectives strongly tied to tested curricula? If so, how? If not, why? How does this proposal promote economic development, have a broad impact, and/or sustain innovation beyond the grant period (especially since the majority of the funds requested will be used for salaries and stipends)? Likewise, the evaluation is somewhat vague. More standard forms of evaluation as opposed to researcher-developed questionnaires would strengthen the proposal. The review panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the SHARE Library with Parent and Family Life
Education Materials

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tammy Harpel

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 18 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$29,125
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to enhance the inventory of the existing SHARE Library to include parent and family life education materials and resources. Even though the goal is reasonable and the amount requested is relatively low, the proposal lacks certain details. For example, what materials does the SHARE library currently have and why/how were these specific instructional equipment and resource materials chosen? By whom and for whom? Is the PI the only faculty member involved in and responsible for this grant? How many students and faculty are in this program? How many classes will be affected (only three)? The evaluation data sources are weak and the evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence is inadequate. From the perspective of the panel the impact is questionable. Although the requested materials would enhance the infrastructure of the program, the proposal does not promote economic development or include substantial partnerships and/or funding by external agencies. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creative Designs: Integrating Instruction From the Lab into the Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 5 (of 5 points)
 A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 18 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$102,360
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to expand computer resources for merchandising and consumer science students. The current lab of 12 desktops is insufficient for classes and not very accessible outside of class time. In some ways the idea of adding 30 laptops is (and the results will be) innovative. Unfortunately, the proposal does not mention a connection to or with K-12 education and/or teacher preparation programs. As such, it does not qualify in the education category. It also seems to include only one faculty member and does not include partnerships with external funders. The PI mentions collaborative relationships with approximately 32 businesses and organizations but does not necessarily involve them in the planning process (for financial support and/or ideas). Likewise, scholarly activity and creative research are mentioned as potential goals but no specifics are provided (too broad/general as currently written). Also, all evaluation measures are internal and faculty written. On a logistical note, if large enough numbers of students check out the laptops and then fail to bring them back on time, classes could be negatively affected. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Literacy/Technology Model Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	
A.2		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>3</u>	(of 5 points)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.2		<u>10</u>	(of 18 points)
B.3		<u>10</u>	(of 20 points)
B.4		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5		<u>2</u>	(of 2 points)
B.6		<u>4</u>	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes	<u>X</u>	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1		<u>4</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2		<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3		<u>3</u>	(of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1		<u>10</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	--	-----------	----------------

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1		<u>2</u>	(of 2 points)
E.2a		<u> </u>	(For S/E)
or		<u> </u>	(of 10 points)
E.2b		<u>6</u>	(For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	
-----	-----	----------	----	--

G. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$139,752</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to refurbish an outdated computer lab with new computer equipment plus literacy software, books, supplies, and videos. The rationale behind the project is understandable in terms of enhancing the infrastructure of the College of Education. However, the proposal is not imaginative or innovative, it does not promote economic development, and the impact is limited. The work plan is fairly detailed (aside from how research will be disseminated), but the section describing evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence is fairly thin at the national and international level. Likewise, for a proposal focused on technology, there is little dissemination and/or sharing of student work via technology. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09EDU-11

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Faculty Development to Meet the Educational Needs of Digital Learners

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Delma McLeod-Porter

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 18 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 56 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$140,375
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to plan, organize, and execute professional development activities for faculty from across the McNeese campus. The goals of revising outdated pedagogies, immersing faculty in digital, interactive environments, and developing faculty communities of practice are pertinent and timely. However, as currently written, the proposal is too broad, vague, disjointed, and contains a number of grammatical errors (namely issues of subject-verb agreement). The panel believes that the needs assessment described should have been done before writing the proposal to justify specific training ideas and equipment purchases. The survey instrument is not an evaluation in and of itself. Likewise, methodologically sound ethnographies require a lot more data collection than is indicated. Several questions remain, such as who are the technology experts who are providing guidelines for the equipment? Are faculty on board with the professional development, and will two-day retreats really impact their technology practices?

