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A. Introduction

A two-member Two-Year Enhancement proposal review team consisting of Dr. Katherine Boswell, of Education Policy Associates, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Dr. Russell Hamm, of R. Hamm Consulting, LLC, Castle Rock, Colorado, met February 14, 2014, via a Skype conference to evaluate twenty-two (22) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, a component of the Board of Regents Support Fund. Both individuals had participated on several previous Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposal review teams.

The panel received the following materials prior to the review: (1) the twenty-two (22) proposals and appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of the proposals listing titles, PIs, submitting institutions, and funds requested; (3) the appropriate RFP containing criteria for evaluation; and (4) a copy of the previous year’s (2012-13) review report. After studying all proposals individually, the panel reviewed and evaluated them collectively. Each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria enumerated in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for twelve (12) proposals deemed worthy of funding. Funds of $1,828,911 were requested by all proposals in this competition. The reviewers recommended first-year awards totaling $690,400.

This report contains two tables that rank all proposals. Table I contains a rank-order list of twelve (12) proposals deemed highly recommended for funding with the recommended funding levels. Table II lists ten (10) proposals that are not recommended for funding.

A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after 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.

B. General Recommendations

The panel applauds the Louisiana Board of Regents for its continued investment in enhancing the academic programs of the two-year college sector, particularly in light of the difficult fiscal times the State has endured. The Board is commended for its commitment to educational excellence at these new and emerging institutions.

C. Recommendations to Applicants

The panel commends the colleges on the continuing improvement in the quality of proposals submitted to this program. We were particularly pleased to see additional evidence that colleges are trying to align measurable learning outcomes to proposed interventions. We recognize how difficult it is to try to measure student learning in such a compressed timeframe, but improved learning outcomes must remain at the core of reform efforts. The colleges need to get beyond the mindset of “build it and they will come” as evidence and justification for these investments.

We would also encourage the colleges to think more strategically about their academic programs, partnerships and investments. Many of these programs should be part of career pathways that lead into the workforce or into baccalaureate programs. In this year’s proposals, the panel saw little evidence of meaningful partnerships with local secondary partners, technical schools, four-year institutions or even
local employers. Local labor market and salary data regarding the number of jobs available in a particular CTE field or evidence of meaningful articulation agreements with four-year university partners for the academic program a college is seeking to strengthen will go a long way in making the case that a proposed project is a worthwhile investment of limited funds.

D. Recommendation to the Louisiana Board of Regents and Louisiana Community and Technical College System

The panelists continue to be disappointed that many eligible institutions in Louisiana are not taking advantage of this unique Enhancement Program that can significantly enrich the quality of academic programs. Of 14 eligible institutions, only nine submitted proposals. Not surprisingly, the institutions that submitted the most proposals were also the campuses that ultimately secured the most dollars to enhance their curricula. While we recognize that preparation of a proposal requires a great deal of effort on the part of the grant writer and his or her colleagues, the process of analyzing academic needs, designing interventions and establishing learning outcomes bears fruit above and beyond the funding received. And the odds of being successfully funded in the program are quite high. Twelve of the 22 submissions in this year’s competition received some support. We encourage the Board of Regents to continue to work closely with LCTCS and other systems with two-year campuses to promote this important funding opportunity. The common complaints heard from too many community college administrators and faculty about inadequate public funding for their institutions ring hollow when those colleges do not take advantage of funding opportunities like the Two-Year Enhancement Program.
## TABLE I
Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, FY 2013-14
Proposals Highly Recommended for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>PROPOSAL NO.</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>FUNDS REQUESTED</th>
<th>FUNDS RECOMMENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>022PEN-14</td>
<td>SOWELA</td>
<td>$31,633</td>
<td>$31,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>018PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$55,485</td>
<td>$55,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>001PEN-14</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$83,698</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>014PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$51,150</td>
<td>$51,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>002PEN-14</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$86,287</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>006PEN-14</td>
<td>LSUE</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>003PEN-14</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$120,099</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>011PEN-14</td>
<td>NUNEZ</td>
<td>$137,605</td>
<td>$97,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>017PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$53,562</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>021PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>008PEN-14</td>
<td>NORTHSHORE</td>
<td>$67,600</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>015PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$139,320</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $938,939 $690,400

