FY 2007-08 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
REVIEW OF TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

I. Introduction

A four-member Two-Year Enhancement Program proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Katherine Boswell (chair), consultant on community college policy issues, Education Policy Associates; Dr. Russell Hamm, consultant on workforce issues, formerly with the U. S. Department of Labor; Ms. Arleen Arnsparger, consultant and project manager, MetLife Foundation Initiative on Student Success, the University of Texas at Austin; and Dr. Suzanne Beal, Vice President of Learning, Frederick Community College, met January 28-30, 2008, in Baton Rouge to evaluate forty (40) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions (formerly the Pilot Enhancement Program). All four individuals had participated on several previous two-year institution proposal review panels.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) the 40 proposals to be evaluated with their rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators and institutions involved, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2007-08 Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) a copy of the previous year's final panel report.

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

A total of $2,600,101 was requested by the applicants of the proposals submitted. After careful review, the panel recommended full funding for two (2) proposals and partial funding for fourteen (14) proposals, for a total expenditure of the $1,080,000 available during this cycle. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Table II lists three proposals that are recommended for funding if additional funds become available. Table III lists three proposals that are not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal immediately follows the tables. A listing of the institutions which comprise the LCTCS follows the reviews. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating form used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

Because of the overall high quality of proposals submitted in this cycle, the panel decided to use a score of 90 and above for proposals recommended for funding, and scores of 89, 88, and 87, respectively, for the proposals recommended for funding if additional funds are forthcoming. Proposals which achieved a score of less than 87 were not recommended for funding.

The panel assures the Board of Regents, the LCTCS, and community college campuses that each proposal was reviewed and discussed in great detail. Proposals from eight different institutions were reviewed, and at each institution one or more projects were funded. Each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP. Proposal budgets were carefully reviewed and any items viewed as unjustified, unnecessary, or inflated were reduced or eliminated as appropriate.

II. Commendations to the Louisiana Board of Regents

The panel once again commends the Louisiana Board of Regents for its continuing commitment to invest in the improvement of higher education at a time of significant fiscal constraints. We are pleased at the progress we see being made by the emerging Louisiana Community and Technical College System and the colleges. We have held up the Louisiana model of program enhancement to many other states in which we have worked 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 particularly pleased with the support this Enhancement Program is providing.

III. Recommendations to LCTCS

To address issues specifically relevant to LCTCS and the community and technical colleges, we recommend the following:

- We strongly encourage LCTCS to become more engaged in the Board of Regents Support Fund Planning and Advisory committees that set guidelines and recommend funding levels for the various funding programs.
- There needs to be a significant educational process throughout LCTCS' community colleges highlighting not only the Two-Year Enhancement Program, but also other grant opportunities available through the Board of Regents. This panel believes that many of the proposals that we evaluated could be equally competitive in other Regents' grant programs. We would also like to see a broader participation of academic departments within colleges and additional submissions from different colleges from across the two-year college community. There are some colleges that take full advantage of the Enhancement program, while others are missing out on a potentially viable source of State support. While current proposals showed evidence of significant improvement in grantsmanship, many submissions could still benefit from additional training in grant preparation, particularly in understanding the importance of expressing measurable outcomes and effective evaluation mechanisms.
- We intend to recommend some revisions to next year's RFP to clarify questions in proposal submissions that continually arise.

TABLE I
TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	98	015PEN-08	DELGADO	$147,272	$120,000
2	97	023PEN-08	LSU-EUNICE	$140,378	$130,000
3	96	003PEN-08	BRCC	$147,591	$120,000
4	95	006PEN-08	BPCC	$28,500	$26,500
4	95	016PEN-08	FLETCHER	$147,618	$120,000
6	94	018PEN-08	DELTA	$149,709	$145,000
7	93	004PEN-08	BPCC	$54,114	$44,114
7	93	012PEN-08	BPCC	$34,410	$20,000
7	93	031PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$100,803	$100,803
10	92	030PEN-08	RPCC, BPCC	$29,571	$27,071
11	91	024PEN-08	NUNEZ	$39,613	$20,000
11	91	040PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$60,500	$30,000
13	90	007PEN-08	BPCC	$49,150	$45,400
13	90	025PEN-08	NUNEZ	$149,615	$100,000
13	90	026PEN-08	RPCC, LTC	$26,549	$26,549
13	90	037PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$15,000	$4,563
			TOTALS:	**$1,320,393**	**$1,080,000**

TABLE II

TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT

PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
17	89	017PEN-08	DELTA	$44,419	$44,419
17	88	029PEN-08	RPCC	$17,972	$17,972
17	87	022PEN-08	LSU-EUNICE	$77,991	$68,000
			TOTALS:	**$140,382**	**$130,391**

TABLE III
TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
20	84	021PEN-08	LSU-EUNICE, LSU-A	$145,900	$0
21	81	008PEN-08	BPCC	$15,838	$0
22	80	011PEN-08	BPCC	$65,295	$0
22	80	019PEN-08	DELTA, LSU-AG CRDC, LTC	$148,232	$0
22	80	033PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$77,300	$0
22	80	039PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$15,422	$0
26	79	001PEN-08	BRCC	$54,960	$0
26	79	013PEN-08	BPCC	$20,000	$0
28	77	028PEN-08	RPCC	$33,695	$0
29	76	032PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$71,712	$0
30	75	027PEN-08	RPCC	$13,000	$0
30	75	035PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$100,725	$0
30	75	036PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$83,999	$0
33	70	020PEN-08	DELTA	$36,863	$0
34	68	010PEN-08	BPCC	$41,250	$0
35	65	009PEN-08	BPCC	$30,000	$0
36	64	005PEN-08	BPCC	$14,397	$0
37	61	002PEN-08	BRCC	$15,803	$0
37	61	034PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$30,324	$0
39	60	014PEN-08	BPCC	$24,611	$0
40	41	038PEN-08	SU-SHREVEPORT	$100,000	$0
			TOTALS:	**$1,139,326**	**$0**

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **001PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Idell Adams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Baton Rouge Community College Teacher Preparation Program

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 9 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 7 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $54,960
Recommended Amount: $0

BRCC is commended for making significant progress in establishing the A.S.T. degree. The panel recognizes the important challenges that remain in building and institutionalizing this complex and critically important academic program. However, the proposal raised some questions. Given the priority of this important and growing program, the proposal did not make a clear case for how the advising, curricular, and recruiting needs of 320 students were being met by a chair, six council members, and faculty working on an overload basis. This project has received two previous Enhancement program awards. Given the articulated need for enhanced teacher education programs in the region and State and the growth in student enrollments, it is unclear to the panel why the program is not yet sustainable. In addition, the proposal would have been stronger if it had contained more explicit and measurable student outcomes and a more vigorous evaluation metric. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **002PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amy V. Pinero

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Using Classroom Technology to Improve Student Engagement and Performance

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project		
B.a	15	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction		
B.b	5	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students		
B.c	5	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development		
B.d	3	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise		
B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources		
B.f	0	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation		
B.g	7	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination		
B.h	3	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s)		
B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative		
B.j	5	(of 10 points)
Checklist		
B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$15,803
	Recommended Amount:	$0

Although the applicant repeatedly suggests that the requested technology will improve retention, student participation, and course completion rates, etc., the panel found no data in the proposal to support these claims. Even though the proposal indicates that the PI has been using the technology in the classroom, again there are no data from this experience. Likewise, there are no data from the technology supplier. Although the goals of the proposal are worthy and supportable and the applicant's desire to incorporate more technology into teaching and learning is good, the proposal should contain some evidence supporting the choice of any technology. We are left to wonder why these particular courses have been selected for piloting the technology. Can measurable goals be set for increases in student retention, course participation, course completion rates, student satisfaction? Specifically, in the Needs section, there is no description of the project's impact on strategic goals. Likewise, in the Plan narrative the PI writes, "the use of interactive technology in the classroom will improve student performance", but the panel could find no data to support the expectations for student performance and success. The panel suggests that the PI add supporting data and resubmit the proposal in another funding cycle. The proposal is not recommended for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **003PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Younger

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Academic Support for BRCC Environmental and Engineering Programs That Address Louisiana Workforce Needs

