

FY 2006-07 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. Susan Henderson, Associate Executive Director, Florida Community College Distance Learning Consortium/Florida Virtual Campus; and Ms. Arleen Arnsparger, consultant and former Vice President for College Advancement at Kingsborough (NY) Community College, met March 26-27, 2007, in Baton Rouge to evaluate forty-two (42) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions (formerly the Pilot Enhancement Program), a component of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund. All four individuals had participated as members of several previous two-year institution proposal review panels.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) all forty-two (42) Two-Year Enhancement Program proposals to be evaluated with their individual rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators and institutions involved, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2006-07 Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) a copy of the previous year's two-year Institution Enhancement 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 each proposal, ranked them according to priority, and transformed the individual tentative ratings into a composite panel rating. Team members made a conscious effort to provide thoughtful feedback and suggestions on how each proposal might be improved for future consideration. They then prepared comprehensive ratings and drafted this final evaluation report.

A total of \$3,014,529 were requested by applicants of the proposals that were submitted. After careful review, the panel recommended full funding for two (2) proposals and partial funding for twenty (20) proposals, for a total expenditure of the \$1,080,000 that is available for the program during this cycle. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Table II lists proposals that were not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal immediately follows the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating form used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

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

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

The review 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. Members of our team have held up the Louisiana model of program enhancement to many other states where we work as an outstanding example of good public policy that supports improved educational outcomes and achievement. Given our collective decades of experience with community and technical colleges on the national, state, and local scene, we are particularly pleased with the support this Enhancement Program is providing to the Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS).

However, we have a number of serious concerns that we would like to share with the Board of Regents.

A) We have been struck by the overwhelming needs of many of the institutions that participate in the Two-Year Enhancement Program competition. Proposals clearly fall into two significant categories: true enhancement projects that enrich or expand existing or proposed academic offerings and improve student achievement; and requests for the most basic of academic support and supplies that under ordinary circumstances should be provided as basic institutional support. As reviewers we are forced to make Solomon-like decisions between providing basic needs at one of the struggling emerging campuses, versus providing funds to purchase new high-tech equipment at one of the more mature colleges. We did our best to balance the requests and ensure an equitable distribution of the limited funds, but the decisions are difficult and troubling. We realize the political realities of limited funds and the enormous challenges the Board faces in trying to balance the legitimate needs of a wide range of the State's postsecondary institutions.

However, given that 27 percent of the students in Louisiana are currently attending community colleges, and many of these institutions are new and incredibly underfunded for even the most basic academic support and supplies, we strongly recommend that the Board continue to seek additional resources to support the needs of these new institutions.

B) Another issue of serious concern is the need to ensure and encourage more articulation between and among your postsecondary institutions. If Louisiana is going to meet its goal of a well-educated populace, it will be important to have seamless systems that encourage the facile movement of students between the technical colleges to the community colleges, and from the community colleges to the four-year colleges and universities. We would like to recommend for Board consideration a new Enhancement Program that

would specifically encourage and target partnerships and articulated programs between educational sectors in the interests of creating a true K-16+ educational system. Perhaps the partnership could be a 2+2+2 partnership between a local high school, a community college, and the regional four-year campus, or a pre-engineering program at a community college that is fully articulated with the engineering department at one of your flagship universities. Such a program might encourage joint admissions, in which the community college student who participates is jointly admitted to the two- and four-year college and advised appropriately, ensuring a smooth transition between both institutions. This model has been very successful in other states between community colleges and research universities (e.g., Rutgers University and the New Jersey Community Colleges) and is worthy of consideration. In creating a new Enhancement program by “putting money in the middle” that would require true partnerships among differing institutions, there is the potential for significant benefits for students and the State. Given the significant needs of two-year institutions, we would not recommend such a change to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions but, if at all possible as resources become available, a new Enhancement Program that has the potential to benefit both two- and four-year institutions, or technical and community colleges, or high schools and community colleges, etc.

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

The panel was heartened by the significant improvement in the overall quality of proposals this year as compared to previous years. Many proposals were resubmissions and specifically addressed the recommendations and concerns contained in the panel’s comments last year. Nonetheless many proposals were generally quite weak, and we continue to recommend that the community college system take greater advantage of the significant experience and resources of the Board of Regents, or other external training resources, to provide grantsmanship training specifically targeted at faculty and staff from the community and technical colleges. We were disappointed that only one of the two new Technical Community Colleges submitted a proposal under this Enhancement Program. A related issue raised concerns among panel members who have served as academic administrators. Many of the proposals are prepared by wonderful and dedicated faculty members who are appropriately anxious to enhance the quality of their respective academic programs at their institutions and seek significant investments in equipment, new personnel, or to establish new academic programs. We note, however, that once these one-time funds are gone, the institution is expected to continue to maintain these positions and/or programs, sometimes at significant cost. We have wondered at times whether these proposals really do represent the highest academic priorities of the institutional leadership. We do not want to discourage faculty members from being entrepreneurial, but we would encourage the consideration of a letter as part of the proposal process, from the appropriate Dean or Academic Vice President, ensuring that this proposal has the full support of the institution and a commitment that, if it is funded, the project will be institutionalized once the grant funds are expended.

Finally, we once again request that the RFP continue to stress the importance of including the following information from all applicants:

A. college FTE information;

B. continued emphasis on how this project will impact student outcomes, support economic development efforts, and encourage workforce development;

C. a method to disseminate the results of the project to other colleges in the LCTCS system; and

D. a much stronger discussion of project evaluation: what will be evaluated and how will the evaluation be conducted?

In conclusion, we again would like to commend the Board of Regents and the Sponsored Programs section for your commitment to improving Louisiana's two-year community and technical colleges and for giving us the opportunity to participate in this very important Enhancement Program review process. We consider it an honor and privilege to work with you and hope that these observations will be helpful in your deliberative processes.

TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

| RANK | RATING | PROPOSAL NO. | INSTITUTION | FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED | FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | 96 | 008PEN-07 | BPCC | \$76,780 | \$66,780 |
| 2 | 94 | 013PEN-07 | BPCC | \$56,707 | \$46,707 |
| 3 | 92 | 003PEN-07 | BRCC | \$36,600 | \$26,600 |
| 3 | 92 | 009PEN-07 | BPCC | \$53,290 | \$46,790 |
| 3 | 92 | 020PEN-07 | FLETCHER | \$102,321 | \$85,000 |
| 3 | 92 | 024PEN-07 | DELTA | \$53,057 | \$40,000 |
| 7 | 89 | 025PEN-07 | DELTA | \$75,000 | \$37,500 |
| 8 | 88 | 010PEN-07 | BPCC | \$66,339 | \$60,339 |
| 8 | 88 | 032PEN-07 | RPCC | \$34,630 | \$34,630 |
| 10 | 87 | 004PEN-07 | BRCC | \$95,365 | \$72,500 |
| 10 | 87 | 033PEN-07 | SLCC, UL L | \$146,712 | \$70,000 |
| 12 | 86 | 002PEN-07 | BRCC | \$139,730 | \$77,820 |
| 12 | 86 | 012PEN-07 | BPCC | \$61,510 | \$51,344 |
| 12 | 86 | 026PEN-07 | DELTA | \$88,358 | \$66,268 |
| 15 | 84 | 001PEN-07 | BRCC | \$80,534 | \$50,000 |
| 16 | 83 | 005PEN-07 | BPCC | \$30,268 | \$15,134 |
| 16 | 83 | 023PEN-07 | DELTA | \$72,205 | \$60,000 |
| 18 | 82 | 018PEN-07 | DELGADO, SLU | \$169,052 | \$25,000 |
| 19 | 81 | 042PEN-07 | SUSLA | \$86,160 | \$15,200 |
| 20 | 80 | 031PEN-07 | RPCC | \$40,428 | \$40,428 |
| 20 | 80 | 035PEN-07 | SUSLA | \$64,676 | \$49,460 |
| 22 | 78 | 040PEN-07 | SUSLA | \$109,130 | \$42,500 |
| | | | TOTALS: | \$1,738,852 | \$1,080,000 |