(Continued on the next page)

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

09EDU-11

Are 65 video cameras really necessary? Are the cameras purchased two years ago being used effectively? Perhaps most importantly, how will faculty use the iPads to make their courses more interactive? And, aside from interfaculty communications, how will the iPads be specifically tied to instruction? Because of these unanswered questions, the panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: iSupport Faculty: Retooling for an Online Future

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Vavasseur

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 4 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$134,365
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to address the limited online course offerings at Nicholls State University through professional development, equipment acquisition, and conversion of existing courses to online formats. While these goals are innovative, timely, laudable, and aligned with State requirements, the proposal itself is somewhat generically written (i.e., lacking specifics regarding actual needs beyond the goals themselves, outlets for research and presentations, and efforts to collaborate and promote economic development). The panel suggests the purchase of fewer high-end desktop computers placed in a lab where faculty would have technical support and perhaps students would also have access. Given the significant time and effort required for online course development, how will the University adequately support 44 faculty developing online courses at the same time?

(Continued on the next page)

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

10EDU-11

Perhaps the PIs could target key faculty/courses for year one of professional development and apply for additional funds in subsequent years. The ISTE conference is a great way to find out trends in online learning but there are also journals and other sources to find this information as well. Funding might be better spent on release time for course development and proper support for faculty converting courses to online formats to accomplish the goals of this project. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Play Therapy Resource Room and Lending Library for Graduate Counseling Students and School Counselors to Enhance the Learning and Professional Development Experience

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Fazio-Griffith

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$7,763
Recommended Amount: \$7,763

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

This proposal seeks to supply materials for a lending library that will support counseling programs at Southeastern. This proposal is modest, but promises a large impact for the investment. Although brief, it is well written and well researched. The materials will complement the existing play therapy room in the counseling center and will allow effective outreach to the community, including marketing materials to area schools. The Department has committed funds for a graduate student to monitor equipment usage. The evaluation component could be strengthened and the impact on curriculum and instruction section could be more fully developed. Despite these minor deficiencies, the budget appears reasonable and the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Educate to Innovate Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Hancock

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,220
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,220

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

This proposal seeks to train STEM teachers in children's engineering via enhanced master's program courses, non-credit courses and seminars, and summer camps for high school students. It is well written and researched, imaginative, and sustainable through solid partnerships and cash matches from SLU. Plans to attend and disseminate new knowledge at national conferences are also notable. Having said that, questions remain. How well do the project goals and objectives align with State standards for math and science? Will graduate students produce anything as a result of the modules (e.g., lesson plans, units)? Will the seminars be evaluated and, if so, how? A participant list and seminar materials are not evidence of evaluation. If each student fills out evaluations or produces artifacts, then there is evidence of attendance as well as something that demonstrates the effectiveness of the seminar. What deliverables will demonstrate whether or not the project outcomes were successful? For consideration the panel suggests disseminating lessons and posting instructional videos for teachers online as opposed to just presenting at ISTE. Despite these minor criticisms, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project C.U.D.L.E. Up for: "M.O.R.E." (Creating Universally Designed Learning Environments "UP"GRADED to: Multi-Sensory Opportunities to Reach Everyone)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Colleen Klein-Ezell

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u> X </u>	No	<u> </u>
A.2		<u> 4 </u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u> 4 </u>	(of 5 points)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u> 5 </u>	(of 5 points)		
B.2	<u> 16 </u>	(of 18 points)		
B.3	<u> 16 </u>	(of 20 points)		
B.4	<u> 4 </u>	(of 5 points)		
B.5	<u> 1 </u>	(of 2 points)		
B.6	<u> 4 </u>	(of 6 points)		
B.7	Yes	<u> X </u>	No	<u> </u>

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u> 5 </u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u> 1 </u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u> 2 </u>	(of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u> 12 </u>	(of 12 points)
-----	--------------	----------------

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1	<u> 1 </u>	(of 2 points)
E.2a	<u> </u>	(For S/E)
or		(of 10 points)
E.2b	<u> 7 </u>	(For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u> X </u>	No	<u> </u>
-----	-----	--------------	----	-------------------

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$122,124 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$119,976 </u>