## TABLE II
Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, FY 2013-14
Proposals Not Recommended for Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>PROPOSAL NO.</th>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>FUNDS REQUESTED</th>
<th>FUNDS RECOMMENDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>012PEN-14</td>
<td>SLCC</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>016PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$57,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>010PEN-14</td>
<td>NUNEZ</td>
<td>$149,496</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>013PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$121,232</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>019PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$59,574</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>020PEN-14</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$64,829</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>007PEN-14</td>
<td>NORTHSHORE</td>
<td>$68,475</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>004PEN-14</td>
<td>DELGADO</td>
<td>$43,626</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>005PEN-14</td>
<td>LA DELTA</td>
<td>$122,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>009PEN-14</td>
<td>NUNEZ</td>
<td>$83,340</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $889,972 $0
INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brenda Brantley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expand Computer Lab in Division of Learning Resources

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional Development (5 points)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score (of 100 points)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

| Requested Amount: | $83,698 |
| Recommended Amount: | $55,000 |

This is a generally well-written proposal that seeks funds to augment and expand technology in Bossier Parish’s Learning Resources Center. The strong needs statement employed numbers and statistics to support the actual and forecasted use of the technology. The project design and evaluation sections were strong and detailed as well. Goals of the proposal, however, were less useful to the panel since the applicant did not include the number of students who might be served with the additional computers. Partial funding of $55,000 is recommended with discretion to the PI to determine where to reduce the budget. The pledged match may be reduced proportionally to the reduced funding.
A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?  X Yes  No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points)  8

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)  4

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  24

5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)  23

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  3

7. Professional Development (5 points)  3

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  4

9. Project Evaluation (10 points)  8

10. Project Dissemination (2 points)  2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

Total Score (of 100 points)  89

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $86,287
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $64,000

This proposal was written in response to a pilot initiative that BPCC conducted in 2012 that showed promising outcomes. The panel commends BPCC for using data to evaluate and then scale up a promising practice, and recommends partial funding of $64,000 to establish a proctored testing laboratory. The panel suggests reducing the equipment to be purchased, but will leave the specifics to the College and project team to determine the most effective use of recommended resources to ensure success of the expanded center. The institutional match should be fully maintained.
INSTITUTION:  Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:  Dee Ann Staats

TITLE OF PROPOSAL:  Expanding Teaching and Enhancing Learning in Anatomy and Physiology

A. Proposal Narrative  (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?  
   Yes  No
   X

2. Description of Project Need (10 points)  10
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)  3
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  20
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)  19
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  3
7. Professional Development (5 points)  5
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  5
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)  10
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)  2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

Total Score (of 100 points)  87

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $120,099
Recommended Amount: $80,000

This is a generally well-conceptualized proposal that seeks funds to augment technology within BPCC's Anatomy and Physiology program. The statistics and arguments employed in the needs statement and subsequent goals and design were compelling and well written. The goal of increasing success rates, stated at 5%, in the panel's opinion is much too conservative given the sizeable requested investment in improved technology. Reviewers certainly hope that a more substantial and aggressive improvement is both sought and achieved. Further, the impact statement, which was too general, failed to explain how many students would be assisted. The panel recommends reduced funding of $80,000 and does not recommend funding for the Smart board system or the Anatomy in Clay Learning System. The pledged match may be reduced proportionally to the reduced funding.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004PEN-14

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Guenther

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science - Science Laboratory Technology Training Program at Delgado Community College

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?  X Yes  No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)  9
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)  5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  19
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)  12
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  3
7. Professional Development (5 points)  3
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  2
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)  4
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)  2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

TOTAL SCORE (OF 100 POINTS) 67

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $43,626
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