TABLE II

**PROPOSAL RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE**

| RANK | RATING | PROPOSAL NO. | INSTITUTION | FIRST-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED | FIRST-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED |
|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| 23 | 76 | 022PEN-07 | DELTA | \$64,619 | \$5,000 |
| | | | TOTAL: | \$64,619 | \$5,000 |

TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

| RANK | RATING | PROPOSAL NO. | INSTITUTION | FIRST-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED | FIRST-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED |
|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 24 | 69 | 017PEN-07 | BPCC | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| 25 | 68 | 019PEN-07 | DELGADO, LA TECHNICAL COLLEGE | \$255,540 | \$0 |
| 25 | 68 | 036PEN-07 | SUSLA | \$77,300 | \$0 |
| 25 | 68 | 006PEN-07 | BPCC | \$55,124 | \$0 |
| 25 | 68 | 007PEN-07 | BPCC | \$41,894 | \$0 |
| 25 | 68 | 015PEN-07 | BPCC | \$53,155 | \$0 |
| 25 | 68 | 016PEN-07 | BPCC | \$39,183 | \$0 |
| 25 | 68 | 029PEN-07 | RPCC | \$30,000 | \$0 |
| 32 | 67 | 030PEN-07 | RPCC | \$42,000 | \$0 |
| 33 | 65 | 021PEN-07 | LSU-E | \$150,000 | \$0 |
| 33 | 65 | 041PEN-07 | SUSLA | 45,653 | \$0 |
| 35 | 64 | 014PEN-07 | BPCC | 72,600 | \$0 |
| 36 | 63 | 028PEN-07 | RPCC | 10,000 | \$0 |
| 37 | 56 | 011PEN-07 | BPCC | 69,200 | \$0 |
| 37 | 56 | 038PEN-07 | SUSLA | 78,991 | \$0 |
| 39 | 55 | 034PEN-07 | SUSLA | 75,000 | \$0 |
| 40 | 54 | 037PEN-07 | SUSLA | 66,073 | \$0 |
| 41 | 50 | 027PEN-07 | RPCC | 10,500 | \$0 |
| 42 | 46 | 039PEN-07 | SUSLA | 18,845 | \$0 |
| | | | TOTALS: | \$1,211,058 | \$0 |

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001PEN-07

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 22 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/
Workforce Development

B.d 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 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 8 (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 Requested Amount: \$80,534

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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

Partial funding of \$50,000 is recommended for this impressive and well-conceived project to support teacher education in Louisiana. The proposal narration could have been strengthened by a stronger "needs" case, although the plan and information regarding impact on the community/economic development and on students was clearly defined. Although the budget narrative was somewhat unclear, it was adequate. Information regarding the progress of this project during the previous year was helpful to the panel as we deliberated whether to re-fund a continuation proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kanetra Jones

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Functions on Wheels

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)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 9 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/
Workforce Development

B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$139,730</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u><u>\$77,820</u></u> |

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

The institutional description provided a brief snapshot of the BRCC's demographics and institutional priorities. Project needs were well established through statistics, as was the narrative of the course completion and attrition rates. Within the project plan, the panel would have preferred to increase the number of full-time and adjunct math faculty attending the professional development workshop to at least 75% or higher. Likewise, student outcomes should have been more ambitious. The Hawthorne effect alone could account for the modest student performance increases. The panel was pleased to see the graphing calculators and "My Math Lab" licenses as an additional funding source, and recommends funding of \$77,820 for this deserving project. Because of many other excellent proposals, the budget request was reduced. This recommendation should fund one computer lab consisting of 42 computers, one workstation cart at \$3,500, and the software requested.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Susan Nealy

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Customer Service Skills: Career Currency for the New Millenium

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 10 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k _____ (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$36,600

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$26,600

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

The PI made an excellent case for the need for customer service, communications, and cultural awareness training at BRCC. This project is wisely designed to imbed skills training in the Technical Competency area and across the curriculum in both face-to-face and online courses. In addition, the proposal is made stronger by the partnership with Delta Community College, the faculty collaboration within and between the colleges, and the intention to reduce duplication and encourage customer service education in other colleges by making the course modules available through MERLOT. The panel also recognizes the PI's intention to address differing learning styles and student availability by creating audio mp3 and video components for downloading. Although much hard work will be necessary to maximize the impact of this investment, it is evident that every avenue has been sought to reach as many students as possible and to sustain course delivery beyond the grant period. However, because of limited funds, the panel is able to recommend only partial funding of \$26,600 for this proposal. A less costly evaluation alternative could be sought. The panel understands that more than 200 course evaluators are currently being trained in Louisiana as part of the Quality Matters program; they should be available to work with colleges at no charge. In addition, the budget needs a bit more specificity. The panel strongly suggests that faculty overload be reduced; some in-kind funding from the participating institutions would have strengthened the project. Nevertheless, we congratulate BRCC for focusing on helping to rebuild Louisiana's workforce.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004PEN-07

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 4 (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 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 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 8 (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 | Requested Amount: | <u>\$95,365</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u><u>\$72,500</u></u> |

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

This was a well-written proposal that does a nice job of establishing both the context for the grant and the need for this new collaborative degree program with concentrations in environmental technology and sciences to prepare workers for jobs related to Louisiana's coastal wetland ecosystem. The proposal would have been stronger if it had addressed the number and types of employment for which students would be prepared and the potential salaries earned by entry-level workers in those industries. Project strengths include the incorporation of learning communities, measurable learning outcomes, and the proposed partnerships with and outreach to the public schools. Given the importance of partnership arrangements, the panel would have liked to have seen letters of support from the K-12 and university partners. Nonetheless, we recommend this project for funding of \$72,500 by reducing equipment costs to accommodate anticipated savings under State contract guidelines.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Achla Agarwal

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Learning Opportunities for Business and Computer Science Students

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 3 (of 5 points)

A.b 4 (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 5 (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 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 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$30,268</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$15,134</u> |

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

The panel was impressed with the project's concept. The narrative section of the proposal might have been strengthened by (1) a stronger needs statement, since the data and tables presented were not adequately related to improved or more effective in-class teaching; (2) improved evaluation metrics, since those offered were not based on before/after measures of change; and (3) the elimination of random and non-supported claims (e.g., "Learning experiences will be greatly improved."). Overall, the proposal made the case. Funding of \$15,134 is recommended to support the purchase of six Sympodium systems. Allocated funds were limited by total available project funds and other strongly competitive projects.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kay Boston

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multipurpose Classroom and Learning Environment

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 18 (of 25 points)

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 8 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (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: 68 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$55,124

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal adequately described the lack of computer resources for the Social Sciences Department and the large number of students enrolled in its courses. The panel notes that the PI considered previous comments and submitted a more modest proposal. However, the panel found troubling statements such as there being general value of use of technology, and some unsubstantiated claims such as "The project will enhance teaching effectiveness in the Division...". The plan and evaluation focused on ordering computers, universal design, taking roll at faculty workshops and satisfaction--all of which are process objectives rather than outcomes. The panel would have preferred measurable objectives with a focus on the potential impact, and specific goals and objectives of the computer lab and workshop on teaching and student learning and improving educational quality. The panel wonders how will student learning gains and use of the computer lab be measured, and how many faculty are currently using the computer lab and incorporating the technology into their teaching.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elaine Cox