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	25	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	10	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	5	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	7	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	1	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	8	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$147,591
	Recommended Amount:	$120,000

This continuation project expresses an excellent idea that epitomizes the partnership goals of the Two-Year Institution Enhancement Program. The NSF-funded Advanced Technology Education Center will open in 2009. This submission will provide funds to continue to enhance the Environmental and Engineering concentration A.A.S. in Science Technology programs as well as the preparation for the baccalaureate program in General Science. The proposal is exemplary: the goals of the project are clearly stated, and the proposed project incorporates all of the Guiding Principles of this program. Of particular note are the outreach to high schools and the evaluation criteria that include outcomes assessment measures. However, because of funding limitations, the panel is forced to reduce the budget modestly and recommends funding of $120,000 for this project, to be expended at the PI's discretion. The institutional match should be fully maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **004PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: April Bounds

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Writing Support Services in English Course Curricula

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 25 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $54,114
Recommended Amount: $44,114

Congratulations on a well-written and persuasive proposal for which the panel recommends funding of $44,114. A particular strength was the citation of the data regarding students' failure rates and laboratory use to describe and support the need for enhancing the writing lab's capabilities. The Needs statement was clear, compelling, and well stated. Further, the intention to embed lab usage within course designs should help drive more students into the lab where they will benefit from assistance. The Plan is practical and the timeline achievable. The training component is an indicator that the PI intends to prepare for a long-term commitment to this project. However, the panel is unsure how the college intends to support the costs for writing support specialists in the future, and that is a serious sustainability issue. The $10,000 recommended reduction in funds is to be taken from conference travel to the International Writing Centers Association, although we do not deny its value. Overall, well done!

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **005PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cindy Darby

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multicultural Resource Center

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 6 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 6 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 8 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $14,397
Recommended Amount: $0

While the panel commends Bossier Parish Community College for its recognition of the value of cultural diversity in the campus environment, we cannot recommend funding for this proposal as it is written. The proposal did reflect some of the findings from the literature that identify the positive impact of enhancing a student's curricular and extracurricular experiences with diverse learning methodologies and exposure to multicultural opportunities, but the project seemed to operate from the assumption: "buy it and they will come." There was little evidence of a concrete plan to actually incorporate these materials into the curriculum or to engage students in activities that would expose them to the resources that support student success. Successful proposals should clearly articulate how the investment of BoRSF monies will contribute to improved and measurable student outcomes and how those outcomes will be explicitly evaluated for determining their impact.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **006PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Earley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Impacting Community College Student Success Through Enhancements in Tutor Training and the Tutoring Process in the Learning Center

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	25	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	8	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	9	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	10	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	5	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	6	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	2	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	10	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$28,500
	Recommended Amount:	$26,500

BPCC wishes to enhance tutor training and the tutoring process to encourage more students to use available tutoring services and to increase student satisfaction with those services. This proposal offers multiple data sources to show the need for the proposed enhancements to tutoring services. Although some of the data regarding use of tutoring services seems to conflict, all data show that fewer than half of all BPCC students make use of them. The college is currently capitalizing on funding through the Lumina Foundation (Achieving the Dream Initiative) to target first-year students who are enrolled in gatekeeper courses in English, science and math that students often struggle to complete. That struggle frequently results in students choosing to leave college. The panel suggests that the PI consider strengthening specific areas of the Plan.

Proposal 006PEN-08 (cont'd.)

Under Impact on Curriculum and Instruction, there should be a closer link between the faculty and tutoring services that explicitly recognizes the connection between tutoring and student success and that intentionally builds it into course expectations and, perhaps, into course requirements (syllabus). Under Project Evaluation, faculty and tutoring services should track cohorts of students who receive tutoring vs. those who did not in terms of more than their motivation and active/passive learning, but in terms of progress in courses, grades, and course completion. The Project Dissemination section is insufficient: e-mail alerts and BPCC publications are not equal to discussions among faculty and staff about data that show results of enhanced tutoring. Face-to-face conversations with faculty are imperative if the goal is to have the faculty direct students to tutoring services. The $26,500 recommended is somewhat lower than the requested amount. The panel does not recommend funding meals for a staff retreat, but other costs may be reduced at the PI's discretion. The pledged institutional match should be fully maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **007PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Hoffman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Job Readiness and Welding Training for North Webster Parish

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $49,150
Recommended Amount: $45,400

This well-written proposal is an effective approach to a documented need for workforce development in North Webster Parish. The plan is clear, and the collaboration among the institutions involved is excellent. The proposal would have been stronger, however, if it had a letter of support from Reynolds Contracting, the employer identified in the proposal. While the panel supports the project, we cannot support paying the salaries of the welding instructors. With this limitation, the panel recommends $45,400 to fund the welding stations, wiring, torch rigs, and some supplies.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **008PEN-07**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Linda Hunter-Scott

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Education 099 - College Success Skills Course

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $15,838
Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal requests funds for the purchase of three Sympodium digital display boards for classroom use. Given the strengths and needs of competing proposals, the panel cannot recommend funding for this equipment at this time. In strengthening the proposal for future submission, the PI might consider compiling a stronger case for the assertion that the digital presentation of data in the classroom will directly affect student attendance. While a “futuristic” feel in the classroom might help, many other issues affect attendance. Further, there appears to be a lack of faculty engagement and commitment to this project. The proposal does not make clear that the quality and content of the course(s) will change or improve -- just the presentation. Overall, although the proposal was complete and well written, it could not compete with more compelling needs presented in other proposals.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **009PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Della Jeter

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Resources to Assist Project MOMS Clients

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 6 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 9 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 6 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. 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: $30,000
Recommended Amount: $0

The panel does not recommend funding this proposal, even though Bossier Parish Community College is commended for its commitment to providing educational opportunities for the neediest citizens in its service area. The Project MOMS initiative seems to be a valuable resource in assisting some of the most vulnerable individuals achieve access to badly needed education and training opportunities. Unfortunately, the panel is unable to recommend funding for the proposal as written. While the proposal makes a good case for need, there is no evidence to support the assertion that the activities of the grant, particularly the provision of childcare and transportation to these students, will directly result in the identified learning outcomes of improved comprehension and proficiency in GED courses or successful test completion. Their attendance will improve, but the PI has not supported the claim that attendance in and of itself is enough to ensure improved learning outcomes. Student participation in courses is obviously critical, but insufficient. The stated objective of a five percent increase in the number of students participating seems too modest, given the infusion of funding. There is also no information about how this program will be sustained once the funds from this one-year grant are expended. One underlying requirement of the Enhancement Program is to demonstrate how the project will be sustained after the funding ends.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **010PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tamika Logan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Recruiting Adults at Work

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 6 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 4 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $41,250
Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal appropriately focuses on bringing more educationally under-represented adult learners into higher education. It details marketing and recruiting strategies to attract them, and makes it possible for them to gain certificates and degrees quickly through portfolios and challenge exams. The project also involves partnerships with companies in hopes of attracting and supporting more adult learners as they seek to earn credentials necessary for their current jobs or to prepare them for future careers. However, although the proposal outlines a recruitment team approach with corporate liaisons, it is unclear how the partnerships with companies that are expected to help the team achieve better recruitment of adult learners will be developed. The budget lacks specifics about how funds will be expended for supplies, training, and external evaluation. The dissemination plan is weak, with limited information-sharing. We do not recommend funding the project now, but suggest that the PI address the identified weak areas and resubmit it in the next cycle. One source of information is Harper College in Palatine, Illinois, which offers a rapidly growing adult fast-track degree program that involves strategic partnerships with area companies.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **011PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Powell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Computer Technology

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $65,295
Recommended Amount: $0

The Bossier Parish Community College Telecommunications Division's request for computer workstations appears to be an equipment replacement request that should be funded from the college's operating budget. The need for the equipment is demonstrated and the proposed plan is straightforward; however, this Enhancement Program discourages use of funds for ongoing operating expenses or to supplant what is clearly the responsibility of the operating budget. This proposal also does not demonstrate how the new stations would be an enhancement rather than a routine upgrade to an already established laboratory. Therefore, the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **012PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Powell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Training Students to be Avid Editors

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 25 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $34,410
Recommended Amount: $20,000