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

This proposal seeks to provide hands on/interactive learning for pre-service and in-service teachers, families and community members through the training and lending of specialized Multi-Sensory Environment (MSE) equipment and materials. Expanding upon a previously successful Enhancement proposal, four Special Education courses will be modified and materials will be available for check out. The work plan provides good detail but the section asking for evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence is brief and broadly described. What type of research will be conducted? Why, how, when, and where? The proposal states that all three co-PIs will attend training in MSEs. Who will lead the training? What other faculty members will be involved? Why was this particular equipment chosen versus other possible options? While the partnerships described in the proposal are notable, the panel wonders if vendors were approached for equipment donations and/or discounts on purchases? Also, the panel notes the in-kind matches are for use of space only. Despite these concerns, the panel recommends partial funding with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multimedia for Educational Leadership

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jarrett Landor-Ngemi

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 2 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 57 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$92,890</u>	<u>\$12,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to convert four traditional classrooms into multimedia classrooms. As such, it matches one of the Enhancement Program's objectives (i.e., to enhance the infrastructure of academic departments or units). Unfortunately, the proposal does not necessarily address the other objectives (i.e., promoting economic development, seeking/including external agency funding, and/or developing broad impact projects). In the proposal the fourth objective is vague, as the goals for technology use and communication skills are not defined. It is not clear where the modules fit in the program. Are all eight modules taught in the one technology course? How do they dovetail with the six courses named on page 5?

(Continued on the next page)

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

14EDU-11

The description of technology use provided in the fourth paragraph on page 7 does not match the optimum use defined in the second paragraph on the same page. The equipment request is poorly justified. There are six classes meeting on different nights of the week which could be taught in two rooms. This project is not actually a two-year endeavor. The activities do not really line up with the objectives. There is almost no evaluation of project objectives. The work plan describes purchase and installation of equipment but does not relate those to the objectives. There is no justification for the instructor's computer with Microsoft tablet technology, miscellaneous peripherals or unspecified software. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15EDU-11

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Southern University at New Orleans, Progression Recruitment
Enhancement Plan Program Dubbed SUNO COE PREPP

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Louise Kaltenbaugh

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No X
 A.2 2 (of 5 points)
 A.3 2 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

**D. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)
 D.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 D.2b 4 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 23 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No

F. Total Score: 53 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$80,665
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to provide interdisciplinary academic support to enhance the access, retention and graduation rates of prospective Education majors at SUNO. As such, the core goal is noteworthy. However, the proposal itself is poorly written, overly wordy, quite repetitive, and lacking necessary detail. As a result, it is difficult to read, understand and interpret. Who are the students (how many, from where, why, how)? Exactly how, when, where and why will the PI and co-PIs use the laptop computers, smart cart, smart board, and smart project screen? What are the details regarding the measurable outcomes (e.g., percentage increase in graduation rates and passing rates on the Praxis exam)? Improving graduation rates will improve the college's reputation but will not catapult it to eminence on any scale. How does this project increase the variety of curricular offerings and improve the quality? Specifics should be provided regarding Noel Levitz's best practices and mentoring activities, including empirical research and results. Unfortunately, because the description of the actual proposed activities is vague (reading more like a "drill and kill" test prep targeted at college students), the proposal in general is weak, too broadly defined and too narrowly focused. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Video Recording and Playback Technology for Counselor Education and Supervision

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Irvin Esters

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$84,420 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$84,420 </u>

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

This proposal seeks to provide video equipment for a counseling program. The equipment will complement new space that is under construction at present. The evaluation plan could be much more specific (e.g., target numbers of videos produced, evidence of student expertise in using the rooms/equipment, etc.). This project will facilitate continued excellence. The location of the facility encourages future development including national accreditation. The PIs describe the Counseling Lab as a hub for education and research but provide few details regarding such research (i.e., who? what? when? how? why?). Overall, however, the project integrates existing resources very well and efficiently makes the program technologically current. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Functional Fitness Laboratory: The Foundation for Student and Professional Advancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Andrew Hatchett

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u> X </u>	No	<u> </u>
A.2		<u> 5 </u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u> 5 </u>	(of 5 points)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u> 5 </u>	(of 5 points)
B.2	<u> 9 </u>	(of 18 points)
B.3	<u> 14 </u>	(of 20 points)
B.4	<u> 4 </u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u> 2 </u>	(of 2 points)
B.6	<u> 6 </u>	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes <u> </u>	No <u> X </u>