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creating a Biotech Pipeline

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)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 6 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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

Requested Amount:

\$41,894

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This is a proposal that addressed a stated workforce need; however, its primary emphasis was on supporting students at Bossier Parish High School and students in dual enrollment programs. With limited funding in the Two-Year Institution Enhancement Program, the panel cannot recommend funding for a high school science lab. If the applicant chooses to redesign this proposal for future consideration, the primary focus should be on upgrading college curricula while still maintaining the important connections with the high school to create the desired pipeline. The panel offers the following feedback: While the proposal includes narrative about workforce needs, no industry or workforce data are included to substantiate that need. Data about job prospects, job placement, or transfer rates for program graduates should have been included. The proposal appropriately described a hands-on instructional approach for the biotechnology program, but the evaluation section is weak. The criteria for measuring the skills acquired by students should have been stated. Dissemination at the high school level is good; it is important to consider similar workshops for college faculty.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elaine Cox

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhanced Culture Experiences

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 24 (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 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: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$76,780

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$66,780

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

Congratulations to the PI on the preparation of a well-written and -documented proposal that received high marks from each reviewer. This proposal did a good job of establishing the educational needs of the targeted student population, potential employment opportunities for graduates of the program, and a well-articulated plan complete with student outcomes. The proposal clearly identifies the impact on the curriculum and the potential for external partnerships once the program is up and running. The evaluation plan utilizes pre- and post tests to measure concepts and skills acquired. The budget is clearly laid out with sufficient detail to justify project expenditures. However, because of limited funds and a strong competition this year, the panel can only recommend funding this project at the \$66,780 level, with budget cuts to be made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Luke Dowden

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Writing Support Services Learning Laboratory

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 25 (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 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 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 Requested Amount: \$53,290

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$46,790

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

Partial funding of \$46,790 is recommended for this project to support a writing lab and requisite tutoring. The panel was impressed with the concept and allocated funds were limited by total available project funds and other competitive projects. However, the proposal could have been strengthened if the PI had explained how the writing (English Composition) faculty were, or may become, engaged in the design and operation of this lab since their support will be critical. This proposal presented a strong needs statement, although evaluation was sketchy and somewhat unrelated to measurable change. The budget was clearly explained. However, we have one criticism: Reducing the percentage of failing students by only 3% is far too modest for the size of the project and the investment ... this project should expect and achieve more!

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gail Hendrix

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Learning and Engagement of Teacher Education
Candidates Through Technology

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 22 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/
Workforce Development

B.d 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 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: 88 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$66,339

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$60,339

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

The panel recommended a \$6,000 reduction to the budget due to total funding available. Demographic data should have been provided about department-specific information that related to the project, e.g., the percentage of the student body that is studying education. More specificity is expected in a proposal in this program. The PI should have described how the computers and software will improve education, impact student quality and the curricula and instruction. The budget narrative did provide a helpful explanation of the software and its impact. Other issues that should have been addressed are why the technology is needed in the specific courses, who will pay for Internet access, and who licensed PASS-PORT? The PI should note that internet access and PASS-PORT licenses could potentially be listed as in-kind contributions.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ellen Hinton

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Success for Students at BPCC

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 12 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 0 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 56 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$69,200

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

Although there is clearly a need for a BPCC childcare center, this proposal is outside the scope of this Enhancement Program. For future reference, proposals submitted must be much more closely tied to student academic outcomes and college curricula. In addition, the panel offers the following feedback for consideration. The proposal provided no data from childcare funding received in a previous year under this program. Does BPCC have data to show that childcare contributed to increased student recruitment, retention, and academic success? The panel assumes that when BPCC contracts with an existing company to provide childcare services, the partner agency will be required to meet State licensing standards. It is reasonable to expect that the project director have the skills needed to establish measurable objectives and conduct needed evaluation that should include measures of academic success for the students whose children are enrolled. It should not be necessary to allocate funds for an external evaluator.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Miles Hitchcock

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Pilot for an Early Warning System in Developmental Mathematics

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 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 5 (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 _____ (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 7 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k _____ (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$61,510

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$51,344

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

The panel congratulates the PIs and BPC on a well-conceptualized proposal that supports the development of an early warning system for at-risk students enrolled in developmental math. The applicants did an excellent job of providing concrete cohort data that measured student success in various developmental math courses. The implementation plan was clearly tied to project goals and objectives, as well as to measurable student outcomes. The panel was also pleased to see the project tied to the College's QEP process. However, due to limited funds and strong competition, the panel recommends a reduced budget at the level of \$51,344 through elimination of funding for the undocumented New Programs and Services line item of the budget (\$10,000). Other line items may be reduced at the PIs' discretion.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Roishene Johnson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Student Success in Human Physiology

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 25 (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 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: 94 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$56,707

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$46,707

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

Partial funding of \$46,707 is recommended to support the creation of and improvements to a human physiology laboratory. The proposal's budget was clear and informative. The panel recommends that laptop computers line item be reduced since the price listed is higher than current market cost. We were much impressed with the project's concept; the needs section was particularly strong and established very well the case for this project. However, the evaluation of student improvement was disappointing because the plan was either vague and unconnected to the metrics that demonstrate improvement, or far too modest in expecting only a 5 percent real change in student achievement. The panel's advice is to expect and achieve more.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014PEN-07

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 3 (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 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 2 (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 4 (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 Requested Amount: \$72,600

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal requesting expensive, high-end computers is not recommended for funding. The PI did not justify why such computers are necessary, such as the their feature sets and the minimum specifications needed to effectively run applications. The proposal would have benefited from the inclusion of specific information about the Telecommunications Division, such as the number of students taking courses, number of graduates, number of students employed in the community and state, and the potential impact on the number of jobs that may be created in the community as a result of a panel's recommendation of funding for this proposal. Additional information was also needed to explain the software and equipment currently available to students and the number of students currently producing software products to develop animation, audio, video and graphics. Additionally, explanation of how students are currently learning these skill sets is necessary in a proposal of this type.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Powell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preparing Students for Jobs in the Movie Industry

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)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 6 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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

Requested Amount:

\$53,155

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal describes in some detail movie industry interest in the Shreveport-Bossier City area and the recognized strength of the BPCC program; however, it did not include data about the success of the program's students. The panel has been funding BPCC's related telecommunications projects for several years and is looking for data about the success of students who graduate from or transfer from the program. What percentage of graduating students find employment in the field and/or transfer to continue their education and training in this area? In what areas are graduates finding jobs? What specific skills are employers seeking? The proposal indicates that no craft services are available in the area. However, on p. 9, the proposal indicates that about \$3,000,000 that the movie and commercial production industries brought to the region paid for craft services. If local providers could not meet their needs, who did provide the services and how did that money benefit the local economy? Travel costs and salary information are insufficient. Upon what are the amounts listed on the budget page based? What rates and time commitment do the salary and fringe benefits reflect? While the proposal is designed for departmental collaboration within the college, there is neither collaboration nor support of any kind coming from industry partners. If the services spelled out in the proposal are critical to meet the needs of companies filming in the region, wouldn't it be possible to garner some industry support for this training?