Congratulations on a well written and persuasive proposal for which the panel recommends funding of $20,000 for the purchase of Avid editing equipment. We acknowledge the strength of the programs within the Telecommunications Division and the contributions they have made to the industries they serve. Most certainly the Divison's programs have successfully provided students with the skills required to make them competitive for available television and film production jobs. The panel does notice that, in response to our comments in several previously submitted proposals, you have crafted a well-written and compelling Needs case. Certainly the technical changes in broadcast format that are due to occur in February 2009 require your program to adjust. While partial funding of $20,000 is recommended, the panel relies on your team to decide how best to apply the monies. For example, we recommend that you review your plans to send five professionals for training when, possibly, one or two could attend and return to the college to train colleagues. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **013PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kimberly Pullen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Liberal Arts and Medical Science Materials for the Library

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 7 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $20,000
Recommended Amount: $0

Regretfully, the panel is unable to recommend funding for this proposal to purchase additional liberal arts and medical science materials for the BPCC library. The proposal included a much stronger Needs statement than in previous submissions. We appreciated the evidence of increased faculty involvement in the selection process. Unfortunately, in this year's competition there were far more worthy projects than available funds, and we were forced to make difficult choices. The projects that were ultimately selected for funding typically made a very strong case accompanied by evidence for how this investment would directly improve the quality of student instruction and lead to improved student outcomes. The panel encourages the team to work with faculty in the appropriate academic departments to identify specific enrichment materials that can be integrated directly in the curriculum and that are demonstrated to enrich and improve student learning and performance; e.g., perhaps there is a medical database that is invaluable in supporting student learning in a particular allied health field that will directly contribute to improved student pass rates on nursing licensure exams. Incorporating the specific requests of disciplinary faculty who are committed to utilizing and evaluating these materials and stating in what ways additional library investments will support the academic success of students would make the proposal more competitive. Another key component is an evaluation mechanism that goes beyond the process objective, "We will purchase x materials by a certain date." Successful proposals have measurable objectives that are tied to concrete improvements; student or faculty satisfaction surveys are not meaningful evaluation measures.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **014PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Womack

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology for Adult Learners

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	10	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	5	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	5	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	5	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	4	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	4	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	1	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	6	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. 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:**	$24,611
	Recommended Amount:	$0

BPCC's computer lab for the community education program is outdated. The PI wishes to purchase computers and other equipment to serve learners in non-credit classes as well as faculty. The proposal indicates that a portion of the approximately 950 students served by community education take classes that require computer technology. There are vague references to the potential impact on credit students, but no specific details are provided about how the lab will be built into course offerings for credit students and used by faculty who teach credit courses. There is no indication that students in the community education program will progress into credit programs, and there are no professional development opportunities for instructors who must learn how best to use the equipment to be purchased. The proposed evaluation, which does not incorporate any learning objectives, is limited to observing increases in enrollment and the satisfaction of students who use the computers. More significantly, a community education program generally is designed to produce revenue and, in the best of circumstances, provides revenue that will enhance the credit side of an institution. This proposal does not make the case that the community education program can become self-sustaining and support its own upgrades. While serving non-credit students is undoubtedly worthwhile, the panel cannot recommend supporting such a computer lab at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **015PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharmaine Hughes

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Trauma Training Using Technology and Telemedicine (T-Med)

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 98 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $147,272
Recommended Amount: $120,000

This is an exciting proposal to enhance both the quality and outreach of EMS training that is effective in several dimensions. The critical need for emergency medical training was established, and the proposed solution — a high-tech mobile training unit that allows for training of high school students as well as professionals at their place of employment — is excellent. One unique aspect of the project is equipping the unit with telemedicine capability, making it useful to the Tulane Life Support Training Center as well as to Delgado, thus creating a partnership that spans the range of emergency medical training. Additionally, this proposal capitalizes on a previous award that provided Delgado with an EMS vehicle. The panel enthusiastically supports this exemplary proposal; however, we must recommend a modest reduction in the budget because of funding limitations. Partial funding of $120,000 is recommended and may be expended at the PI's discretion. The institional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended reduction.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **016PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: J. Mike Hamner

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development and Implementation of a Fluid Mechanics Course and Training Laboratory

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	22	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	8	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	10	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	5	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	7	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	3	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	10	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$147,618
	Recommended Amount:	$120,000

Congratulations to Fletcher Technical Community College for a well-written and persuasive proposal for which the panel recommends funding of $120,000. A particular strength of the proposal was the presentation of data regarding the workforce needs and worker benefits in the oil and gas industries that are vital to the area economy. The occupational projections and the clear case made for increasing the numbers of workers was impressive. We further note the good documentation of industry support, the thorough budget and explanation, and the overall strength of good writing. Somewhat disappointing, however, was the estimated increase in the number of newly trained workers you expect to prepare — just ten percent above current numbers. Given the importance of this new lab and the capabilities it will offer, we hope you exceed this expectation. The panel is unsure why the biographical sketch of the principal investigator was missing from the proposal and why it was replaced with that of another staff member. While funds recommended fall short of the request, the panel relies on your team to decide how best to apply them. The institutional match should be fully maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **017PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Bowman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Using Podcasting to Enhance Learning at Delta

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	23	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	9	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	9	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	9	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	4	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	4	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	3	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	8	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$44,419
	Recommended Amount:	$44,419 (if additional funds become available)

The panel commends Delta for an excellent proposal and recommends an award of $44,419 if additional funds are made available. We recognize the work that went into revising and resubmitting the proposal. Unfortunately, the availability of limited funds in this year's program and the compelling educational needs elsewhere make it impossible to fund all worthy proposals. If additional funding is not made available, we strongly encourage you to resubmit it. The projects that were ultimately selected for funding typically have made a very strong case accompanied by evidence for how this investment of funds will directly improve the quality of student instruction and lead to improved student outcomes. We encourage your team to work with faculty in the appropriate academic departments at the college to identify specific examples of how they intend to incorporate podcasting into their curricula, how it will enrich the learning experience, and how they can measure that improved student learning and performance. We commend the PI for the Needs assessment that supports your arguments for the widespread use of MP3 players among students. Is there any evidence in the literature from other institutions currently using podcasts that supports your assertion that students will utilize podcasts for learning activities, not just for entertainment? Incorporating the specific requests of disciplinary faculty who are committed to utilizing the technology and evaluating how it supports the academic success of their students will make this proposal better. The PI should develop an evaluation mechanism that goes beyond process objectives such as course syllabi that evidence the use of the equipment. Successful proposals have measurable objectives tied to concrete outcomes that go far beyond a student or faculty satisfaction survey. You might consider comparing the retention and performance of students among different sections of the same course that do and do not incorporate the technology to evaluate student performance differences; that kind of evidence will make for a compelling proposal that has potential for dissemination far beyond Delta Community College.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **018PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hilda Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Nursing Education in the Louisiana Delta Region

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 21 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 4 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 94 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $149,709
Recommended Amount: $145,000

The panel recommends that the college receive the largest award in this cycle ($145,000). This strong proposal clearly establishes the need for the requested equipment in a medically underserved service area. With Delta's recently approved candidacy for SACS accreditation, the college is now on a fast track to create a fully operational nursing program by January 2009 so it can graduate skilled nurses who are able to move quickly into currently available nursing positions in the area. The requested equipment will provide advanced technology and learning tools for the new nursing program that will prepare nurses at the level needed by community health providers. The panel commends the PI for creating a facility that will serve Delta students, nursing faculty, and community-based nurses, offering advanced training opportunities for all. Missing from this proposal, however, are letters of support from area healthcare providers and community representatives that address the need for advanced nursing training and the role of this type of facility. We are somewhat unfamiliar with Louisiana demographics and workforce shortages; therefore, we trust that the proposal accurately describes the area's needs. However, in all proposals Delta should strive to provide supporting documentation that will help reviewers judge all the merits of the proposal. We rely on the PIs to determine where to make cuts in the budget to accommodate the decrease in funds awarded. We express our good wishes as Delta designs and delivers a first-class nursing program. The institutional match should be maintained as pledged.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **019PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College; LSU AG Center Rural Development Center; Louisiana Technical College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Barbara Jones

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increased Accessibility to Higher Education in Northeast Louisiana

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $148,232
Recommended Amount: $0