Initially the applicant wrote a compelling needs statement, listing strategic goals to support additional investments in biotechnology education and laboratory equipment. Delgado needs funding for expanding educational training programs to provide workers for growing regional biotech industries. Ultimately, the case that this project will address that need was not made. Delgado entered into an significant collaborative effort with many public and private entities and established a very impressive Bio-Tech Advisory Committee. Despite campus membership in a strong consortium, the proposal had no evidence of any matching support from any partner -- not even a letter of support. The project design would have been much stronger if it had included more emphasis on curricular reform and pedagogy related to improving student outcomes. The impact statement provided no information about articulation with four-year partners, which supposedly is a strategic goal, or about how the project would connect students to real jobs in the local biotech economy. Ironically, there was a brief but compelling argument for the needs of low-income students who find it difficult to travel to the lab site at Ochsner Medical Center, but that argument was in the section of the proposal regarding additional funding sources and evidence of collaboration rather than in the needs or impact section. The evaluation section was inadequate. The summary stated that program success would be calculated and analyzed by following students over the short and long terms, and assessing the percentage of students who were employed, but there was no information related to how that would be accomplished. The panel is convinced of this project’s potential, but does not recommend funding. The panel encourages Delgado to revisit the project in the next funding cycle, to focus more clearly on implementation and student outcomes, and to reach out to partners to demonstrate some level of matching support.
The panel does not recommend funding this proposal. While the described need -- to provide support to rural and distance education students -- appears practical, the needs argument and statistical support were not compelling and did not make an adequate case for this investment. Specifically, there were little or no student data to show that students were not being served and the proposal did not directly address the needs/failures of the students in the seven rural sites. The U.S. Commerce Report data that were provided were too general. The proposal also failed to present a statistics-based impact statement, so the panel was unable to understand what realistic impacts would occur. Finally, the plan to distribute both computers and air-cards to rural students is fraught with risk and would not work as described. No explanation was included to demonstrate how the technology would be monitored, protected, or maintained. Simply supplying students with the technology does not insure its use will be for learning.
The panel was impressed by this proposal to procure a Proton NMR Spectrometer to enhance LSUE’s chemistry curriculum. The proposal had a well-written and well-documented needs statement, which made the case for why science students at LSUE should have access to better lab equipment as part of their chemistry education and training. The statement of strategic goals was strong, as were the project design and the impact sections. The proposal would have been even stronger had it had some evidence of investment, even in-kind, on the part of LSUE and/or local industry, and a stronger learning outcomes-based evaluation section. Nonetheless, the review panel was convinced of the need for this investment and recommends that the proposal be fully funded.
The panel does not recommend that this proposal be funded. While the described need -- to develop faculty and improve student “information literacy” -- appears practical, the needs argument and statistical support were not compelling and did not make an adequate case for this investment. Specifically, while a large percentage of students are taking remedial courses, little or no student data were incorporated to show that students were taking remedial courses because they lacked information literacy skills. Further, the goals section failed to explain how many students would be affected or how many would improve. The proposal also failed to present statistics-based impact statements, so the panel was unable to determine what real impacts would occur. These were missing again in the evaluation section since no statistical data were identified to measure improvement. Finally, the budget provided no description or justification of the items requested as they relate to the goals of the project.
This is an intriguing, well-written proposal that seeks support to enhance outreach efforts to underserved populations in Northshore’s service region. The panel was impressed with the well-thought-out design and targeted marketing efforts. The panel admits that our initial reaction was caution, wondering if this was an appropriate use of BoRSF Enhancement funds. But after careful review of the proposal, the panel decided that the College made a strong case that targeted efforts to reach an underserved population, which would be carefully evaluated to determine the return on investment, were worthy of funding. While admittedly out of the ordinary, the panel is convinced it is worth a trial. Indeed, we are looking forward to reading the final report on the impact of these efforts and strongly encourage NTCC to share lessons learned with other LCTCS colleges. Given other significant needs across the State the panel cannot support full funding for the request, but recommends that $45,000 be awarded with discretion to the PI in determining budgetary reductions. The institutional match should be fully maintained.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 009PEN-14

**INSTITUTION:** Nunez Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Donald Hoffman

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancement of Two Year Institutions for Faculty and High School Teachers, to Develop Work Force in STEM Education Using Project Based Learning

### A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Data Adequate? Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional Development (5 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score (of 100 points)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $83,340

**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT:** $0

The review panel does not recommend that this proposal be funded. While this is an interesting and unique set of ideas, the proposal is incomplete. Absent are most of the critical sections (needs, goals, design, impact, and so forth). Therefore the proposal does not meet the basic requirements of the Request for Proposals.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010PEN-14

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen LeBlanc

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: College Career Center for Students

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? X Yes No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points) 7

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points) 4

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) 20

5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points) 22

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (5 points) 2

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 4

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) 7

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) 2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

5

Total Score (of 100 points) 76

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $149,496
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