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u> 4 </u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u> 1 </u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u> 3 </u>	(of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u> 12 </u>	(of 12 points)
-----	--------------	----------------

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1	<u> 2 </u>	(of 2 points)
E.2a	<u> </u>	(For S/E)
or	<u> </u>	(of 10 points)
E.2b	<u> 7 </u>	(For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes <u> X </u>	No <u> </u>
-----	------------------	----------------------

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$104,848 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

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

This proposal seeks to develop a full-blown functional fitness lab. The proposal starts out strong but becomes a little repetitive and basic. As a whole, the proposal would be stronger if the PI already had concrete research projects in mind, given that the projects represent one-third of the objectives. The evaluation components of objectives 2 and 3 are not as clear as they should be. The training budget is not clearly explained. Who is being trained? The tie-in to education and/or K-12 teacher training was not clearly described and, therefore, the proposal is not a good fit in the education category. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 18EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Pre-service Teachers Conceptual Understanding of Elementary Mathematics and Related Teaching Strategies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yuxin Ma

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 1 (of 2 points)
D.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
D.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 21 (of 23 points)
B.3 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$146,230
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$122,871

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

This proposal seeks to enhance pre-service teachers' conceptual understanding of and skills in teaching mathematics thinking strategies. The goals are pertinent and timely, the proposal is innovative, well written and researched, and the PIs secured a good institutional match. Having said that, questions remain. For example, what will the software add that cubes do not already do? If not all the faculty teach reform-based mathematics in the methods courses, why will they switch because of this project? How will the products of this project actually be used (not by whom, when, and where, but how)? How do these products complement materials that are readily available, such as NCTM illuminations? The AAAS has already put together some literature on how students learn mathematics in a book by the same name. What data will be collected on pre-service teacher learning ("quantitative" data is a vague description)? If the app is developed with Enhancement funds, then Louisiana schools should have free access, otherwise the statewide impact is limited. What is the full-time programmer doing after February? And finally, has Microsoft and/or Apple been asked for possible donations and/or applicable discounts? Despite these questions, the panel recommends partial funding with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 19EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Biomechanics Laboratory Initiation Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Justin Shroyer

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$229,094
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to set up a biomechanics lab for teaching and research purposes. As such, it is a strong, imaginative project that enhances the infrastructure of the Department of Kinesiology and promotes economic development. The lab will be leveraged to increase external funding. The degree to which this enhances the Department as a whole will depend on how well faculty integrate this into their courses and research. The equipment will allow the Department to collaborate with footwear companies. Manufacturers will provide part of the training. Unfortunately the proposal does not mention a connection to or with K-12 education and/or a teacher preparation program and, as such, it does not qualify in the education category. Also, the evaluation is vague and almost non-existent. What measures will be used to determine success? Just scheduling a lab for class use does not actually indicate how successfully the lab is integrated. What deliverables will demonstrate whether or not this technology was successfully integrated into courses, resulting in improved student results? Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 20EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Learning through Design: A Curriculum for Teaching Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Douglas Williams

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 4 (of 5 points)
 A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)
 D.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 D.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 20 (of 23 points)
 B.3 18 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. 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>\$157,089</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$106,853</u>

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

This proposal seeks to enhance pre-service teachers' skills in teaching technological design to young children. Educational gaming is one of the emerging topics in technology integration in K-12 schools and the demand for STEM-related careers is critically important. As such, this proposal describes an imaginative project that will enhance the infrastructure of the College of Education (meeting two of the RFP objectives). Having said that, it is unclear how the proposal meets the other stated goals of the RFP such as promoting economic development, including funding from external agencies, and having a broad, lasting impact. Though the panel agrees that education efforts need to go beyond basic skills, teachers are held accountable for State standards. It is not clear how well this project dovetails with those standards. If the project is not directly related to achieving Louisiana standards, then teachers will not adopt it. Also, how will this technology-designed curriculum actually be used in schools versus within the pedagogical lab experience? The evaluation component is vague. The project is interesting and pre-service teachers need motivating science and math instruction, but without connections to the State standards and actual use in schools, the ability for this project to have a lasting impact is questionable. Because of limited funds available, the panel recommends partial funding and does not recommend funding for the iPads. Other reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 21EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Diverse Perspectives: Materials and Media in Support of Infusing
Multicultural Education Into the Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynn Clark