This collaboration among Delta, LTC Region 8, and the LSU Agricultural Center for Region 8 requests equipment to expand dual enrollment programs offered through Blackboard and interactive video. This proposal had several strengths. The need was well documented and the potential for expansion of the current program was clearly articulated. The panel particularly liked the effective partnership among the higher education institutions and the secondary school system. However, the proposal would have been stronger if the impact on the curriculum were much more specifically delineated; e.g., which courses will be delivered in what formats? Because of the strengths of many other proposals this year, the competition for funds has been particularly fierce. Therefore, the panel cannot recommend funding the proposal now, but suggests that it be resubmitted next year with a more fully developed curricular plan.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **020PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Don Wheeler

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Weather from Space

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 3 (of 5 points)
A.b 2 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $36,863
Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal requests equipment that will provide immediate and comprehensive weather monitoring for both Delta Community College students and the community. Given the strengths and needs of competing proposals, the panel cannot recommend funding for this project. However, in strengthening the proposal for a future request, the PI should consider building a stronger case that students need access to real-time weather data. It is likely that the pedagogical concepts and an understanding of weather and the skill to prognosticate weather events might be taught from the data currently available on the Web and from other government sources. Further, the PI noted that students might achieve employment in government-based weather, security, or civil defense offices/agencies, but provided no supporting explanation or data for these possibilities. Overall, though the proposal was complete and well written, it could not compete with more compelling needs presented in other proposals.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **021PEN-08**

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul R. Fowler

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding Louisiana State University at Eunice's Pathway to Success to the Learning Center for Rapides Parish and Louisiana State University at Alexandria

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 19 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 9 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 9 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 6 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $145,900
Recommended Amount: $0

The panel commends the PI and his team for a superb proposal and demonstrated commitment to student success. Unfortunately, the availability of limited funds and other compelling educational needs make it impossible to fund all worthy proposals. The panel considered many strong and well-supported proposals this year; reluctantly, we are unable to recommend funding for this proposal. We applaud the outstanding success LSU-E is demonstrating in your Pathways to Success program and recognize the importance of providing similar opportunities for students at LSU-A and in Rapides Parish. You clearly understand the importance of measuring student outcomes and the diverse support systems that contribute to student success. The question/concern that ultimately swayed us was whether in this particular request Enhancement funds were being asked to fund a core academic program that should be supported by tuition and State funds, particularly regarding the Regents' decision to expand LSU-E's mission to provide developmental education to sister institutions in light of policy changes at the State level. We do not question the need for this project or its critical importance; we are just unconvinced that Enhancement monies would not be supplanting State funds.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **022PEN-08**

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gloria P. Hernandez

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mathematics Education Laboratory at LSUE

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. 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: $77,991
Recommended Amount: $68,000 (if additional funds become available)

This is a strong proposal that offers a good description of learning needs that would be addressed by this new lab. One strength is that the lab would be used by area teachers, school children, and UL Lafayette students. An additional strength is the applicant's aggressive pursuit of additional matches and free materials from publishers. However, the limited availability of funds and the widespread and compelling educational needs throughout the State make it impossible to fund all worthy proposals. We recommend funding of $68,000 for this project if additional funds become available, deleting the non-specialized furniture. If funding is not available this year, we encourage LSU-Eunice to resubmit in the next funding cycle and, in the interim, consider seeking other sources for basic classroom furniture and other equipment that is not specialized and that any potential BoRSF award would be unlikely to support. The panel also suggests preparing a more aggressive project dissemination plan that is not limited to one article published in a newsletter.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **023PEN-08**

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Fred Neal Landry

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana Evidence Recovery Laboratories: Centers of Excellence (LaERL)

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 25 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 97 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $140,378
Recommended Amount: $130,000

This well-written proposal will provide a significant enhancement to LSU-E's current programs. Specifically, it will augment the A.A.S. programs in crime scene management. This proposal further establishes the need by identifying potential audiences — current students in several curricula as well as public safety officers. Exemplary partnerships with local law enforcement and the high school also highlight this proposal. Finally, the evaluation focuses on student success as well as student perception. Because of limited funds, however, the panel recommends slightly reduced funding of $130,000 for this excellent project. Support Funds may be expended at the PI's discretion, and the pledged institutional matching funds may be reduced proportionally to the reduced award. The panel considers this proposal to be a model for all others that are submitted in this program in the future. The Board staff should make this proposal available to any community college that requests information on how to prepare a winning proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **024PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dawn Ruth

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mobile Computer Lab

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $39,613
Recommended Amount: $20,000

This project's plan is to extend computer services to students, and the panel recommends funding of $20,000 for the project. We acknowledge the challenges facing Nunez as it seeks to provide support for increasing student access to technology. If space is available, you might consider investing in desktop rather than laptop computers since desktops are much lower in price. In future applications, a stronger, data-based case should be made to demonstrate the need for assistance. It is unclear in this proposal how many students access computers on a daily basis, if a shortage actually exists, and/or if adding more computers will make a positive difference for the student body. Too, we are unsure if the plan to move these computers between classrooms is viable and if faculty will install, de-install, move and install again over the long term. While we do not deny the needs of the lab as presented, limited funds prohibit fully funding it. Recommended funds may be expended at the PI's discretion.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **025PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Culinary Arts Program in a Community College

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 22 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 9 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 9 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 9 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $149,615
Recommended Amount: $100,000

The panel recommends that Nunez be awarded partial funding of $100,000 to be expended at the PI's discretion to support this proposal to expand its Culinary Arts program to a neighboring parish. We recognize that the amount is only two-thirds of the original request, but this year it was more difficult than ever to fund all worthy proposals, and all but two of those that were recommended for funding have budgets that were significantly reduced. We commend Nunez's efforts to rebuild the academic and workforce preparation activities in light of Hurricane Katrina, building on strengths, and meeting the workforce training and education needs of the community. The proposal would have been even stronger if it had included more concrete numbers of students who would be trained, and what kinds of salaries graduates of the program might command in the local economy. One other area of weakness was the lack of letters of support or collaboration from the local hospitality industry, given their significant needs that you articulated. We do encourage you to seek private-sector contributions to make up the difference between the requested and recommended funds.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **026PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College; Louisiana Technical College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Henry Mark Smith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creating Hybrid Courses with Multiple Presentation Forms in the Sciences

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 9 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 9 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $26,549
Recommended Amount: $26,549

This proposal both increases the availability of science curricula to a broader range of potential students and enhances the quality of the curricula to better prepare them for advanced courses in allied health and other science-based fields. With greatly expanded online offerings, diverse students who might not otherwise be able to access on-site classes will be better able to complete a comprehensive degree program at a distance or in the event of another natural disaster. The collaboration among the faculty in the disciplines is also strong. The panel suggests that the PI give attention to the following questions: What professional development will be offered for faculty or others to effectively incorporate materials and innovative teaching strategies into curriculum and course delivery, and how will they be made available? The proposal does not make it clear how faculty will strengthen teaching and learning other than by using the purchased materials. What information about the availability of necessary technologies for e-learning of students in hybrid courses do you have? Do they currently have the equipment and technological skills to use computer-based programs? Will some additional support and/or training be needed to make this possible? Project evaluation that incorporates student learning outcomes is very important to measure the success of your efforts. Extensive project dissemination is indicated in the proposed plan. The panel encourages multiple approaches to ensure meaningful discussions of the resulting data, not just printed information that gathers dust. We applaud the substantial institutional match and collaboration with other institutions indicated in the proposal and recommend full funding of $26,549.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **027PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Henry Mark Smith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Resources for Special Populations in Washington Parish

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $13,000
Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal would provide resources to supplement science courses offered at the Washington Parish Correctional Institution. Currently, science course offerings are limited because of lack of materials for laboratory experiments. The proposal has several strengths: the need is clearly established, and the project builds upon a program currently in place. The proposal highlights the impact of higher education on recidivism, and the budget is modest. However, the proposal also contains major flaws. Surprisingly, there is no endorsement from Washington Parish Correctional Institute and no evidence that the kinds of laboratory courses with the necessary equipment would be allowed at the institution. The panel fully endorses the importance of correctional education; however, we are concerned that a degree program in General Studies is not the best preparation for the workforce. The inmate-students would be better served if a career program specifically tied to workforce needs were to be offered. No funding is recommended for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **028PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Henry Mark Smith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Three Dimensional Visualization in the Sciences