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016PEN-07

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 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 16 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 1 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 7 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k _____ (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$39,183</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$0</u> |

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

The review panel commends the inclusion of salary data related to workers entering the relevant industries described in the proposal. The needs statement, however, could have been stronger with documentation from the State Department of Labor on numbers of openings in related fields. Clearly the curriculum would be enhanced by the inclusion of high definition editing training, but given the stated need within industry, there was no evidence of collaboration with local telecom businesses which would benefit from a trained workforce, and no significant sources of additional funding other than \$5,000 in institutional match. While BPCC's Department of Telecommunications has an outstanding track record in developing new and innovative programs, the panel is unable to recommend funding for this project due to limited funding and an extremely competitive field.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kimberly Pullen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Liberal Arts and Allied Health Materials for the Library

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 2 (of 5 points)

A.b 2 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (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 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 7 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 69 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$20,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

Although the panel was convinced that a real need for this project exists, the proposal did not demonstrate early and deep involvement of faculty from the Liberal Arts and Allied Health areas. Since Enhancement funds this cycle are very limited and there were many stronger, more competitive projects, funding this proposal is not recommended. Faculty involvement in the selection process at the early stages would have ensured that students would be directed to use the proposed resources. The proposed investment in electronic books would be a sound investment in future learning as long as faculty use and support them.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College; Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ashley Chitwood

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

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 21 (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 9 (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: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$169,052*

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$25,000

**The RFP restricts the maximum allowable request to \$150,000.*

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

This creative and well-written proposal to collectively purchase and share equipment among institutions and their faculty is a good one. It is recommended for reduced funding of \$25,000 to enhance and further develop the annual NETT conference, a conference that could significantly impact 200 or more faculty and thousands of students. The panel appreciates the collaborative nature of the project, but we also realize that the entire request of \$169,000 is beyond the maximum limit for this program. However, questions arose as to who will manage the transfer, return, tracking, and storage of the valuable equipment that could potentially be lost or stolen. There are less expensive options for SmartBoards that would be far more portable.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College; Louisiana Technical College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donita Qualey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Supporting the Linkage of Delgado Community College and Louisiana Technical College Region 1 Healthcare Programs with Human Patient Simulation

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 19 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 5 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 0 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/
Workforce Development

B.d 2 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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 Requested Amount: \$255,540*

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

**The RFP restricts the maximum allowable request to \$150,000.*

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

The guidelines for the this Enhancement Program specify that budget requests cannot exceed \$150,000, yet this proposal significantly exceeds that amount. The panel understands that significant funding directed toward rebuilding New Orleans will soon be available through the Research Commercialization and Educational Enhancement Program. We recommend that this proposal, if applicable, be submitted under that program or to other funding agencies. In adapting the proposal for future resubmission, the panel offers these insights. Although the narrative indicates (and we clearly understand) that the region needs more healthcare workers, it would have been strengthened by providing specific workforce data and information about job prospects for and placement of program graduates. What percentage of graduates immediately qualifies for healthcare jobs? What percentage transfers to universities? How many students will be served by this equipment at LTC? Are there reasons why students at LTC cannot share equipment housed at Delgado? If the answer is that Delgado is too far away, can transportation be provided and supported through another funding source? The proposal would be additionally strengthened with letters of support from area healthcare facilities and evaluation that includes student academic outcomes.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: J. Mike Hamner

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Building Capacity and Assuring Access for Associate of Science in Teaching 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 23 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 10 (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 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 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k _____ (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$102,321</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u><u>\$85,000</u></u> |

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

The panel congratulates the PI for a well-written proposal that addresses an area of high demand--enriching the curriculum in support of a new Associate of Science in Teaching degree program. The PI gave evidence of establishing strong partnerships and collaborations with local school districts and with Nicholls State University. Quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods were incorporated in the project to measure the success of the program in enrolling and retaining students. However, due to limited funds and competitive demand, the panel can only recommend partial funding of \$85,000 since we anticipate significant savings in equipment expenditures, particularly for laptop computers based on current State contract. Lower cost 42" LCD screens are recommended over the proposed 42" plasma screens because plasma uses technology that is not the industry standard; it is being phased out.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021PEN-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul R. Fowler

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Retention and Success Through Program Enhancement:
Pathways to Success at Louisiana State University at Eunice

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 2 (of 5 points)

A.b 2 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 18 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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 **Requested Amount:** \$150,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

The panel unanimously acknowledges the early success of the Pathways program and the increased student retention. No disagreement existed concerning the need for student orientation and their access to critical information; however, reviewers could not support the plan that relies only on electronic means. In fact, orientation that is face-to-face may be superior simply because students interact with real staff. A decision to go forward in creating electronic or Web-based products should seek other ways to create them rather than purchasing the equipment and self-creating them. Excellent and affordable production companies will provide better products and also ways to maintain and update them. Finally, while the intent of this proposal is certainly defensible, it appeared to be a collection of initiatives only somewhat related to Pathways. A focused and affordable proposal would have been somewhat more competitive. Funding is not recommended for this proposal; however, the panel did believe that a real need for it exists.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022PEN-07

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 16 (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 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 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k _____ (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 Requested Amount: \$64,619

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$5,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

The panel recommends funding of \$2,000 for professional development and \$3,000 for equipment if additional funds become available. The brief literature search, survey of student iPod use on campus, and the detailed and achievable plan were valued by the panel. The project team is commended for willingness to share information and podcasting skills statewide, far beyond the history department. Of concern is the management and security of a classroom set of 30 iPods. Sustainability of the project was also questioned due to the request for funding of bandwidth of almost \$15,000 annually. How bandwidth would be provided after the conclusion of the award should have been explained. Podcasting is effectively used at many higher education institutions for anytime, anywhere access to education. The PIs are encouraged to review freely available online resources to learn how to create and store podcasts. They might review the requirements to become an iTunes University. Google Videos (<https://upload.video.google.com>) might be another option for the storage of podcasts at little or no cost.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kirk Bradley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving the Success and Performance Measures of Students in
Developmental Studies

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 8 (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 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (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 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$72,205</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u><u>\$60,000</u></u> |

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

The panel is pleased to recommend partial funding of \$60,000 for this project as we are keenly aware that the need to improve the success rates of students in developmental programs at almost all community colleges exists. This proposal offers positive approaches to addressing that need and, on that basis, the panel recommended funding. We are pleased with Delta's intention to address varied student learning styles through the use of technology and manipulatives, and to provide instructional approaches that will more effectively meet the needs of developmental students. The panel recommends that budget cuts be made at the discretion of the PI. We are also impressed with the institutional support level, which may be reduced, if necessary, proportional to the reduced budget.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stacy Medaries

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Visual Arts at Louisiana Delta 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 24 (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 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 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 Requested Amount: \$53,057

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,000

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

This is a well-written and conceptualized proposal that established the need for enhanced support for the visual arts at Delta Community College. The panel particularly commends the College's efforts to partner with local high schools and provide professional development opportunities for the community, in addition to strengthening preparation of students interested in transferring into baccalaureate programs at a university. The proposal would have been stronger had it had specific enrollment goals and identified objectives that were linked more clearly to student outcomes. Nonetheless, the panel does recommend this project for partial funding of \$40,000 through reductions to be made at the discretion of the project's team.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cyndy Robertson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Delta Library Collections Project

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 23 (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 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: 89 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$75,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$37,500

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

Reduced funding of \$37,500 is recommended for the creation of and improvements to planning and development of a library and learning resource center. Although the panel was impressed with the concept, available funds were limited by total available monies and strong competition. The panel acknowledges the good thinking and long-term planning that would result in a sound and usable resource facility. Proposal improvements could have been made to the Impact on Students and Impact on Community proposal sections, which, unfortunately, were not persuasive, illustrative, or supportive of the concept. Further, the evaluation section was vague and lacked metrics. Despite that, the panel found the sizeable and varied matching support pledged to be among the best in this competition.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alvina Thomas

