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A. Introduction

A two-member Two-Year Enhancement Program proposal review team consisting of Dr. Katherine A. Boswell (chair), consultant on community college policy issues, and Dr. Russell E. Hamm, consultant on workforce issues, formerly with the U.S. Department of Labor, met January 9-10, 2012, in Baton Rouge to evaluate thirty-one (31) 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 following materials were transmitted electronically to the team before their visit: a) all thirty-one (31) Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposals to be evaluated with their rating forms; b) a summary of all proposals listing titles, investigators and institutions involved, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2011-12 Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the previous year’s Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposal review Final Report.

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

A total of $2,865,376 was requested by all proposals. After careful review, the team recommended full or partial funding for sixteen (16) proposals for a total expenditure of the $1,071,445 that is anticipated to be available for the program in 2011-12. Table I contains a rank-order list of sixteen (16) proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. The team set the funding bar at 80 rating points since the quality of the proposals as a whole increased this year. Table II lists the fifteen (15) proposals that were not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal follows the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted is found in Appendix A and the rating form used by the evaluators is in Appendix B.

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

The team is encouraged by significant improvements in the overall quality of proposals this year as compared to past years. Proposals continue to have a stronger focus on measurable outcomes and virtually all of the proposals addressed tangible and significant institutional needs. Proposal need statements were better documented and more compelling than past proposals, making it more difficult to determine which proposals to recommend for funding, particularly in light of significant needs demonstrated at institutions across the State.

We continue to recommend that LCTCS take greater advantage of the significant experience and resources of the Board of Regents and/or other external training resources to provide grantsmanship training specifically targeted at faculty and staff from the community and technical colleges.
In the past we have expressed concern that many of the proposals are prepared by dedicated faculty members who are appropriately anxious to enhance the quality of their respective academic programs and seek significant investments in equipment, in new personnel, and/or to establish new academic programs. We note, however, the restriction in the RFP that once the one-time funds are gone, the institution must pledge to continue to maintain the new positions and/or programs, sometimes at significant cost. While the team has not wanted to discourage faculty from being entrepreneurial, we have urged submission of a letter as part of the proposal process from the upper administration ensuring that the proposal has the full commitment and support of the institution. We were pleased to see more letters of support from the appropriate Dean or Academic Vice President, which assure us that the proposal has the full support of the institution and if funded the project will be institutionalized for at least one year after grant funds are expended.

C. Recommendations to Applicants to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions

This year, for the first time in a decade of reviewing Two-Year Enhancement program proposals, the team made the painful decision to reduce almost all the final amounts recommended as compared to the initial requests. The average budget request for individual proposals submitted to the Program has been increasing over the past few years while the total dollar amount available has remained stable or been reduced. The team was faced with a decision between fully funding a few projects which would benefit a smaller number of students and institutions or, after careful consideration and scrutiny, scaling back the size of most projects in order to ensure a more equitable distribution of funds to worthy projects. The team recognizes that Principal Investigators have a far greater understanding than external reviewers of the needs and particulars of individual projects. We do, however, have enough experience as grant writers and project managers ourselves to know that there are usually savings and belt tightening that can be achieved without undermining essential project outcomes. We regret this necessity and recognize that it will require difficult decisions for many project managers, particularly those who are dependent on expensive equipment investments. While we do not recommend that the Board of Regents reduce the maximum budget request allowable at this time, we do caution future Enhancement proposal writers that budget requests that push against the upper limits are far more likely to receive significant scrutiny and require greater justification. Unless the total amount of funds available in the program increases significantly, the demand on these limited dollars is going to become even more competitive in the future. Scale your projects wisely, and be prepared to justify large budget requests.

One persistent problem with several proposals is the difficulty of designing an evaluation component that addresses impact on student learning outcomes rather than mere completion of process objectives. This continues to be the major weakness found in many proposals. We urge faculty to become familiar with the types of evaluation designs that measure student academic preparedness and effectiveness.