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)
A.b 0 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 25 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 2 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 2 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$33,695
	Recommended Amount:	$0

This proposal for the purchase of equipment that will provide three dimensional technology in science courses is not recommended for funding. The panel acknowledges that the proposal is well composed, and we agree with the PI's assertion that “this population of at-risk students needs classroom teaching that incorporates innovative technological resources . . ., best teaching practices, etc.”; however, we are not convinced that the globe is necessarily the best technological investment that might be made. Even though the proposal is complete and well written, it could not compete against more compelling needs presented in other proposals. In strengthening this proposal for future submission, consider building a stronger case to explain why this particular globe is of greater value than other pedagogical methods — perhaps computer-based simulations — for interesting and motivating students.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **029PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edward Thompson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Technological Means for Educational Enhancement for ADA Students at the Community College: The Smart Board as a Classroom Tool

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 21 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 9 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 9 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 9 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $17,972
Recommended Amount: $17,972 (if additional funds become available)

The panel commends the RPCC Mathematics Department for a strong proposal and recommends it for full funding if additional funds become available. If additional funds are not made available, we encourage the PI to resubmit the proposal in the future. The projects that were ultimately selected for funding typically made a very strong case accompanied by evidence for how this investment of funds would directly improve the quality of student instruction and lead to improved student outcomes. We encourage you to work with the math and English faculty to identify specific examples of how they intend to incorporate the Smart Board to implement innovative approaches to the delivery of instruction that would enrich the learning experience of struggling students, and how they can measure improved student learning and performance. We commend the measurable goals identified in the project plan. Is there any evidence in the literature from other institutions that use Smart Boards to support the assertion that ADA students will benefit from the interventions you are considering? Your evaluation mechanism should go beyond process objectives documenting the purchase of materials by a certain date or course syllabi that evidence the use of the equipment. Successful proposals in the current competitive environment have measurable objectives that are tied to concrete outcomes that go far beyond a student or faculty satisfaction survey. You should consider comparing the retention and performance of students between different sections of the same course that do and do not incorporate the technology to evaluate student performance differences. That kind of evidence will make for a compelling proposal that has potential for dissemination far beyond River Parishes Community College.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **030PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College; Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Vavasseur

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: PRAXIS Student Center

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 22 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 7 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $29,571
Recommended Amount: $27,071

This excellent proposal is strengthened by the collaboration between River Parishes Community College and Bossier Parish Community College as they seek ways to improve student access to the PRAXIS exam, increase students' ability to pass and achieve needed certification, and expand students' opportunities to continue in teacher education programs at the university level. The proposal clearly identifies the need for more highly qualified and prepared teaching candidates in Louisiana. The information about the numbers of teachers who continue to renew temporary certificates because of difficulties passing the PRAXIS exam is compelling. The panel appreciates the efforts made to find reliable data about student success on the PRAXIS I exam suggesting that student success may be low. The requested software contains assessment tools that make it possible to evaluate student knowledge before and after the course. The face-to-face summer institute is an additional strength of the proposal. Evaluation and dissemination plans are both comprehensive. The panel recommends funding of $27,071 for this proposal, trusting that the PI will find ways to trim some costs. The institutional match, however, should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **031PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John I. B. Alak

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development and Implementation of Hands-on Laboratory Exercises to Re-enforce Instructional Delivery at SUSLA

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	25	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	10	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	0	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	5	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	3	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	10	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$100,803
	Recommended Amount:	$100,803

This well-written proposal requests funds to purchase laboratory materials for the established Associate in Medical Laboratory Technology program. The need for well-prepared allied health professionals is clearly identified. Currently there is “minimal augmentation” of classroom instruction with lab experiences. Rather than an enhancement, the laboratory materials requested are very basic to a program designed to prepare technicians for the workforce. Because of SUSLA's critical need, the panel recommends full funding for this request ($100,803).

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **032PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Arcenia Anthony

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Get Ready for the Opportunity to Work (GROW)

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 4 (of 5 points)
A.b 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 18 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $71,712
Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal is well written, and the need to extend literacy training and job-readiness training is evident; however, the panel was offered other proposals that appeared to benefit more students and in programs that demonstrated more convincingly the ability to be sustained. This project is designed to serve only twenty students, and the PI did not explain how the program will continue after one year of funding. The panel believes that other college and university options exist to assist GED students. Perhaps in future submissions the PI should demonstrate how GROW will be incorporated into the permanent fabric of Southern University-Shreveport. We acknowledge the challenges of serving this student population and salute your commitment to do so, but cannot recommend funding for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **033PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Orella R. Brazile

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthen Library Resource Collections to Support Health and Medical Science Program

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 22 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 4 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 6 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $77,300
Recommended Amount: $0

Regrettably, the panel is unable to recommend funding for the purchase of additional health and medical science materials for the library. Even though the Needs statement was compelling, projects ultimately selected for funding typically made a strong case accompanied by evidence for how the investment of funds would directly improve the quality of student instruction and lead to improved student outcomes. Given the increasing competition for funds, we encourage your team to work with faculty in the appropriate academic departments to identify specific enrichment materials that can be integrated directly in the curriculum and that are demonstrated to enrich and improve student learning and performance; e.g., perhaps there is a medical database that is invaluable in supporting student learning in a particular allied health field that will directly contribute to improved student pass rates on the nursing licensure exams. Incorporating the specific requests of disciplinary faculty who are committed to utilizing and evaluating how additional library investments support the academic success of their students makes a proposal more competitive. The evaluation mechanism should extend beyond process objectives. Successful proposals should contain measurable objectives that are tied to concrete improvements. Student and faculty satisfaction surveys are not meaningful evaluation measures.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **034PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carneta Cooper

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Southern University Upstage Drama Troupe

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 1 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $30,324
Recommended Amount: $0

The proposal makes clear that 100% of surveyed SUSLA students from a variety of departments indicate that they favor the formation of a campus theatre group, and that 90% said they would pay to see a production performed by their peers. The proposal indicates that plays are currently being performed at Southern, so opportunities for participation already exist. It appears that the addition of the equipment and more formal opportunities to participate in a drama troupe would promote greater participation in various aspects of theatre production and perhaps a higher level of professionalism within theatre arts. The collaboration with the SUSLA Service Learning Center where students earn college credit for volunteering with the Shreveport Little Theatre is commendable. However, that option also appears to be currently available to students. There is no indication of how these enhancements would be incorporated into any course redesign within theatre or related courses. Using Enhancement Program funds to support travel for the theatre manager and a select group of students to participate in national competitions serves a very limited group, and it is not immediately apparent how this positively impacts teaching and learning more broadly. Although the panel appreciates the desire to enhance SUSLA's theatre program, we do not recommending funding for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **035PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joyce Cottonham

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Foreign Language Classroom with Computer-Assisted Instruction

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	15	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	5	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	5	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	0	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	7	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	3	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	10	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$100,725
	Recommended Amount:	$0

This proposal would expand and update SUSLA's language laboratory by upgrading software, adding computer-aided instruction, and creating 20 new computer stations to support enrollment growth. While the need is well demonstrated, the proposal is problematic. There is no full-time faculty member in the foreign language department, suggesting either that there is a lack of institutional commitment or the proportional growth in language instruction is not as significant as in other areas. In addition, the proposal would have been much stronger if it had referenced the workforce demands for language instruction that are so important to competition in the global economy. The panel does not recommend funding for this project at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **036PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ilko Iliev

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of e-Education Through Faculty Development at Southern University at Shreveport

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 3 (of 5 points)
A.b 2 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 7 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $83,999
Recommended Amount: $0

This project is designed to enhance e-education through faculty development. Given the strengths and needs of competing proposals, this proposal could not be recommended for funding, even though the panel acknowledges that it is well-written and the goal of enhancing distance education useful. The explanation of why e-learning initiatives and faculty capabilities have been largely unsuccessful was indeed illuminating: “Changes in academic affairs, faculty resistance . . . certification, . . . departmental infrastructure,” etc., all point to issues that are unlikely to be solved by the funds this proposal requests. A much higher level of interest and commitment on behalf of both faculty and college leadership is required to confront the challenges that limit distance education’s growth. No evidence that shows an emerging faculty engagement in the project was presented; to go forward without such commitment is risky. The PI might consider an approach that rewards faculty with a computer and support equipment after each demonstrates a new capability and a willingness to offer e-learning, a less risky scenario. We suggest that you seek the required engagement of staff and resubmit the proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **037PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Teresa A. Jones