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 0 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 9 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$65,977
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$65,977

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

This proposal seeks to design a three-part workshop for multicultural resources. It is an innovative project that enhances the infrastructure of the College of Education and Human Development, and it is funded in part by external agencies, as well as internal departmental monies. The combination of programs and courses described, the collaboration of faculty involved, and the partnerships formed in support of this project (as seen in attached letters) are noteworthy. Likewise, the proposal is grounded in theory and research, and efforts have been made to sustain the studio, the library, and the lab. The proposal states that the University recently cancelled requirements for multicultural classes within its teacher preparation programs and therefore elements of those classes need to be systematized and infused into other courses. What happened to the materials used by the previous multicultural classes?

(Continued on the next page)

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

21EDU-11

The written objectives are generally clear. Are there plans to measure students' and instructors' attitudes, beliefs, actions before, during and after the introduction of the materials and activities? Are there plans to disseminate the materials beyond UL-M? Will the website be advertised statewide and nationally? How will this project promote economic development and broad impact? Despite these questions, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 22EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Excellence in Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Robertson

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No X
 A.2 2 (of 5 points)
 A.3 2 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 20 (of 23 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 0 (of 2 points)
 D.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 D.2b 4 (For NS/NE)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No

F. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$18,000
 Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to purchase around 500 children's books and around 150 new curricular materials to enhance the curriculum library at UL-M. The goal is understandable. Unfortunately, the proposal is very basic, sparsely written and not fully developed. The goals and objectives are clear, crisp, and concise. However, the description of the institution, the need behind the enhancement request, the integration of new materials with existing curricula, and the idea of measurable outcomes are either weak or missing. The proposal is not particularly imaginative; there is nothing in the need statement that grabs the reader and says this really needs funding. How these materials will be fully integrated into courses and actually affect instruction is not clear. Arguably, only those students preparing for language arts or possibly social studies positions would use these resources. It is not clear what percent of the students meet these criteria. This proposal will not promote economic development and/or result in a high level of eminence. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 23EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Breaking Barriers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 18 points)
B.3 8 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$68,217
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to provide resources and training in use of assistive technologies to pre-service and in-service teachers. Although the goal is certainly a good one, the scope of this proposal appears to be fairly limited. As a result, the notion of broader impact is questionable, as is the promotion of economic development. This proposal describes a nice collaboration between the University and the Region VIII Assistive Technologies Center, but it does not make clear how the assistive technologies will be used with general education students. It hints that assistive technologies will be used by future teachers for all their students, yet also makes the case that these technologies are not always offered to special education students in their IEPs. If the technologies are not widely available at the schools, how will teachers use them? The evaluation component is vague. Will standardized instruments or in-house ones be used and what are the measurable outcomes (attitudes versus enactment/real use/implementation and effect)? Also, there is no indication that this proposal has wider buy-in within the Department. Who else will be involved and how? The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 24EDU-11

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: University of New Orleans Urban Education Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Sharpton

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

**D. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 1 (of 2 points)
D.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
D.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 23 points)
B.3 18 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$323,980</u>	<u>\$49,973</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to establish a "sustainable" Urban Education Center that will improve the quality of education in high-need, urban schools through increased research activity, enhanced teacher education and leadership preparation programs, and ongoing dissemination activities for stakeholders engaged in urban education. It is well written and well defined. The situation in New Orleans is clearly described and University resources are delineated. How the Center will enhance the University is not so clear. There are letters of support from the State Board of Education, the Recovery School District, and the Charter School Association. However, there are no letters of support from outside universities even though several are listed as partners. For this to be truly successful, other universities need to be partners. It appears as though the Center would serve primarily to coordinate internal activities within UNO (e.g., on p. 7, the focus is on coordinating research among UNO faculty). Couldn't this happen without a center?