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

Staff Note: BoR Sponsored Programs managers have for several years presented grants-writing workshops with postsecondary faculty and staff across the State when invited to do so by an institution. Last fall they conducted 13 such two-plus hour workshops via videoconference with individuals and/or small groups of faculty who were interested in discussing opportunities in all Support Fund programs. If your campus is interested in this service, please contact the Enhancement Program managers during the summer to make arrangements. Most of the videoconferences occurred in August or early September, with proposals due in October.
D. Commendations and Recommendations of the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Review Team to the Louisiana Board of Regents

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

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

E. Conclusion

We acknowledge and commend the Board and Sponsored Programs staff for your commitment to improving Louisiana’s two-year community and technical colleges and for giving us the opportunity to participate in this important Enhancement Program review process. We consider it an honor and privilege to work with you and hope that these observations will be helpful in your deliberative processes.
### 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>97</td>
<td>021PEN-12</td>
<td>RPCC</td>
<td>$30,518</td>
<td>$30,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>020PEN-12</td>
<td>RPCC</td>
<td>$146,084</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>003PEN-12</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$65,794</td>
<td>$60,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>031PEN-12</td>
<td>Sowela</td>
<td>$49,714</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>015PEN-12</td>
<td>LSU-Eunice</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>004PEN-12</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$95,295</td>
<td>$79,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>018PEN-12</td>
<td>RPCC</td>
<td>$92,445</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>011PEN-12</td>
<td>LA Delta</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>013PEN-12</td>
<td>LSU-Eunice</td>
<td>$149,471</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>005PEN-12</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$92,791</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>025PEN-12</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$35,445</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>017PEN-12</td>
<td>Nunez</td>
<td>$149,993</td>
<td>$99,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>008PEN-12</td>
<td>LA Delta</td>
<td>$95,834</td>
<td>$60,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>023PEN-12</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$108,300</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>029PEN-12</td>
<td>Sowela</td>
<td>$132,494</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>027PEN-12</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$67,900</td>
<td>$33,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $1,572,078

### 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>17</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>001PEN-12</td>
<td>BRCC</td>
<td>$89,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>007PEN-12</td>
<td>LA Delta</td>
<td>$134,514</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>030PEN-12</td>
<td>Sowela</td>
<td>$77,432</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>002PEN-12</td>
<td>BPCC</td>
<td>$52,162</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>022PEN-12</td>
<td>RPCC</td>
<td>$74,670</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>024PEN-12</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$108,956</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>006PEN-12</td>
<td>Delgado</td>
<td>$138,482</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>010PEN-12</td>
<td>LA Delta</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>014PEN-12</td>
<td>LSU-Eunice</td>
<td>$114,726</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>012PEN-12</td>
<td>LA Delta</td>
<td>$60,338</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>028PEN-12</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$145,935</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>016PEN-12</td>
<td>Nunez</td>
<td>$119,063</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>019PEN-12</td>
<td>RPCC</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>026PEN-12</td>
<td>SUSLA</td>
<td>$31,410</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>009PEN-12</td>
<td>LA Delta</td>
<td>$36,710</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $1,293,298

---

**2012 ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

**Table I**

**PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

**Table II**

**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001PEN-12

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Sells

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: BRCC’s Center for Teaching Enhancement

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</th>
<th>X Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)</td>
<td>23</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 (0 points)</td>
<td>X Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Total Score (of 100 points) | 71 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $89,900
Recommended Amount: $0

The review team cannot recommend funding for BRCC’s Center for Teaching Enhancement proposal, though the concept has strong merit. Particularly noteworthy was the fact that the need and idea for the Center were generated from among faculty ranks and brought forward to the Executive Cabinet, which seems to also have endorsed it in concept. The need statement was strong and commendable because it seemed to be based on a needs assessment of academic deans and ongoing research conducted by the General Education and Assessment Committee. However, what was problematic is that a project designed to prepare teachers for student-centered instruction and best practices in pedagogy did not include measurable objectives related to improved teaching or learning outcomes. The plan provided great detail pre-award, but little detail about what would transpire if funding was received. The impact statement lacked clarity and specificity and the evaluation measures were all process-related. The budget requests for travel and professional speakers were not justified and unrealistic in the current fiscal environment. Although the reviewers are committed advocates for faculty development, this particular proposal did not make a strong enough case.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002PEN-12