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening African America Male Student Success Through Mentoring

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 22 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 9 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 9 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 4 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $15,000
Recommended Amount: $4,563

Despite strong competition and limited funds in this year's program, the panel is pleased to recommend partial funding of $4,563 for this proposal to support African American male student success through mentoring. It was impossible to fund all worthy proposals. The projects that were selected for funding typically made a very strong case accompanied by evidence for how the investment would directly improve the quality of student instruction and lead to improved student outcomes. Even though the panel was unable to recommend full funding, in light of the significant needs of the target population, the modest award of $4,563 will at least allow you to support some transportation expenses and supplies to launch a pilot program. We encourage you to seek additional internal and external resources among business or civic groups to support this important outreach effort. The PI should note that the words "in kind" on the budget's lines for institutional match funds are insufficient. There should be a dollar amount recorded and a full explanation of the source and kind of funds in the budget narrative.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **038PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joseph I. Orban

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digitilization of Biology and Chemistry Class Rooms to Enhance Instruction at Southern University Shreveport

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project
B.a 10 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction
B.b 3 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students
B.c 3 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development
B.d 3 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise
B.e 5 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources
B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation
B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination
B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)
B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative
B.j 2 (of 10 points)

Checklist
B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 41 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $100,000
Recommended Amount: $0

The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal because it lacks adequate information in important areas. For example, in the Impact on Curriculum and Instruction section, ". . . the proposed project is expected to have positive impact on curricular offerings and instructional methods . . ." Specifically, how will use of this technology be incorporated into course design? How will faculty learn how to effectively use the technology to enhance instruction? A training workshop focused on how to use components of the technology is insufficient to help faculty learn how to use the technology effectively to bring course content alive for students and engage them in the content. The proposal does not describe any plan to redesign courses or offer ongoing professional development in instructional strategies. Is there evidence that incorporating this type of technology leads to improved student success? Successful proposals in this competitive funding environment include data to document a compelling need, findings from research that show why the particular approach was selected, and an evaluation that is connected to established learning outcomes in addition to grades. The proposal offers no data to support its request related to hoped-for outcomes in each section. The panel is knowledgeable about the merits of incorporating technology into classroom instruction and welcomes proposals that are designed to do that effectively. We suggest that the PI address these weaknesses and resubmit the proposal in another cycle.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **039PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raegan Stearns

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Capturing Cooper Town: Martin Luther King, Jr. Neighborhood Oral History Project

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	25	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	5	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	5	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	5	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	0	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	7	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	3	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	10	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$15,422
	Recommended Amount:	$0

This oral history project is a well-conceptualized, laudable effort. In the face of changing demographics, the project would document the history of Shreveport's Cooper Town neighborhood, a culturally significant endeavor that should be undertaken. However, the Two-Year Institution Enhancement Program does not appear to be the appropriate resource for doing so, especially given the increasing competition for funds. The project as described is primarily an archival process rather than an instructional program. While the proposal indicates that students will be trained as interviewers, the project's curricular role is not fully articulated. The primary budget expense — purchase of new computers for an open computer laboratory in the library — is not clearly justified. The panel urges the PI to seek funding for this proposal from the Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities or other State or regional/local arts or humanities councils.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **040PEN-08**

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College - Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tuesday M. Williams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening Student Success Opportunities Through Career Services Internship Initiative

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project B.a	23	(of 25 points)
Impact on Curriculum and Instruction B.b	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Quality of Students B.c	10	(of 10 points)
Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development B.d	10	(of 10 points)
Faculty and Staff Expertise B.e	10	(of 10 points)
Additional Funding Sources B.f	5	(of 5 points)
Project Evaluation B.g	5	(of 7 points)
Project Dissemination B.h	3	(of 3 points)
Evidence of Collaboration(s) B.i	0	(of 0 points)
Budget Page and Budget Narrative B.j	5	(of 10 points)
Checklist B.k	0	(of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$60,500
	Recommended Amount:	$30,000

The panel recommends $30,000 for this innovative and unique proposal for a career-oriented, paid student internship program. We acknowledge the numerous challenges facing the targeted population as the students strive to become comfortable and successful in professional career environments. We believe that this program will provide that "entrance" and will help grow these young people's confidence as they compete in the work world. Further, we acknowledge and applaud the collaboration of all the partners — especially the city — to make this work. However, we are concerned that no substantive plan that demonstrates how this program will be sustained and grown was offered. While we agree with the needs as presented, Enhancement Program funds are very limited. Perhaps fewer individuals could be served as you test the efficacy of the ideas expressed. The panel relies on the PI to decide how best to reduce the budget to match the award. However, the panel noticed that the budget page contained just the words "in kind" on the lines designated for institutional matching funds. An amount should have been specified for each budget item and an explanation of the source and kind of funds pledged should have been part of the budget narrative.

LCTCS Campuses

Campuses of the Louisiana Technical College (updated August 2006)

Louisiana Technical College – Region 1

Vice Chancellor and Provost: Kim Rugon
Phone: (504) 736-7274 Fax: (504) 736-7007
e-mail: krugon@theltc.net

LTC Region 1 Campuses:

Jefferson (Cynthia Williams, Campus Dean)
Phone: (504) 736-7072 Fax: (504) 736-7120

Sidney N. Collier[1]

Slidell[2]

West Jefferson (Danneal Jones, Campus Dean)
Phone: (985) 361-6464 Fax: (504) 361-6226
e-mail: dajones@theltc.net

Louisiana Technical College – Region 2

Regional Director: Dr. Kay McDaniel
Phone: (225) 359-9204 Fax: (225) 359-9206
e-mail: kmcdaniel@theltc.net

LTC Region 2 Campuses:

Baton Rouge (Dr. Kay McDaniel, Campus Dean)
Phone: (225) 359-9204 Fax: (225) 359-9206

Folkes (Dildred Womack, Campus Coordinator)
Phone: (225) 634-7829 Fax: (225) 634-4225
e-mail: dwomack@theltc.net

Jumonville (Amy Gauthier, Campus Dean)
Phone: (225) 638-8613 Fax: (225) 618-0157
e-mail: agauthier@theltc.net

Port Allen Extension (Dr. Kay McDaniel, Campus Dean)
Phone: (225) 342-5061 Fax: (225) 342-5120

Westside (Mary Stewart, Campus Coordinator)
Phone: (225) 342-8229 Fax:
e-mail: mstewart@theltc.net

Louisiana Technical College – Region 3

Regional Director: Gregory Garrett
Phone: (985) 380-2436 Fax: (985) 380-2440
e-mail: ggarrett@theltc.net

LTC Region 3 Campuses:

Young Memorial (Gregory Garrett, Campus Dean)
Phone: (985) 380-2436 Fax: (985) 380-2440

Lafourche (Cynthia Poskey, Campus Dean)

---

[1] Campus closed as a result of Hurricane Katrina. There is no campus dean designated for Sidney Collier campus at this time.

[2] Campus closed as a result of Hurricane Katrina. There is no campus dean designated for Slidell campus at this time.