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development and Implementation of a Financial Aid System

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 21 (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 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 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 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$88,358

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$66,268

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

This proposal has been recommended for reduced funding of \$66,268. Since there were a number of well-written proposals, total funds available for this program allowed full funding of only two proposals. In this proposal's narrative, data were provided to establish the need for the software system both in terms of student services and accreditation. The project team appears to have achieved the first of four specific objectives: to investigate, recommend, and purchase a financial aid software package. However, the narrative should have been updated to reflect this accomplishment and the process by which PowerFAIDS was selected, and more details should have been included in the evaluation. The panel wishes the team good luck in the implementation of this noteworthy system that should benefit all students.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027PEN-07

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Henry Mark Smith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Including Awareness of Dangers from Nature in the Science Classes

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 2 (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 2 (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: 50 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$10,500

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

Though raising awareness about potential dangers from nature and increasing knowledge about how to remain safe are important, this proposal does not adequately connect these benefits to River Parishes' science curriculum and/or workforce preparation. Increasing hands-on learning opportunities in the curriculum is an appropriate goal. However, it was unclear how this specific request for weather equipment would enhance the current curriculum and how it is linked to potential job opportunities or transfer requirements. As RPCC moves toward the development of the program that will eventually award an Associate of Science in Teaching degree, physical sciences will clearly be a part of the transfer requirements. However, the proposal did not address any of the specifics of the physical sciences curricula or how this request complements them. The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal for these reasons.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028PEN-07

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Henry Mark Smith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Supporting Distance Learning with Video

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 17 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 0 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 6 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 63 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$10,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal team did a good job of documenting significant educational needs in the RPCC service area. However, there is no evidence of a strong connection between the identified needs to develop distance education programs and this plan. The narrative lacked specificity on materials to be incorporated in the proposed video courses and how these courses would be adapted to take advantage of the strengths of the media beyond just televised talking heads. The panel wonders if scripts and storyboards will be developed or if traditional lectures will be videotaped. The budget would have been stronger with additional detail and specificity. The panel recommends that the PI review Dallas Tele-Learning for high-quality videos, or the National Sciences Digital Library, at www.nsd.org for science and math resources. Other potential sources are I-Tunes University and Google videos. This proposal required additional research and planning and is not recommended for funding at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029PEN-07

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Henry Mark Smith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Supporting Laboratory Courses at Remote Locations

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 20 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 9 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 0 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 0 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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 Requested Amount: \$30,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

Funding is not recommended for this proposal. Although the panel believes that real need exists for the concept of offering science courses at external locations, more competitive projects existed in this cycle. The proposal might have been improved in several ways. Much data were presented regarding the college constituency which, while interesting, was not related to making a case for off-campus--perhaps even in-prison--educational offerings. The PI should base the case on accessibility, making it easy and comfortable for all students to attend class closer to home. Additionally, for the size of the requested investment, the proposal sought very modest (5 percent) improvements in graduation rates. We again exhort PIs to expect more and achieve more. The applicant marked two sections as not applicable, yet the panel could not disagree more. Impact on student quality and community/economic development is at the very core of this funding initiative and is deserving of serious thinking. The panel does, however, acknowledge the well-developed plan and explanation of impact in the section titled Curriculum and Instruction.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030PEN-07

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Henry Mark Smith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Three Dimensional Visualization in the Sciences with a Portable Globe

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 14 (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 0 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 9 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (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: 67 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$42,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal attempts to put the community in River Parishes Community College by providing innovative technology to the college and surrounding middle and high schools that have made significant in-kind contributions. A well prepared plan is presented with initiatives, strategies, accountability measures and dissemination activities. The potential impact on curriculum and instruction could be substantial. The proposal should address the impact on Community and Workforce Development. The proposal ignored this section stating that it did not apply. The team could not disagree more. Impact on the Community and Workforce Development is at the very core of this funding initiative and it deserved your good thinking. If the application is resubmitted for funding, project evaluation would benefit from additional development.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031PEN-07

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dayanand Thangada

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Classroom Instructions via Integrating Technology into Classroom

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)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 6 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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 Requested Amount: \$40,428

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,428

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

River Parishes Community College has insufficient available computer access to adequately integrate technology into classroom instruction, to attract high school students into computer science and teacher education programs, and to prepare students for the workforce. The addition of a mobile lab will clearly advance the College's ability to do all of the above. The goals of this proposal are worthy and the enhanced technology, along with faculty development, should enable RPCC to become more competitive in attracting and retaining students. While the panel recommends funding for this proposal, we offer the following comments to strengthen future proposal submissions to the Enhancement Program. The goals, though well-stated, are not supported by specific activities that will be carried out to achieve each of them; e.g., in reference to goal #3 relating to strengthening relationships with external agencies, the proposal offers only the statement: "We have always had good relationships. . .". The proposal would have been strengthened with examples and data to indicate the impact of the current relationships and specifically how this proposal will help enhance them. The request for software for teacher education would have been strengthened with a description of the software and how it will be used. The latter information should be provided to the Board's staff during contract negotiations.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032PEN-07

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Allison Vicknair

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Moving Towards an Electronic Campus

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 5 (of 5 points)

A.b 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 6 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 9 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 8 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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 Requested Amount: \$34,630

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$34,630

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

This is a strong proposal in support of establishing a Web-based portal to support student access and success in partnership with four Technical Colleges from Region 9. This well-conceptualized proposal has the potential to significantly impact the delivery of student services at the partner institutions. The proposal documents highly successful pilot projects which demonstrated significant results that provide credibility to the project plan and proposed measurable outcomes. Also, the project builds nicely on proposed network infrastructure investments planned at the State systems level. One area that may need additional consideration is in strengthening the faculty advising components of the project. National research suggests that faculty need significant ongoing professional development to help them be more effective in their advising roles, and that on-line advising cannot substitute for the value of an in-person advising relationship, particularly for at-risk student populations. The panel recommends that this project receive full funding of \$34,630.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033PEN-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Judith Bride

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

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 23 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 7 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 10 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/
Workforce Development

B.d 7 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 10 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 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 | Requested Amount: | <u>\$146,712</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u><u>\$70,000</u></u> |

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

Partial funding of \$70,000 is recommended to support the design and creation of the Lean Manufacturing and Digital Manufacturing Program at SLCC. While the panel was impressed with the concept, allocatable funds were limited by total available funds and other strong competitive projects. This important initiative is directly connected to improvements in Louisiana manufacturing, with direct results on the economy. Lean manufacturing processes are currently the single most important focus for improving productivity and supporting global competitiveness for America's manufacturers. Funds may be reduced in these line items: multimedia set-up, personnel training (faculty stipends), and professional services (on-campus staff).