(Continued on the next page)

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

24EDU-11

The panel had several other questions. On page 7, who will identify and disseminate the research funds described in Objective 3? Will these funds be available to partner institutions or just UNO faculty? On page 8, once again the focus seems to be exclusively on UNO courses. If there are university partnerships, this should be part of a larger conversation about improving courses at member institutions (or at least across campus). Will the Urban Education Conference described on page 9 focus on UNO faculty and students or other institutions? Will urban educators across other parts of Louisiana and the country be recruited? Will the Center really change pedagogical approaches at UNO, or just course content? It is not clear that these reforms will be disseminated outside the University. The potential impact of a center like the one proposed can be enormous and far-reaching (the timing is critical and the need is great). The biggest question with this proposal has to do with "sustainability." Not only is the amount requested large, 75%+ of the requested funds are for salary purposes (e.g., for release time, summer pay, graduate assistants, consultants, local faculty, and presenters). What happens beyond year one and year two? What other external agencies are involved in funding this Center? How, when and will the Center collaborate with other urban education centers across the country (to learn from current research and best practices, avoid duplication, refine contextual nuances, etc.)? Funding is not recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Education
for the FY 2010-11 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration (Years)	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001-EDU-11	Warny,Sophie	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	NE	New Request	Making a Big Splash with Louisiana Fishes: A Three-tiered Education Program and Museum Exhibit	\$128,775.00	\$0.00	\$128,775.00
002-EDU-11	da Silva,Graziela	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	New Request	Equipment Support for the Implementation of a State of the Art Sedimentology Laboratory.	\$121,904.00	\$0.00	\$121,904.00
003-EDU-11	Garrison,Lawrence	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport	1	E	New Request	Improvements and Enhancements to School of Education Student Technology Lab	\$79,774.00	\$0.00	\$79,774.00
004-EDU-11	Beer,Glenn	Louisiana Tech University	1	NE	New Request	Rigor and Relevance in the Classroom: The Path to Educational Excellence	\$166,647.00	\$0.00	\$166,647.00
005-EDU-11	Bowers,Sharon Tiffany	Louisiana Tech University	1	NE	New Request	Building Capacity through Collaboration and Integration to Enhance Health and Education: Moving to Live and Learn	\$72,134.00	\$0.00	\$72,134.00
006-EDU-11	Harpel,Tammy	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	New Request	Enhancement of the SHARE Library with Parent and Family Life Education Materials	\$29,125.00	\$0.00	\$29,125.00
007-EDU-11	Heiden,Kathleen	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	New Request	Creative Designs: Integrating Instruction From the Lab into the Classroom	\$102,360.00	\$0.00	\$102,360.00
008-EDU-11	Kimbell-Lopez,Kimberly	Louisiana Tech University	1	NE	New Request	Literacy/Technology Model Classroom	\$139,752.00	\$0.00	\$139,752.00
009-EDU-11	McLeod-Porter,Delma	McNeese State University	1	E	New Request	Faculty Development to Meet the Educational Needs of Digital Learners	\$140,375.00	\$0.00	\$140,375.00
010-EDU-11	vavasseur,cynthia	Nicholls State University	1	E	New Request	iSupport Faculty: Retooling for an Online Future	\$134,365.00	\$0.00	\$134,365.00
011-EDU-11	Fazio-Griffith,Laura	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	New Request	A Play Therapy Resource Room and Lending Library for Graduate Counseling Students and School Counselors to enhance the learning and professional development experience.	\$7,763.00	\$0.00	\$7,763.00
012-EDU-11	Hancock,Robert	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	New Request	Educate to Innovate Louisiana	\$70,220.00	\$0.00	\$70,220.00
013-EDU-11	Klein-Ezell,Colleen	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	New Request	Project C.U.D.L.E. Up for: "M.O.R.E." (Creating Universally Designed Learning Environments "UP"GRADED to: Multi-Sensory Opportunities to Reach Everyone)	\$122,124.00	\$0.00	\$122,124.00
014-EDU-11	Landor-Ngemi,Jarrett	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	2	E	New Request	Multimedia for Educational Leadership	\$92,890.00	\$12,000.00	\$104,890.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration (Years)	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
015-EDU-11	Kaltenbaugh, Louise	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	NE	New Request	Southern University at New Orleans, Progression Recruitment Enhancement Plan Program dubbed SUNO COE PREPP	\$80,665.00	\$0.00	\$80,665.00
016-EDU-11	Esters,Irvin	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	New Request	Video Recording and Playback Technology for Counselor Education and Supervision	\$84,420.00	\$0.00	\$84,420.00
017-EDU-11	Hatchett,Andrew	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	New Request	Functional Fitness Laboratory: The Foundation for Student and Professional Advancement	\$104,848.00	\$0.00	\$104,848.00
018-EDU-11	Ma,Yuxin	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	NE	New Request	Enhancing Pre-service Teachers Conceptual Understanding of Elementary Mathematics and Related Teaching Strategies	\$146,230.00	\$0.00	\$146,230.00
019-EDU-11	Shroyer,Justin	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	New Request	Biomechanics Laboratory Initiation Program	\$229,094.00	\$0.00	\$229,094.00
020-EDU-11	Williams,Douglas	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	NE	New Request	Learning through Design: A Curriculum for Teaching Design	\$157,089.00	\$0.00	\$157,089.00
021-EDU-11	Clark,Lynn	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1	E	New Request	Diverse Perspectives: Materials and media in support of infusing multicultural education into the classroom	\$65,977.00	\$0.00	\$65,977.00
022-EDU-11	Robertson,Cynthia	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1	NE	New Request	Excellence in Education	\$18,000.00	\$0.00	\$18,000.00
023-EDU-11	Sivakumaran, Thillainatarajan	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1	E	New Request	Breaking Barriers	\$68,217.00	\$0.00	\$68,217.00
024-EDU-11	Sharpton,William	University of New Orleans	2	NE	New Request	University of New Orleans Urban Education Center	\$323,980.00	\$49,973.00	\$373,953.00