Phone: (225) 634-7829 Fax: (225) 634-4225
e-mail: cposkey@theltc.net

River Parishes (Dennis Murphy, Campus Dean)
Phone: (985) 536-4418 Fax: (985) 536-7697
e-mail: dmurphy@theltc.net

Louisiana Technical College – Region 4

Regional Director: Dr. Christopher Williams
Phone: (337) 262-5962 Fax: (337) 262-5122
e-mail: cwilliams@theltc.net

LTC Region 4 Campuses:

Lafayette (Dr. Christopher Williams, Campus Dean)
Phone: (337) 262-5962 Fax: (337) 262-5122

Acadian (Pat Miers, Campus Coordinator)
Phone: (337) 788-7521 Fax: (337) 788-7642
e-mail: pmiers@theltc.net

CB Coreil (Susan Ardoin Johnson, Campus Dean)
Phone: (337) 363-2197 Fax: (337) 363-7984
e-mail: sardoin@theltc.net

Evangeline (Pat Miers, Campus Coordinator)
Phone: (337) 788-7521 Fax: (337) 788-7642
e-mail: pmiers@theltc.net

Gulf Area (Angela Lee, Campus Dean)
Phone: (337) 893-4984 Fax: (337) 893-4991
e-mail: alee@theltc.net

TH Harris (Allen Espree, Campus Dean)
Phone: (337) 948-0239 Fax: (337) 948-0239
e-mail: aespree@theltc.net

Teche Area (Annette Faulk, Campus Dean)
Phone: (337) 373-0011 Fax: (337) 373-0039
e-mail: afaulk@theltc.net

Louisiana Technical College – Region 6

Regional Director: Robert Savage
Phone: (318) 487-5443 Fax: (318) 487-5970
e-mail: bsavage@theltc.net

LTC Region 6 Campuses:

Alexandria (Robert Savage, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 487-5443 Fax: (318) 487-5970
e-mail: bsavage@theltc.net

Avoyelles (Tom Gauthier, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 876-2801 Fax: (318) 876-2643
Email: tgauthier@theltc.net

Huey P. Long (Mervin Birdwell, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 628-4342 Fax: (318) 628-7768
e-mail: mbirdwell@theltc.net

Lamar Salter (Charles Bealer, Campus Dean)
Phone: (337) 537-3135 Fax: (337) 537-5571
e-mail: cbealer@theltc.net

Morgan Smith (Sanders Senegal, Campus Dean)
Phone: (337) 824-4811 Fax: (337) 824-5653
e-mail: ssenegal@theltc.net

Oakdale (Darrell Rodriguez, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 487-0139 Fax: (318) 335-3347
e-mail: drodriguez@theltc.net

Shelby Jackson (Mignonne Ater, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318)757-6501 Fax: (318) 757-8659
e-mail: mater@theltc.net

Louisiana Technical College – Region 7

Regional Director: Charles Strong
Phone: (318) 371-3035 Fax: (318) 371-3055
e-mail: cstrong@theltc.net

LTC Region 7 Campuses:

Shreveport (Angie Rymer, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 676-7811 Fax: (318) 676-7805
e-mail: arymer@theltc.net

Northwest (Charles Strong, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 371-3035 Fax: (318) 371-3055
Email: cstrong@theltc.net

Mansfield (Jill Heard, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 872-2243 Fax: (318) 872-4249
e-mail: jheard@theltc.net

Natchitoches (Carol Hebert, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 357-3162 Fax: (318) 352-2248
e-mail: chebert@theltc.net

Sabine Valley (Ed Corley, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 256-4101 Fax: (318) 256-4134
e-email: john.corley@theltc.net

Louisiana Technical College – Region 8

Regional Director: Norene R. Smith
Phone: (318) 397-6102 Fax: (318) 397-6106
e-mail: nsmith@theltc.net

LTC Region 8 Campuses:

Delta Ouachita (Norene Smith, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 397-6102 Fax: (318) 397-6106
e-mail: nsmith@theltc.net

Bastrop (Vettye Garrett, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 283-0836 Fax: (318) 283-0871
Email: vgarrett@theltc.net

North Central (Donna Sewell, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 368-3179 Fax: (318) 368-9180
e-mail: dsewell@theltc.net

Northeast (Debbie Price, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 435-2163 Fax: (318) 435-2166
e-mail: dprice@theltc.net

Ruston (JoAnn Deal, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 251-4145 Fax: (318) 251-4159
e-mail: jdeal@theltc.net

Tallulah (Patrick Murphy, Campus Dean)
Phone: (318) 574-4820 Fax: (318) 574-1868
e-mail: pmurphy@theltc.net

Louisiana Technical College – Region 9

Regional Director: William S. Wainwright
Phone: (985) 732-6640 Fax: (985) 732-6603
e-mail: william.wainwright@theltc.net

LTC Region 9 Campuses:

Sullivan (William Wainwright, Campus Dean)
Phone: (985) 732-6640 Fax: (985) 732-6603
e-mail: william.wainwright@theltc.net

Ascension (Cleve Marchand, Campus Dean)
Phone: (225) 675-5398 Fax: (225) 675-6007
e-mail: cmarchand@theltc.net

Hammond Area (Sharon Hornsby, Campus Dean)
Phone: (985) 543-4120 Fax: (985) 543-4121
e-mail: shornsby@theltc.net

Florida Parishes (Sharon Hornsby, Campus Dean)
Phone: (225) 222-4251 Fax: (225) 222-6064
e-mail: shornsby@theltc.net

Appendix A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

Proposals Submitted to the
Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions
for the FY 2007-2008 Review Cycle

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001PEN-08	Baton Rouge Community College Teacher Preparation Program	Baton Rouge Community College (Liberal Arts); Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge; Southeastern Louisiana University; Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge;	Idell Adams; Daniel Simon; Jeanne Stacy; Mary McKeough; Sue Avery;	**1**	**$ 54,960**
				Total	**$ 54,960**

Proposal is a **Continuation Request**
Previous Contract: LEQSF(2004-05)-ENH-PEN-01 - (2006-0

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

002PEN-08	Using Classroom Technology to Improve Student Engagement and Performance	Baton Rouge Community College (Business and Technology);	Amy V. Pinero; Janet B. Daniel; Susan M. Nealy;	**1**	**$ 15,803**
				Total	**$ 15,803**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003PEN-08	Academic Support for BRCC Environmental and Engineering Programs That Address Louisiana Workforce Needs	Baton Rouge Community College (Math and Science);	Laura Younger; Francesca Mellieon-Williams; Jane Henry; JoDale Ales; Joy Davis; Karen Stephens; Sandra Guzman;	**1**	**$ 147,591**
				Total	**$ 147,591**

Proposal is a **Continuation Request**
Previous Contract: LEQSF(2007-08)-ENH-PEN-04

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

004PEN-08	Integrating Writing Support Services in English Course Curricula	Bossier Parish Community College (Center for Learning Assistance);	April Bounds; Luke Dowden;	**1**	**$ 54,114**
				Total	**$ 54,114**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development

005PEN-08	Multicultural Resource Center	Bossier Parish Community College (Multicultural Affairs);	Cindy Darby; Brenda Brantley; Ginger X. Bryan;	**1**	**$ 14,397**
				Total	**$ 14,397**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006PEN-08	Impacting Community College Student Success Through Enhancements in Tutor Training and the Tutoring Process in the Learning Center	Bossier Parish Community College (Center for Learning Assistance);	Donna Earley; Luke Dowden;	**1**	**$ 28,500**
				Total	**$ 28,500**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

007PEN-08	Job Readiness and Welding Training for North Webster Parish	Bossier Parish Community College (Administration); Louisiana Technical College;	John Hoffmann;	**1**	**$ 49,150**
				Total	**$ 49,150**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Partnerships

008PEN-08	Enhancing Education 099 - College Success Skills Course	Bossier Parish Community College (Behavioral and Social Sciences);	Linda Hunter-Scott;	**1**	**$ 15,838**
				Total	**$ 15,838**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009PEN-08	Resources to Assist Project MOMS Clients	Bossier Parish Community College (Mothers on the Move);	Della Jeter;	**1**	**$ 30,000**
				Total	**$ 30,000**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Partnerships

010PEN-08	Recruiting Adults at Work	Bossier Parish Community College (Center for Learning Assistance);	Tamika Logan; Luke Dowden;	**1**	**$ 41,250**
				Total	**$ 41,250**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

011PEN-08	Advanced Computer Technology	Bossier Parish Community College (Telecommunications);	Larry Powell;	**1**	**$ 65,295**
				Total	**$ 65,295**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012PEN-08	Training Students to be Avid Editors	Bossier Parish Community College (Telecommunications);	Larry Powell; Bill Bruce;	**1**	**$ 34,410**
				Total	**$ 34,410**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

013PEN-08	Liberal Arts and Medical Science Materials for the Library	Bossier Parish Community College (Library);	Kimberly Pullen; Danny Williams; Judith Coston;	**1**	**$ 20,000**
				Total	**$ 20,000**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