While the panel heartily supports this effort, we offer some pertinent observations. Engage the interest of local manufacturers now rather than after the program is created. Manufacturers, especially small ones who are in the majority in the service area, will buy into the program if they are included in early planning. The proposal's focus is almost entirely within the College, and that could lead to the alienation of those individuals to be impacted. Also, please plan to offer training within firms rather than on campus, even if it means acquiring movable training equipment. Small manufacturers will not leave their plants. The panel's experience is that this initiative will be easy to accomplish on campus, but it is very challenging to make it happen with businesses.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ratonya Bennett

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Learning Resources for the Counseling Center for
Southern University at Shreveport Louisiana

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 15 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 4 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 4 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 5 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 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: 55 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$75,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal that lacks narrative to support requests for large equipment and supply purchases. There is no documented need or student impact. It also lacks documentation as to student use of the counseling center. The proposal would also have benefited from an estimate of the number of students impacted. There is a lack of alignment between the project summary and the actual grant proposal. To be competitive in this program, the proposal requires additional research and/or planning.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Orella R. Brazile

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improved Open-Access Lab to Support Health and Medical Sciences Programs

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 8 (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 3 (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: 80 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$64,676</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u><u>\$49,460</u></u> |

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

It is evident from the description offered in this proposal that SUSLA's faculty and students in the Allied Health and Nursing programs do not have access to the level of technology needed for required academic research, training, and testing. Nor is the technology level aligned with both student and industry expectations. To enable the College to make inroads in meeting the goals of the proposal, the panel recommends partial funding of \$49,460 for this proposal. The review panel is recommending funding for 20 computers and 20 LCD displays, as well as the other equipment and supplies requested. The need is critical, but the proposal had some significant weaknesses that the panel hopes the college/PI can improve upon in future submissions.

Successful proposals should have more than general information on how the requested equipment and software will be integrated in existing courses or be used to provide the basis for course redesign. The proposal has statements that suggest its impact, but it never provided data or referenced specific studies to support the statements. Each of these sections--Impact on the Curriculum, Impact on Quality of Students, Impact on the Community and Economic/Workforce Development--are essentially restatements of the same points, offering no additional data or specifics. Each section deserves thoughtful consideration. The evaluation section references a survey to be conducted each semester to determine the effectiveness of the lab. The panel is unclear about the evaluation's measurable objectives and student learning outcomes. Data about enrollment, retention and course completion should have been included to make the case for need stronger. Budgets should always be specific, especially regarding supplies to be purchased for \$1,100. Institutional match is mentioned only in the narrative; during contract negotiations it will need to be specified in the budget and budget justification. Future budgets will be strengthened if the PI calculates the value of institutional support and indicates it on the budget page and in the justification.

Each year the panel considers many proposals designed to provide resources that will lead to improved student success at Louisiana's community and technical colleges. Each year most of the applicants improve their skills and provide supporting information so the panel can fairly judge the quality of the proposed initiatives. However, this panel is seriously concerned that SUSLA is not keeping pace with its sister colleges in making these improvements. As these program's proposals become increasingly competitive, it will become impossible for us to support proposals that fall significantly short in addressing the required areas. We strongly urge SUSLA to consider making a serious investment in training personnel to develop the skills that are needed to construct quality proposals that adequately support funding requests. The Board of Regents, through the EPSCoR program, offers colleges and universities grantsmanship workshop funding. Investigate other grants funding avenues as well.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Orella R. Brazile

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthen Library Resource Collections to Support Health and Medical Sciences Programs

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 19 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 1 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 7 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 3 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 7 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 1 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 7 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i _____ (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 4 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k _____ (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$77,300</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$0</u> |

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

The panel recognizes the significant needs articulated in the proposal for learning resource materials to support the Health and Medical Sciences programs at Southern University, Shreveport. However, due to limited funding and highly competitive grants from other institutions, the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal at this time. While health sciences programs are a high priority at SUSLA as well as across the State, this proposal did little to document involvement with faculty in identifying resources needed to support the courses or curricula. There were few details as to what materials would be purchased. There were no measurable student learning outcomes that would result from this project, at least as it is currently designed. The panel acknowledges the College's need for significant learning resource investments; however, in order to be a serious contender for funding in this Enhancement program, this proposal needed additional research and planning as well as evidence of insights from and collaboration with faculty from the relevant disciplines.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mahailier L. Broom

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementing Students' "Curriculum Advising and Program Planning"
(CAPP)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 2 (of 5 points)

A.b 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 18 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 0 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 4 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 4 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 5 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 4 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 2 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 54 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$66,073

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

The panel was impressed with the applicant's desire to acquire the Banner CAPP process for tracking and advising students, and it is clear that a need exists. However, allocatable funds are limited by total available funds and stronger, more competitive projects existed. Funding is not recommended for this proposal as it stands. The proposal could have been improved in several ways. First, little data relating how many students need to be tracked and advised were provided, nor was it clear if the College was currently failing to provide some level of service. The evaluation plan was essentially nonexistent, leading the panel to wonder if real improvements in the progress of students would be effected with the investment sought. Perhaps most problematic was the absence of explanation for the expenditures. If the panel knew what the consulting fee was, we would quite likely agree with the need for assistance. Again, the panel believes that SUSLA likely needs this system, but the proposal did not make the right case. Please be assured that our comments are offered in hopes that the PI will resubmit a sounder proposal in another cycle.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ruby Evans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing E-learning Through Faculty Development at SUSLA

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 13 (of 25 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 6 (of 10 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 4 (of 10 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/
Workforce Development

B.d 5 (of 10 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 9 (of 10 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 2 (of 7 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 3 (of 3 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 3 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 56 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$78,991</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$0</u> |

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

The panel would like to have been able to recommend this proposal. However, the applicant did not plan for faculty development, but only for the purchase of equipment. With additional documentation as to how this project would impact teaching and learning, funding most likely would have been recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon F. Green

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Students in the Numbers Game (SING)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 3 (of 5 points)

A.b 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 10 (of 25 points)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 3 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 1 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 2 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 2 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 5 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 46 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$18,845

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

Math anxiety is a recognized challenge for many students throughout their high school and college experiences. Increasingly, community colleges are taking this challenge seriously and offering tutoring, supplemental instruction, and innovative instructional approaches to help students regain confidence and find success in math classes. While this proposal accurately describes the problem, the plan defined did not seem to offer a workable solution. Thus, the panel cannot support funding for this proposal.

The proposal would provide opportunities for students to learn by listening to lectures from consultants and peers, watching PowerPoint presentations, reading book reviews and articles, and creating lists of study strategies. There is much research about and many proven best practices identified that highlight effective teaching strategies, learning styles, and other approaches to help students overcome learning challenges. The strategies in this proposal are not among those that have worked elsewhere. Students need to be actively engaged in and construct their own learning. They need to see, feel, and experience what is possible for them. This proposal does not seem to offer any of these opportunities. If SUSLA is interested in resubmitting a proposal next year to provide assistance to these students who clearly could benefit from it, the panel recommends that College staff review the literature and documentation of best practices to help you formulate a more promising plan.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Vanessa L. Leggett

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Smart Classroom Expansion Project

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)

Additional Funding Sources

B.f 2 (of 5 points)

Impact on Curriculum and Instruction

B.b 8 (of 10 points)

Project Evaluation

B.g 5 (of 7 points)

Impact on Quality of Students

B.c 8 (of 10 points)

Project Dissemination

B.h 2 (of 3 points)

Impact on Community and Economic/

Workforce Development

B.d 7 (of 10 points)

Evidence of Collaboration(s)

B.i 0 (of 0 points)

Faculty and Staff Expertise

B.e 10 (of 10 points)

Budget Page and Budget Narrative

B.j 8 (of 10 points)

Checklist

B.k 0 (of 0 points)

G. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$109,130

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$42,500

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

The Smart Classroom proposal made a good case for the importance of increased technological enhancements for the University's developmental education programs. The proposal supports the integration of technology in content instruction in English, mathematics, and reading, and will provide student access to WorkKeys, a widely recognized skills assessment tool. Unfortunately, due to a highly competitive field, the panel can only recommend funding of \$42,500 for this project, which should provide at least two fully equipped Smart Classrooms, given anticipated savings on equipment based on current computer costs under State contract.