The panel does not recommend funding for Nunez’s College Career Center. While having such a center for students can certainly contribute to their success, this proposal did not make a strong enough case for such a significant investment of limited Enhancement funds. Given the rigorous statewide competition for this program’s dollars, proposals should have clearly defined, measurable student learning outcomes and a clear alignment among project activities, equipment and programmatic investments. The significant budget request for equipment and staff release time was unrealistic and not justified based on the project design and stated outcomes. There was little evidence of professional development and the evaluation plan was weak.
### Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?  \[X \quad \text{Yes} \quad \_ \quad \text{No} \]

2. Description of Project Need (10 points)  \[10 \]

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)  \[5 \]

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  \[22 \]

5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)  \[22 \]

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  \[3 \]

7. Professional Development (5 points)  \[5 \]

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  \[0 \]

9. Project Evaluation (10 points)  \[7 \]

10. Project Dissemination (2 points)  \[2 \]

### Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

Total Score (of 100 points)  \[86 \]

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $137,605  
**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT:** $97,632  

The applicant proposes some good ideas about providing EMT, CAN, Paramedic, and Allied Health students with lab and lecture enhancements simulating situations they will face in the real world. The statistics and arguments employed in the needs statement and subsequent goals and design sections, while making sense, lacked statistical information about the numbers of students that would be impacted or assisted. However, a good case was made for the current overall lack of technology to support even students’ most basic training needs. Partial funding of $97,632 is recommended. The panel recommends that fewer than 12 computers be purchased and that the $27,780 for supplies be reduced to fit within the recommended budget. The panel notes that the 20% listed for shipping all equipment is unrealistically high. Future proposals should be more thorough and more carefully prepared. The institutional match should be fully maintained.
The proposal had a strong needs statement about the challenges that accompany the merger of ATC with SLCC and the College’s attempt to expand capacity to serve students in multiple locations. The proposal provided evidence of one strategic goal, which is to have a measurable increase in student completion; however, a three percent increase for such a significant investment of funds is very modest. The proposal was on the right track in terms of course redesign, but it just did not make a compelling case for exactly how these interventions would lead to the desired outcomes. The case should have been more concrete and evidence based. Having other sources of funding helped the proposal, but funds requested were very high in relation to the projected outcomes. Ultimately the panel was not convinced that this investment had a sufficiently significant potential for impact, and does not recommend funding the project. The proposal has the ingredients to be an intriguing project, therefore the panel encourages the applicant to rework the proposal and submit it again.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013PEN-14

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Alak

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of Hands-On Laboratory Exercises for Augmentation of Instructional Delivery at SUSLA

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</td>
<td>X Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional Development (5 points)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score (of 100 points) 73

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $121,232
Recommended Amount: $0

While the proposal’s goals -- to procure lab equipment/supplies and develop student lab exercises -- are practical, the needs arguments and statistical support were not compelling and did not make an adequate case for this investment. The needs statement failed to document how many students are negatively impacted by the lack of hands-on exercises, and the impact statement provided no data about the number of students who would benefit from the project’s outcomes. While no details were provided, the evaluation section indicated a plan to gather the type of critical data (e.g., changes in transfer rates, retention, matriculation, and completion rates) that would have strengthened this proposal if these data had been incorporated into the plans and goals. It was impossible for the panel to estimate the long-term benefits that would accrue from this project. The budget provided no justification or even an explanation for the intended expenditures. The panel does not recommend funding.
### Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?  
   - X Yes  
   - No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points)  
   - 10

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)  
   - 5

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  
   - 22

5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)  
   - 23

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  
   - 3

7. Professional Development (5 points)  
   - 5

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  
   - 2

9. Project Evaluation (10 points)  
   - 9

10. Project Dissemination (2 points)  
    - 1

### B Budget and Budgt Narrative (Total of 10 points)

Total Score (of 100 points)  
- 90

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:**  
- $51,150

**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT:**  
- $51,150

The panel recommends full funding for SUSLA's health care simulation lab project. The applicant did a very good job of establishing the goals and needs, along with concrete objectives. The project design was well articulated and the argument for the potential to enhance student learning in a number of different Allied Health departments was clearly made. The project evaluation included measures of student outcomes and the budget request was clearly defended and reasonable.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015PEN-14