014PEN-08	Technology for Adult Learners	Bossier Parish Community College (Community Education);	Donna Womack;	**1**	**$ 24,611**
				Total	**$ 24,611**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015PEN-08	Trauma Training Using Technology and Telemedicine (T-Med)	Delgado Community College (EMS Education);	Sharmaine Hughes;	**1**	**$ 147,272**
				Total	**$ 147,272**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

016PEN-08	Development and Implementation of a Fluid Mechanics Course and Training Library	Fletcher Technical Community College (Math and Science);	J. Mike Hamner;	**1**	**$ 147,618**
				Total	**$ 147,618**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

017PEN-08	Using Podcasting to Enhance Learning at Delta	Louisiana Delta Community College (Arts and Humanities);	Sharon Bowman; Barbara Jones; Connie Thomason;	**1**	**$ 44,419**
				Total	**$ 44,419**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018PEN-08	Enhancing Nursing Education in the Louisiana Delta Region	Louisiana Delta Community College (Nursing);	Hilda Brown;	**1**	**$ 149,709**
				Total	**$ 149,709**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

019PEN-08	Increased Accessibility to Higher Education in Northeast Louisiana	Louisiana Delta Community College (Instruction); LSU AgCenter Rural Development Center; Louisiana Technical College;	Barbara Jones; Lauri Anderson;	**1**	**$ 148,232**
				Total	**$ 148,232**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

020PEN-08	Weather from Space	Louisiana Delta Community College (Math and Science);	Don Wheeler;	**1**	**$ 36,863**
				Total	**$ 36,863**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021PEN-08	Expanding Louisiana State University at Eunice's Pathway to Success to the Learning Center for Rapides Parish and Louisiana State University at Alexandria	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Developmental Education); Learning Center for Rapides Parish; Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria;	Paul R. Fowler;	**1**	**$ 145,900**
				Total	**$ 145,900**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

022PEN-08	Mathematics Education Laboratory at LSUE	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Sciences and Mathematics);	Gloria P. Hernandez; S. Renee Hazelton-Robichaux;	**1**	**$ 77,991**
				Total	**$ 77,991**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

023PEN-08	Louisiana Evidence Recovery Laboratories: Centers of Excellence (LaERL)	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Business and Technology);	Fred Neal Landry; Kenneth Elliott; Michael Axelrod; Sanford Wood; Steven Gervais;	**1**	**$ 140,378**
				Total	**$ 140,378**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
024PEN-08	Mobile Computer Lab	Nunez Community College (Arts and Humanities);	Dawn Ruth; Gwen Robinson;	**1**	**$ 39,613**
				Total	**$ 39,613**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

025PEN-08	Enhancing the Culinary Arts Program in a Community College	Nunez Community College (Health and Natural Science);	Stephen Waddell; Ruth Varisco;	**1**	**$ 149,615**
				Total	**$ 149,615**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

026PEN-08	Creating Hybrid Courses with Multiple Presentation Forms in the Sciences	River Parishes Community College (Sciences); Louisiana Technical College;	Henry Mark Smith; Benjamin Lanier-Nabors; F. Lee Kleinpeter; Iris Henry; Sharon Lagarde; Victor Sanchez;	**1**	**$ 26,549**
				Total	**$ 26,549**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
027PEN-08	Enhancing Resources for Special Populations in Washington Parish	River Parishes Community College (Math and Science);	Henry Mark Smith; Benjamin Lanier-Nabors; F. Lee Kleinpeter;	**1**	**$ 13,000**
				Total	**$ 13,000**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

028PEN-08	Three Dimensional Visualization in the Sciences	River Parishes Community College (Math and Science);	Henry Mark Smith;	**1**	**$ 33,695**
				Total	**$ 33,695**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

029PEN-08	A Technological Means for Educational Enhancement for ADA Students at the Community College: The Smart Board as a Classroom Tool	River Parishes Community College (Math and Science);	Edward Thompson; Benjamin Lanier-Nabors; Kim Dudley;	**1**	**$ 17,972**
				Total	**$ 17,972**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
030PEN-08	PRAXIS Student Center	River Parishes Community College (Teacher Education); Bossier Parish Community College;	Cynthia Vavasseur; Angie Bales;	**1**	**$ 29,571**
				Total	**$ 29,571**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

031PEN-08	Development and Implementation of Hands-on Laboratory Exercises to Re-enforce Instructional Delivery at SUSLA	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Science and Technology);	John I. B. Alak; Barry Hester; Joseph I. Orban;	**1**	**$ 100,803**
				Total	**$ 100,803**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

032PEN-08	Get Ready for the Opportunity to Work (GROW)	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Community Education);	Arcenia Anthony; Xanthe Seals;	**1**	**$ 71,712**
				Total	**$ 71,712**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
033PEN-08	Strengthen Library Resource Collections to Support Health and Medical Sciences Program	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Library);	Orella R. Brazile;	**1**	**$ 77,300**
				Total	**$ 77,300**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

034PEN-08	Enhancement of Southern University Upstage Drama Troupe	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Mass Communications and Theatre Arts);	Carneta Cooper; Gwendolyn Lewis; Joslin Pickens; June Phillips;	**1**	**$ 30,324**
				Total	**$ 30,324**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development

035PEN-08	Enhancing Foreign Language Classroom with Computer-Assisted Instruction	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (English and Foreign Language);	Joyce Cottonham; Genevieve Iliev; June Phillips; Wanda M. Waller;	**1**	**$ 100,725**
				Total	**$ 100,725**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
036PEN-08	Enhancement of e-Education Through Faculty Development at Southern University at Shreveport	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Biomedical Sciences/e-Education);	Ilko Iliev;	**1**	**$ 83,999**
				Total	**$ 83,999**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

037PEN-08	Strenthening African American Male Student Success Through Mentoring	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Student Affairs);	Teresa A. Jones; Willie Siglar;	**1**	**$ 15,000**
				Total	**$ 15,000**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

038PEN-08	Digitalization of Biology and Chemistry Class Rooms to Enhance Instruction at Southern University Shreveport	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Science and Technology);	Joseph I. Orban;	**1**	**$ 100,000**
				Total	**$ 100,000**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Technology and Distance Education

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
039PEN-08	Capturing Cooper Town: Martin Luther King, Jr. Neighborhood Oral History Project	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Library);	Raegan Stearns; Orella R. Brazile;	**1**	**$ 15,422**
				Total	**$ 15,422**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development

040PEN-08	Strengthening Student Success Opportunities Through Career Services Internship Initiative	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (University Career Services);	Tuesday M. Williams;	**1**	**$ 60,500**
				Total	**$ 60,500**

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions for the FY 2007-2008 Review Cycle		
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	**Total Funds Requested**	**Total First-Year Funds Available**
40	**$2,600,101**	**$1,080,000**

Appendix B

RATING FORM

Proposal Number:_____ Project Director:_____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

FISCAL YEAR 2007-08

RATING FORM FOR TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS, FY 2007-08

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. THE CURRENT SITUATION-Total of 10 points

a. Demographic Data (5 points)

_____ of 5 points Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit/division that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of strategic goals, mission, community, faculty, students, measurable objectives, and relevant institutional or departmental resources? Has the applicant supplied an adequate amount of demographic data?

b. Needs of the Project and Impact on Strategic Goals (5 points)

____ of 5 points Has the applicant adequately described project needs and related them to the goals and measurable objectives? To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or institution(s)?

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN-- Total of 90 points

Plan of Proposed Project (25 points)

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

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction (10 points)

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

Impact on Quality of Students (10 points)

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

Impact on Community and Economic/Workforce Development (10 points)

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

Faculty and Staff Expertise (10 points)

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

Additional Funding Sources (5 points)

_____ of 5 points f. To what extent will the project assist in establishing any new relationships or strengthen an existing relationship with one or more partners? Is the project likely to contribute to the economic or workforce development activities in Louisiana? Is there evidence of collaboration other than financial?

Project Evaluation (7 points)

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

Project Dissemination (3 POINTS)

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

Evidence of Collaboration(s) (0 POINTS)

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

Budget Page and Budget Justification (10 points)

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

Checklist (0 POINTS)

_____ 0 points k. Is the checklist completed and signed?

BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount: $_____ Recommended Amount: $_____

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution:_____

Consultant's Signature: _____Date:_____(Two-Year Enhancement, Rev. 8/2007)