Each year the panel considers many proposals designed to provide resources that will lead to improved student success at Louisiana's community and technical colleges. Each year most of the applicants improve their skills and provide supporting information so the panel can fairly judge the quality of the proposed initiatives. However, this panel is seriously concerned that SUSLA is not keeping pace with its sister colleges in making these improvements. As these program's proposals become increasingly competitive, it will become impossible for us to support proposals that fall significantly short in addressing the required areas. We strongly urge SUSLA to consider making a serious investment in training personnel to develop the skills that are needed to construct quality proposals that adequately support funding requests. The Board of Regents, through the EPSCoR program, offers colleges and universities grantsmanship workshop funding. Investigate other grants funding avenues as well.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Willie Siglar

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: African American Males Meeting the Challenge of Higher Education
(AAMMCHE)

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)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><u>Plan of Proposed Project</u> B.a <u>20</u> (of 25 points)</p> <p><u>Impact on Curriculum and Instruction</u> B.b <u>5</u> (of 10 points)</p> <p><u>Impact on Quality of Students</u> B.c <u>8</u> (of 10 points)</p> <p><u>Impact on Community and Economic/ Workforce Development</u> B.d <u>2</u> (of 10 points)</p> <p><u>Faculty and Staff Expertise</u> B.e <u>10</u> (of 10 points)</p> | <p><u>Additional Funding Sources</u> B.f <u>0</u> (of 5 points)</p> <p><u>Project Evaluation</u> B.g <u>4</u> (of 7 points)</p> <p><u>Project Dissemination</u> B.h <u>3</u> (of 3 points)</p> <p><u>Evidence of Collaboration(s)</u> B.i <u>0</u> (of 0 points)</p> <p><u>Budget Page and Budget Narrative</u> B.j <u>4</u> (of 10 points)</p> <p><u>Checklist</u> B.k <u>0</u> (of 0 points)</p> |
|---|--|

G. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$45,653</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$0</u> |

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

Funding is not recommended for this proposal. The panel was impressed with the project's concept--assisting African American males to be successful in college--believing that the need to do this exists. However, available funds were limited and stronger, more competitive projects existed. While the panel acknowledges the strong, persuasive explanation of need, the proposal and plan failed to explain how the expenditures actually met the need. For example, \$20,000 is budgeted for professional services with little explanation of how consultants will work with and impact the young men. The panel is also unclear about the supplies required and why an external evaluator is needed. It appears that this initiative is basically a mentoring program that could require very little funding. It is our hope that this proposal be improved and resubmitted in another cycle.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042PEN-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dorsey Summerfield, Jr.

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer Assisted Music Production: Enhancing the Quality of Learning Music Notation, Theory, and Software Applications (Project CAMP)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.a 4 (of 5 points)

A.b 4 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 90 Points)

Plan of Proposed Project

B.a 19 (of 25 points)

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 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: 81 (of 100 points)

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

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY | Requested Amount: | <u>\$86,160</u> |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: | Recommended Amount: | <u><u>\$15,200</u></u> |

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

Because of the large number of competitive proposals and limited funds for this Enhancement Program, the panel recommends that this proposal be funded at the substantially reduced level of \$15,200, which is designated for musical equipment. The needs statement was well stated, and institutional support for the acquisition of equipment is commendable. The panel hopes that the principal investigators will resubmit this proposal in a subsequent cycle. It should have clearly stated outcomes (lacking in the current proposal), and additional details in the evaluation and project plan sections.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the
Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions
for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle**

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 001PEN-07 | Baton Rouge Community College Teacher Preparation Program | Baton Rouge Community College (Liberal Arts); | Idell Adams; Daniel Simon; Esperanza Zenon; Jeffrey Weaver; JoDale Ales; Kanetra Jones; Marcella Hackney; Sue Avery; | 1 | \$ 80,534 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 80,534 |

Proposal is a **Continuation Request**

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

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

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--|--------------|-------------------|
| 002PEN-07 | Functions on Wheels | Baton Rouge Community College (Math and Science); | Kanetra Jones; Dennis Taylor; Donna Newman; | 1 | \$ 139,730 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 139,730 |

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 003PEN-07 | Customer Service Skills: Career Currency for the New Millenium | Baton Rouge Community College (Business and Technology); Baton Rouge Community College; | Susan Nealy; | 1 | \$ 36,600 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 36,600 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education | | | | | |
| 004PEN-07 | Academic Support for BRCC Environmental and Engineering Programs That Address Louisiana Workforce Needs | Baton Rouge Community College (Biology); | Laura Younger; A. K. A. Shahjahan; Esperanza Zenon; Jane Henry; JoDale Ales; Joy Davis; Karen Stephens; Marcella Hackney; | 1 | \$ 95,365 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 95,365 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development | | | | | |
| 005PEN-07 | Enhancing Learning Opportunities for Business and Computer Science Students | Bossier Parish Community College (Business and Computer Science); | Achla Agarwal; | 1 | \$ 30,268 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 30,268 |
| 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 |
|---|---|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 006PEN-07 | Multipurpose Classroom and Learning Environment | Bossier Parish Community College (Behavioral and Social Sciences); | Kay Boston; | 1 | \$ 55,124 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 55,124 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success | | | | | |
| 007PEN-07 | Creating a Biotech Pipeline | Bossier Parish Community College (Science and Allied Health); | Elaine Cox; Judith Coston; | 1 | \$ 41,894 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 41,894 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Partnerships | | | | | |
| 008PEN-07 | Enhanced Culture Experiences | Bossier Parish Community College (Science and Allied Health); | Elaine Cox; Judith Coston; | 1 | \$ 76,780 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 76,780 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success | | | | | |

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 009PEN-07 | Writing Support Services Learning Laboratory | Bossier Parish Community College (Developmental Services); | Luke Dowden; Donna Earley; Holly French; | 1 | \$ 53,290 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 53,290 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Partnerships | | | | | |
| 010PEN-07 | Enhancing Student Learning and Engagement of Teacher Education Candidates Through Technology | Bossier Parish Community College (Behavioral and Social Sciences); | Gail Hendrix; | 1 | \$ 66,339 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 66,339 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships | | | | | |
| 011PEN-07 | Success for Students at BPCC | Bossier Parish Community College (Grants and External Funding); | Ellen Hinton; | 1 | \$ 69,200 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 69,200 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Partnerships | | | | | |

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|--|--|---|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 012PEN-07 | A Pilot for an Early Warning System in Developmental Mathematics | Bossier Parish Community College (Mathematics and Technical Education); | Miles Hitchcock; Ed Thomas; Luke Dowden; | 1 | \$ 61,510 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 61,510 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success | | | | | |
| 013PEN-07 | Improving Student Success in Human Physiology | Bossier Parish Community College (Science and Allied Health); | Roishene Johnson; Elaine Cox; Sandra Vickers; | 1 | \$ 56,707 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 56,707 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development | | | | | |
| 014PEN-07 | Advanced Computer Technology | Bossier Parish Community College (Telecommunications); | Larry Powell; | 1 | \$ 72,600 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 72,600 |
| 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-07 | Preparing Students for Jobs in the Movie Industry | Bossier Parish Community College (Telecommunications); | Larry Powell; Clif Cardin; Elizabeth Dickson; | 1 | \$ 53,155 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 53,155 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development | | | | | |
| 016PEN-07 | Training Students to be Avid Editors | Bossier Parish Community College (Telecommunications); | Larry Powell; Bill Bruce; | 1 | \$ 39,183 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 39,183 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development | | | | | |
| 017PEN-07 | Liberal Arts and Allied Health 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 | | | | | |