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Iris Champion

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: New Age Learning: Increasing Student Success in College-Level Math Courses through Virtual Student Accessibility

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? X Yes No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points) 10

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points) 5

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) 19

5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points) 17

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (5 points) 5

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 5

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) 8

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) 2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

  Total Score (of 100 points) 82

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $139,320
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $88,000

The applicant proposed several good ideas to create two computer technology-based classrooms for teaching mathematics. While the overall quality of this proposal needed improvement, the statistics and arguments employed in the summary (which would be better placed in the needs section) made sense and made the proposal more compelling. Future proposals should contain significant data-based arguments and outcomes statements, as well as be more thoroughly researched and carefully written. Nevertheless, while the proposal lacked data, a good case was made for the current overall lack of technology to support math. Funding of $88,000 is recommended. The panel recommends that the numbers of computers and workstations be reduced at the PI’s discretion.
While there are significant documented benefits associated with Smart classrooms, this proposal did not make a strong enough case that the technology was critical to improving academic outcomes in SUSLA’s English curriculum. The panel was left with the impression that the technology would be nice to have, but was not essential. The applicant stated that the restructuring project of embracing technology in the English classroom would positively impact curriculum and instruction, but there was little evidence to support the argument. The discussion of professional development was vague, and the evaluation was not particularly well defined with concrete outcome measures. Given the significant number of competing proposals from Southern University at Shreveport itself, this proposal did not make a strong enough case to merit funding.
INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jimmy Daniel

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Re-Shaping Learning for Student Success in a Virtual Class via Faculty Training in Online Pedagogy and MOODLE Technology

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)
   1. Demographic Data Adequate? ___X___ Yes   _______ No
   2. Description of Project Need (10 points) _______ 10
   3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points) _______ 5
   4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) _______ 21
   5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points) _______ 21
   6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) _______ 3
   7. Professional Development (5 points) _______ 3
   8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) _______ 5
   9. Project Evaluation (10 points) _______ 5
  10. Project Dissemination (2 points) _______ 2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)
   Total Score (of 100 points) _______ 85

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $53,562
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $35,000

The PI of this generally well-written proposal listed several good ideas to train and improve faculty for successful student e-learning. The strong needs statement employed data and statistics along with a solid argument to increase the numbers of e-learning-ready faculty. The goals, design and evaluation sections were strong as well, employing data as goals and outcomes were made specific. The panel recommends reduced funding of $35,000 and suggests that the number of computers (25) be reduced, that supplies be eliminated, and that conference travel be reduced to support a single faculty attendee at each conference.
This was a very strong, well-written proposal that successfully made the case for why developing the capacity to link competency-based curricula to local labor market needs through developing a cohort of DACUM- and SCID-trained faculty would significantly improve student outcomes in both credit and noncredit academic programs as Southern University in Shreveport. The panel recommends full funding for SUSLA’s workforce project.
A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? Yes No
   X Yes

2. Description of Project Need (10 points) 6

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points) 5

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) 19

5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points) 19

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (5 points) 2

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 0

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) 7

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) 2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)