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Keith Bruce

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Post Production Lab Environment

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? X Yes   ___ No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points)  4

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

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  16

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  18

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  3

7. Professional Development (0 points) X Yes   ___ No

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)  67

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $52,162

Recommended Amount: $0

The Division of Telecommunications at BPCC seeks funds for Avid Media Composer software and the technology (computers) to offer students experience in industry-standard post-production editing. While the reviewers have supported the growth of this program in past competitions, this proposal failed to build a compelling case regarding the positive workforce and economic impact the investment would have. The proposal explained that employment for camera operators and editors would grow 12% over the next decade, which appears modest. Not clear was the number of jobs forecast for Louisiana and the increase in TV/film employment that might result from this investment. Although the review team continues to recognize this program as a State leader, this proposal was not convincing enough for us to recommend funding for it.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003PEN-12

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Margaret Cox

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding Teaching and Enhancing Learning in the Microbiology Laboratory

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)  
   _______ 23

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  
   _______ 27

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

7. Professional Development (0 points)  
   X Yes    _______ No

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)

   _______ 10

Total Score (of 100 points)  _______ 95

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $65,794
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $60,794

The reviewers recommend funding of $60,794 for the “Expanding Teaching and Enhancing Learning in the Microbiology Laboratory” proposal from BPCC. This is a well written and well conceived proposal. It is student focused, makes a strong case for need, and is well supported with data and learning outcomes. Unfortunately, the review team recommends a small reduction ($5,000) in the budget due to the extraordinarily competitive group of proposals’ demand for Enhancement Program funds this year. Perhaps the reduction can be achieved through modest savings on equipment and discounts, but the final decision should be made at the PI’s discretion.
BPCC seeks funding to bring to scale the Active Learning Model currently employed in anatomy courses. The reviewers recommend that this sound proposal be funded at the level of $79,714, subject to budget adjustments noted below. The team acknowledges that this proposal targets the introductory “gate-keeping” anatomy classes, where it will have the greatest impact for the most students. We note that the goals for this project are well argued, but the resulting impact remains somewhat speculative since no data reflected how this project would affect the economy or improve student learning. Nevertheless, we believe that the requested equipment will have a direct impact on improving instruction and the project may serve as a model for others. The funding recommended reflects the following reductions: 1) eliminate the student response system and 2) reduce the amount allocated for laptop computers ($1,303/unit appears far too high in today’s market). Overall, though, this is a good project.
INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Chris Rondeau

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementing Mobile Electronic Devices into Cyber Information Technology Instruction

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) 21

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) 26

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (0 points) X Yes _______ No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 4

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) 88

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $92,791
Recommended Amount: $62,000