* The Enhancement Program RFP restricts requests for 2nd-year funding to no more than \$50,000

Total Number of Proposals submitted	24
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,686,728.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$61,973.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,748,701.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

**RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
PURCHASE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT**

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|--|
| YES ____ NO ____ | A.1 | Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.2 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.3 | To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)? |

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 56 points

- | | | |
|--|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal? |
| _____ of 18 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated? |
| _____ of 20 pts. | B.3 | To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged? |
| _____ of 2 pts. | B.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana? |
| _____ of 6 pts. | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project? |
| No Points Given, but this is a required component. | B.7 | Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals? |

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 6 pts. | C.1 | To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan and the items of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology? |
| _____ of 1 pt. | C.2 | Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it? |
| _____ of 3 pts. | C.3 | To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate? |

COMMENTS:

D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE--Total of 12 points

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 12 pts | D.1 | Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed? |
|-----------------|-----|---|

COMMENTS:

E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT--Total of 12 points

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 2 pts. | E.1 | To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)? |
|-----------------|-----|---|

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Depending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either E.2a OR E.2b:

- | | | |
|------------------|------|--|
| _____ of 10 pts. | E.2a | <u>For science/engineering proposals only:</u> To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana? |
| | E.2b | <u>For non-science/non-engineering proposals only:</u> To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana? |

COMMENTS:

BoRSF Enhancement RFP, FY 2010-11, Page 22

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 3 of 3

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned

YES ___ NO ___

G.1

If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

G. TOTAL SCORE (NOTE: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

___ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. 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: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Form 6.11, rev 2010)

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criteria under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—Total of 10 points

- | | | |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| YES _____ NO _____ | A.1 | Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.2 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.3 | To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)? |

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—Total of 66 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 23 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated? |
| _____ of 25 pts. | B.3 | To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence—or maintaining a current high level of eminence—commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged? |
| _____ of 2 pts. | B.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana? |
| _____ of 6 pts. | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project? |

C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—Total of 12 points

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 12 pts | C.1 | Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed? |
|-----------------|-----|---|

BoRSF Enhancement RFP, FY 2010-11, Page 24

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____ Page 2 of 3

COMMENTS:

D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT--Total of 12 points

_____ of 2 pts. D.1 To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Depending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either D.2a OR D.2b:

_____ of 10 pts. D.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?

D.2b For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

E. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES__NO__ F.1 If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

F. TOTAL SCORE (NOTE: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____ Page 3 of 3

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____ Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. 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: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____