Total Score (of 100 points) 72

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount: $59,574

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount: $0

The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal. While the described goals -- to equip and upgrade humanities classrooms -- are practical, the needs argument and statistical support were not compelling and did not make a convincing case for the investment. The needs statement failed to document how many students would be served and how many classes would be offered or improved. Further, the impact section did not have a data-supported explanation of how many students would be assisted because of new technology. While the panel agrees that strategically employed technology may improve instruction or leverage instructional time and talent, the simple argument that adding technology will make things better, without explaining how or how many, is not compelling. It was impossible for the panel to estimate the long-term benefits from a proposal lacking important data.
The proposed project is intriguing but ultimately lacked enough concrete evidence to make its case compared to other funding requests. The articulation of the proposal was very general, backed up by little evidence. For instance, one argument was about the importance of the potential training for helping students gain employment in the growing regional music industry. The panel expected but was not provided with numbers that indicate how many jobs in the industry are available, what salaries they command and whether this training would indeed adequately prepare students for these positions. The project design and evaluation sections were weak and lacked measurable outcomes and specificity. The arguments were not strong enough to justify this level of investment. The panel does not recommend funding.
This is a generally well-written proposal to enhance services and advising for first-generation students with the intention to lead to a higher rate of employability following postsecondary education. The needs statement presented a solid argument for serving first-generation students, but it would have been stronger if it had employed numbers and statistics explaining how many students need such help. The goals, design and evaluation sections were strong as well, but needed more specific data. The panel recommends a reduced budget of $25,000, with the number of student tutors reduced and supplies reduced or eliminated. The pledged match may be reduced proportionally to the reduced funding.
The panel recommends full funding for SOWELA’s critical thinking and science literacy project. The applicant made an excellent case for how investing in telescope equipment would significantly enhance the College's science curriculum and expand student learning opportunities. The panel was particularly impressed with the proposed outreach efforts to engage local high school and middle school students in the program, and with the goal of building a larger pool of students interested in STEM from traditionally underrepresented populations. The panel wishes to commend the PI for providing a very frugal budget, including his offer to stay with family members to reduce the cost of housing during training, which helped make the case that recommended resources will be wisely managed.
Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal #</th>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Req. amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001PEN-14</td>
<td>Mrs. Brenda Brantley</td>
<td>Expand Computer Lab in Division of Learning Resources</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$83,698.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002PEN-14</td>
<td>Mrs. Donna Densmore</td>
<td>Enhancement of Test Proctoring Lab</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$86,287.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003PEN-14</td>
<td>Dr. Dee Ann Staats</td>
<td>Expanding Teaching and Enhancing Learning in Anatomy and Physiology</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$120,099.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004PEN-14</td>
<td>Dr. James Guenther</td>
<td>Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science-Science Laboratory Technology Training Program at Delgado Community College</td>
<td>DEL</td>
<td>$43,626.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005PEN-14</td>
<td>Ms. Annie/A Mckinney</td>
<td>Enhancing retention by expanding the use of technology, electronic and print resources for Delta's rural community locations to meet the academic and technical support needs of the expanding college programs.</td>
<td>LADELTA</td>
<td>$122,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006PEN-14</td>
<td>Dr. Chad Huval</td>
<td>Proton NMR Spectrometer to Enhance Chemistry Curriculum</td>
<td>LSUE</td>
<td>$62,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007PEN-14</td>
<td>Mrs. Margaret Keller</td>
<td>ILLUSTRATE: Information Literacy: Leading Undergraduate Students To Resourcing Academic Technological Experiences</td>
<td>NTCC</td>
<td>$68,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008PEN-14</td>
<td>Dr. Tina Tinney</td>
<td>Putting Northshore Technical Community College ON THE MAP</td>
<td>NTCC</td>
<td>$67,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009PEN-14</td>
<td>Mr. Donald Hoffman</td>
<td>Enhancement of two year Institutions for faculty and high school teachers, to develop work force in STEM education using project based learning</td>
<td>NUNEZ</td>
<td>$83,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010PEN-14</td>
<td>Mrs. Kathleen LeBlanc</td>
<td>College Career Center for Students</td>
<td>NUNEZ</td>
<td>$149,496.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011PEN-14</td>
<td>Mr. Stephen Waddell</td>
<td>A&amp;P for EMT</td>
<td>NUNEZ</td>
<td>$137,605.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012PEN-14</td>
<td>Mrs. Nicole Learson</td>
<td>Virtual Academic Integration</td>
<td>SLCC</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013PEN-14</td>
<td>Dr. John Alak</td>
<td>Development of Hands-on laboratory exercises for augmentation of instructional delivery at SUSLA.</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$121,232.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014PEN-14</td>
<td>Prof. Jo Brown</td>
<td>Establishment of a Health Care Simulation Lab-Multi Team Approach</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$51,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015PEN-14</td>
<td>Dr. Iris Champion</td>
<td>New Age Learning: Increasing Student Success in College-Level Math Courses through Virtual Student Accessibility</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$139,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016PEN-14</td>
<td>Mrs. Joyce Cottonham</td>
<td>Embracing Technology in the English Classroom</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$57,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017PEN-14</td>
<td>Mr. Jimmy Daniel</td>
<td>Re-Shaping Learning for Student Success in a Virtual Class via Faculty Training in Online Pedagogy and MOODLE Technology</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$53,562.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal #</td>
<td>PI Name</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>First Year Req. amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018PEN-14</td>
<td>Ms. Stephanie Graham</td>
<td>Linking Competencies and Curricula to Workforce Needs</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$55,485.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019PEN-14</td>
<td>Dr. Lonnie McCray</td>
<td>Multimedia Lab</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$59,574.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020PEN-14</td>
<td>Mr. Dorsey Summerfield</td>
<td>Music Education Animation Technology [MEAT]</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$64,829.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021PEN-14</td>
<td>Ms. Tuesday Williams</td>
<td>Strengthen First Generation Employability through Peer Advisement</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022PEN-14</td>
<td>Mr. Alexander Bell</td>
<td>Critical Thinking and Science Literacy. A Hands-On Approach to Teaching Physical Science</td>
<td>STCC</td>
<td>$31,633.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Proposals submitted: 31