Partial funding of $62,000 is recommended for BPCC’s “Implementing Mobile Electronic Devices into Cyber Information Technology Instruction” proposal. The review team tends to be skeptical of the appropriateness of using BoRSF funds to purchase the latest and greatest technology; however, we were impressed by the nature of the project’s design, which specifically seeks to measure differences in learning outcomes related to the use of new devices -- with a control group of classes using traditional textbooks -- versus outcomes from courses adopting e-book readers. The proposal made good use of data and different evaluation methodologies, and the project is designed to inform a broader strategic initiative investigating future curricular needs. However, given the high cost of the project and pressing financial needs of other proposals, the team recommended a reduction in the budget since we were not convinced that there would be enough differences to justify measuring relative impacts on learning outcomes between iPads and Android Xoom tablets. The reduced budget should still allow the project to function on a smaller scale, and the PIs should determine how and where to scale the initiative back.
Delgado Community College seeks funds to establish a video production system to create student videos for the nursing program and to offer books in a digital format. Reviewers found the need statement to be compelling: low completion rates in the ADN program (55%) and the CPN program (67%). The proposal asserts that low completion rates result from students who lack study and test-taking skills. Although that assertion may well be valid, the connection between the need and the solution (build a video laboratory and produce videos) appears weak. We agree that students must attain study/test skills but do not see that the large investment in a video lab will necessarily improve the skills they lack. Further, the belief that e-books loaded onto iPads or similar technologies will remedy students’ study-skills challenges is an expensive assumption – not even mentioning the difficulties in keeping track of the devices and assuring their proper use. Further, our experience suggests that the PIs might investigate many videos and learning assistance systems that are currently available for the entire healthcare education system. The team does not recommend funding for this proposal.
The reviewers commend the project teams from Louisiana Delta and River Parishes Community Colleges for their collaborative efforts in designing this project. Nevertheless, we cannot recommend funding for it. One of the major arguments in the need statement centers around the high costs of traditional textbooks for students with limited budgets, and the potential for significant cost savings and learning enhancements associated with the use of e-books. However, the proposal and its budget describe how the iPads will be kept in securely locked cabinets in appropriate classrooms. That plan seems to defeat the purpose of arguing for technology enhancements to decrease textbook costs and support increased student access and engagement by not making those devices available for students outside of class. The proposal also lacked a significant evaluation component and contained unsupported budget requests, e.g., $10,000 for unspecified travel. The review team is skeptical when asked to consider large expenditures for the purchase of the latest and greatest technology that does not meet very concrete learning goals. Although the review team advocates for enhancing student engagement through appropriate investments in new technology, this particular proposal did not make a strong enough case for the large investment.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008PEN-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kirk Bradley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Program Completion Through Effective Supportive Learning Initiatives (SLI)

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) 20

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) 25

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (0 points) X Yes  No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 2

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) 85

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount: $95,834

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount: $60,834

Louisiana Delta Community College seeks funding to further equip the Student Success Center (with an emphasis on the biological sciences) and to provide tutoring services for students. The team congratulates LDCC for this sound proposal and recommends that this request be funded at the level of $60,834, subject to the budget adjustments noted below. The reviewers note the strength of the need statement and agree with the PIs’ conclusion: invest in this Center. However, we note that the impact of the investment remains somewhat speculative regarding numbers of students to be affected, anticipated improvements and improvement in faculty skills. The evaluation section is strong as is the overall purpose; in general, this is a good project. The $60,834 recommended is less than that requested, reflecting the following recommendations: 1) reduce the amount allocated for tutors by approximately $30,000 and 2) eliminate the cost for the consultant ($5,000).
INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Richard Gibbs
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Instrumentation Upgrade for Laboratory and Classroom Instruction

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) _____ 2

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) _____ 15

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) _____ 0

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

7. Professional Development (0 points) X Yes _____ No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) _____ 4

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) _____ 0

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) _____ 0

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

Total Score (of 100 points) 37

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $36,710
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

Unfortunately, the review team cannot recommend funding for this proposal because it is incomplete. While the proposal does a good job of establishing project need and documents the number of students who potentially could benefit from the investment in upgraded laboratory facilities, it has an inadequate discussion of project design and no information about impact, evaluation or dissemination.
Louisiana Delta Community College seeks funding to further equip the Process Technology laboratory with simulators. The team agrees that process technology and an increase in process operators are important to regional industry. This proposal, however, was not compelling since: 1) it lacked an introductory summary, 2) it had very general strategic goals, 3) it had a weak impact statement, and 4) its budget contained no explanation or narrative. Further, the review team questioned the 60% placement rate of the program, wondering why it was so low given the asserted high need for operators. Are there additional problems that should be investigated? Overall, there appears to be a need for further investment in the PTEC lab, but this proposal failed to make a strong case for it. For these reasons the reviewers recommend that this proposal not be funded.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Delta Community College  
**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Robert Hammack  
**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Forensic Science

---

**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)  
   - 4

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  
   - 23

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  
   - 26

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

7. Professional Development (0 points)  
   - X Yes  
   - No

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)  
  - 90

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Requested Amount: $150,000  
- Recommended Amount: $100,000