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 018PEN-07 | Using Collaboration, Conference and Continued Support to Impact Excellence in Teaching with Technology on the Northshore | Delgado Community College (Northshore); Southeastern Louisiana University; | Ashley Chitwood; | 1 | \$ 169,052* |
| | | | | Total | \$ 169,052 |

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Professional Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships

Note: *The RFP restricts the maximum amount requested to \$150,000

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|--------------|--------------------|
| 019PEN-07 | Supporting the Linkage of Delgado Community College and Louisiana Technical College Region 1 Healthcare Programs with Human Patient Simulation | Delgado Community College (Nursing); Louisiana Technical College; | Donita Qualey; Dianne Thames; Mary Trosclair; Patricia Egers; | 1 | \$ 255,540* |
| | | | | Total | \$ 255,540 |

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

Note: *The RFP restricts the maximum amount requested to \$150,000.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 020PEN-07 | Building Capacity and Assuring Access for Associate of Science in Teaching Program | Fletcher Technical Community College (General Education, Math and Science); | J. Mike Hamner; Carolyn Rieffel; | 1 | \$ 102,321 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 102,321 |

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

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

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|---|---|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 021PEN-07 | Increasing Retention and Success Through Program Enhancement: Pathways to Success at Louisiana State University at Eunice | Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Developmental Education); | Paul R. Fowler; | 1 | \$ 150,000 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 150,000 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development | | | | | |
| 022PEN-07 | Using Podcasting to Enhance Learning at Delta | Louisiana Delta Community College (English, E-learning); | Sharon Bowman; Barbara Jones; Connie Thomason; | 1 | \$ 64,619 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 64,619 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Technology and Distance Education | | | | | |
| 023PEN-07 | Improving the Success and Performance Measures of Students in Developmental Studies | Louisiana Delta Community College (Math and Sciences); | Kirk Bradley; Barbara Jones; Cyndy Robertson; Karen Harmon; | 1 | \$ 72,205 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 72,205 |
| 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 |
|--|---|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 024PEN-07 | Enhancement of the Visual Arts at Louisiana Delta Community College | Louisiana Delta Community College (Liberal Arts); | Stacy Medaries; | 1 | \$ 53,057 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 53,057 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Partnerships | | | | | |
| 025PEN-07 | Delta Library Collections Project | Louisiana Delta Community College (Library); | Cyndy Robertson; Barbara Jones; | 1 | \$ 75,000 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 75,000 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development | | | | | |
| 026PEN-07 | Development and Implementation of a Financial Aid System | Louisiana Delta Community College (Student Services); | Alvina Thomas; Kay Harper-Hayes; | 1 | \$ 88,358 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 88,358 |
| 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 |
|---|---|--|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 027PEN-07 | Including Awareness of Dangers from Nature in the Science Classes | River Parishes Community College (Natural Sciences); | Henry Mark Smith; | 1 | \$ 10,500 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 10,500 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Technology and Distance Education | | | | | |
| 028PEN-07 | Supporting Distance Learning with Video | River Parishes Community College (Natural Sciences); | Henry Mark Smith; F. Lee Kleinpeter; Iris Henry; Sandra Guzman; | 1 | \$ 10,000 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 10,000 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development | | | | | |
| 029PEN-07 | Supporting Laboratory Courses at Remote Locations | River Parishes Community College (Natural Sciences); | Henry Mark Smith; Iris Henry; Sandra Guzman; Thomas R. Henson; | 1 | \$ 30,000 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 30,000 |
| 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 |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 030PEN-07 | Three Dimensional Visualization in the Sciences with a Portable Globe | River Parishes Community College (Natural Sciences); | Henry Mark Smith; Sandra Guzman; | 1 | \$ 42,000 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 42,000 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships | | | | | |
| 031PEN-07 | Enhancement of Classroom Instructions via Integrating Technology into Classroom | River Parishes Community College (Computer Science); | Dayanand Thangada; Cynthia Beatty Vavasseur; | 1 | \$ 40,428 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 40,428 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success | | | | | |
| 032PEN-07 | Moving Towards an Electronic Campus | River Parishes Community College (Student Services); | Allison Vicknair; Kim Dudley; LeAnn Detillier; | 1 | \$ 34,630 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 34,630 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Technology and Distance Education, Partnerships | | | | | |

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 033PEN-07 | Faculty and Curriculum Enhancement for Two-Year Institutions by Incorporating Lean Manufacturing and Digital Manufacturing | South Louisiana Community College (Arts and Sciences); University of Louisiana at Lafayette; | Judith Bride; Lonny McDonald; Shannon Comeaux; Shannon Comeaux; Suren N. Dwivedi; Suren N. Dwivedi; | 1 | \$ 146,712 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 146,712 |

Proposal is a **New Request**

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

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 034PEN-07 | Acquisition of Learning Resources for the Counseling Center for Southern University at Shreveport Louisiana | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Counseling Center); | Ratonya Bennett; | 1 | \$ 75,000 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 75,000 |

Proposal is a **New Request**

Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 035PEN-07 | Improved Open-Access Lab to Support Health and Medical Sciences Programs | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Library); | Orella R. Brazile; Rose M. Powell; | 1 | \$ 64,676 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 64,676 |

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 |
|---|---|---|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 036PEN-07 | Strengthen Library Resource Collections to Support Health and Medical Sciences Programs | 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 | | | | | |
| 037PEN-07 | Implementing Students' "Curriculum Advising and Program Planning" (CAPP) | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Registrar); | Mahailier L. Broom; Gabriel Fagbeyiro; | 1 | \$ 66,073 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 66,073 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Professional Development, Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development | | | | | |
| 038PEN-07 | Enhancing E-learning Through Faculty Development at SUSLA | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Academic Affairs); | Ruby Evans; Ilko Iliev; | 1 | \$ 78,991 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 78,991 |
| 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 |
|--|--|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| 039PEN-07 | Students in the Numbers Game (SING) | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Student Affairs); | Sharon F. Green; | 1 | \$ 18,845 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 18,845 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success | | | | | |
| 040PEN-07 | The Smart Classroom Expansion Project | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Enhancement and Freshman Studies); | Vanessa L. Leggett; Ruby Evans; | 1 | \$ 109,130 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 109,130 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success, Technology and Distance Education | | | | | |
| 041PEN-07 | African American Males Meeting the Challenge of Higher Education (AAMMCHE) | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Student Affairs); | Willie Siglar; | 1 | \$ 45,653 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 45,653 |
| Proposal is a New Request | | | | | |
| Guiding Principle(s) : Student Access and Success | | | | | |

| Prop# | Title | Institution/Department | Principal Investigator(s) | Duration (Years) | BoRSF Money Requested |
|-----------|--|--|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 042PEN-07 | Computer Assisted Music Production: Enhancing the Quality of Learning Music Notation, Theory, and Software Applications (Project CAMP) | Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport (Music); | Dorsey Summerfield, Jr.; | 1 | \$ 86,160 |
| | | | | Total | \$ 86,160 |

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 2006-2007 Review Cycle | | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------------|
| Total Number of Proposals Submitted | Total Funds Requested | Total First-Year Funds Available |
| 42 | \$ 3,014,529 | \$ |

Appendix B

Rating Forms

- A. For Equipment Proposals
- B. For Non-Equipment Proposals

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2006-07

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

- _____ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 15 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- _____ of 2 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine required component whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts. F.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2006-07
 RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
 REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 20 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated? |
| _____ of 25 pts. | B.3 | To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged? |
| _____ of 2 pts. | B.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project? |

No Points Given, But this is a required component B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine required component whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts. E.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____