Total Money Requested: $1,828,911.00
Appendix B

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

Proposal Number: ___________________  Project Director: ______________________________

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 points)

1. Demographic Data (0 points, but a required component)
   Has the applicant adequately described the demographic data about the campus that will benefit from the proposed project, and relevant institutional or departmental resources, if appropriate?

2. Description of Project Need (_____ of 10 points)
   Has the applicant adequately described project needs and related them to the goals and measurable objectives? To what extent will the needs of the project, if funded, enhance the affected campus, entity, department/division or unit?

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (_____ of 5 points)
   What are the strategic goals of the intended project? Are the objectives clearly stated and measurable? What are the measurable objectives that will indicate that the goal(s) have been achieved? Did the applicant identify outcome goals/objectives and the process goals/objectives separately? Can they be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?

4. Design of Proposed Project (_____ of 25 points)
   To what extent will the project assist the applicant to strengthen the capacities of Louisiana’s two-year campuses in order to improve their academic, workforce development, missions, and programs, and enhance infrastructure? Is the proposal aligned with the Guiding Principles and focused on the development/improvement of the two-year institution and students’ academic achievement? Are all activities designed to achieve goals and objectives? Are appropriate activities provided for each goal and objective?

5. Impact of the Project (_____ of 25 points)
   To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the institution to attract and/or retain students? Does the applicant consider critical shortage areas in the State? Is evidence presented that student achievement will be favorably impacted by the project? Is the anticipated impact aligned with needs, key goals, objectives, and the proposed budget?

6. Faculty and Staff Expertise (_____ of 3 points)
   To what extent will the project enhance faculty and staff expertise? Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified and trained to implement this project?
7. **Professional Development (_____ of 5 points)**
   Does the applicant describe the need for any professional development activities? What is the primary purpose(s) of the activities? Are the professional development activities connected to the primary activities of the project? Is faculty/staff training tied to each aspect of the proposal (need, objectives, activities, evaluation)? If special training will be required for project participants, has an appropriate plan been developed? What is the anticipated impact of professional development?

8. **Additional Funding Sources and Evidence of Collaboration (_____ of 5 points)**
   To what extent will the project assist in establishing any new relationships or strengthen an existing relationship with one or more partners? Is the project likely to contribute to economic or workforce development activities in Louisiana? Is there evidence of collaboration other than financial? To what extent will collaborative partners share the costs associated with this project? Do letters of support clearly specify financial and/or in-kind contributions of each partner? Are the supporting documents convincing?

9. **Project Evaluation (_____ of 10 points)**
   Does the project have an evaluation plan? To what extent is the plan for assessment of the outcomes of the proposed project sound, clearly identified, and measurable? Does the assessment plan align to the goals, objectives, and activities? Did the applicant describe in detail how he/she will measure the success of goals and objectives in the evaluation section? To what extent will the proposed project have a positive impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the institution, division, or unit? Is this impact significant? Is it measurable?

10. **Project Dissemination (_____ of 2 points)**
    Are the plans for dissemination of best practices clearly specified and attainable? Is the plan adequate to fully disseminate results of the project?

B. **Budget Page and Budget Narrative (_____ of 10 points)**
    Is the proposed budget reasonable for the scope of work to be performed? Are personnel support costs, if any, stated and adequately explained? Are equipment and supply costs appropriate? Is the proposed budget adequately justified in the budget explanation/narrative? Have any guidelines regarding disallowed budgetary items (stated in the RFP, pp. 10-11) been violated?

---

**REVIEWERS' BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount: $________________________ Recommended Amount: $_____________________________