The review team recommends $100,000 in funding for LDCC’s Forensic Science proposal, which is very well written and makes a strong case for the need for the investment. The proposal contained well-documented evidence of collaboration and support from area law enforcement agencies and its implementation plan was reasonable. The proposal would have benefitted from more concrete measurable objectives; nonetheless, the review team is convinced of the necessity and value of this project. Unfortunately, given the compelling statewide need for Enhancement funds, we cannot recommend full funding at this time, although we hope that the PI will be successful in identifying additional sources of external support that may help make up for the reduction in the budget. The reviewers leave it to the PI to decide where budget savings may be found.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Delta Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Clara Lewis

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Students' Learning Experiences Through Learning Communities and Service -- The Ladelta Learn-N-Serve Project

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? _____ Yes _____ No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points) 10

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points) 2

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) 20

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) 10

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (0 points) _____ Yes _____ No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 5

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) 2

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) 2

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

Total Score (of 100 points) 58

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount: $60,338

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0

Louisiana Delta Community College seeks funding for computers and equipment in support of establishing service-based student learning experiences. The team compliments the strong need case presented as it substantially expressed the value of service learning. However, the proposal failed to connect the need case to the request for computers and equipment. The strategic goals did not note the need for technology to support service learning and, further, it was unclear why the project needed to “input, collect, analyze and research data…” to make service learning work. The proposal made a brief mention of computers acting as “teaching tools for the elderly,” which was not explained anywhere else in the proposal. Finally, the budget was poorly justified. This proposal expressed an admirable concept but did not make a convincing case for the actual investment, thus the team does not recommend funding for it.

(RatingForms07-08.xls:jh)
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Eunice

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Chad Huval

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laboratory Improvements to Enhance the Teaching and Learning of the Chemical Sciences at LSU Eunice

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)  
   4

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  
   22

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  
   26

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  
   3

7. Professional Development (0 points)  
   X Yes  No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  
   5

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) 89

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $149,471

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $100,000

The review team recommends that the LSU-Eunice Chemistry Lab Improvements proposal receive partial funding of $100,000. This was a well-written proposal that made a very strong, well-documented case for this equipment investment. The PI explained the dissemination strategy well, and the plan to revise the curriculum was solid. The proposal would have benefitted from more concrete student outcome measures in the evaluation section. Nevertheless, the reviewers are convinced of the necessity and value of this project despite other compelling statewide needs. The PI should identify additional sources of external support that may help make up for the reduction in the recommended award and may determine where budget savings are to be found. Congratulations on the design of this project.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014PEN-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Eunice

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Fred Landry

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana Rural Business Cooperative and Entrepreneurship Training Laboratory

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)  12

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  10

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  3

7. Professional Development (0 points)  X Yes  _____ No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  3

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)  65

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $114,726

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0

Louisiana State University-Eunice seeks funding for computers, computer lab equipment, a video production studio, and software to establish a rural-oriented business and entrepreneurship training lab, but the team does not recommend that it be funded. We compliment the strong case presented in this proposal as it established the need for business development training for rural Louisiana. Further, the strategic goals appear well thought out. However, we failed to be persuaded that success was dependent upon a high-tech, expensive computer lab. Further, the plan to install video production equipment and to produce training videos seems unnecessary and costly given the plethora of well-produced business training videos that are available from many sources. Finally, the impact statement for this project was general, lacking specific targeted numbers that would represent improvement. This is an admirable concept within a proposal that just was not convincing.
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This proposal from LSU-Eunice faculty is well written and documented. The PI made a strong case for the need for moving to a digital-based radiography system, and the review panel recommends $85,000 in partial funding for the project. Given the compelling statewide needs for Enhancement funds, we are unable to recommend full funding for such an expensive project at this time. We hope the PI will be successful in identifying additional sources of external support that may help make up for the reduction in the award. The review team leaves it to the PI’s discretion to determine where budgetary savings may be found.
### 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)   __________ 3

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)   __________ 10

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)   __________ 10

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

7. Professional Development (0 points)   **X** Yes   _____ No

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)**   __________ 8

Total Score (of 100 points)   **56**

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount:  **$119,063**

RECOMMENDATIONS:  **Recommended Amount:**  $0

Nunez Community College seeks funding primarily for professionals to “enlighten students …” and “create a support system whereby students are helped to feel confident and comfortable when engaging in [systems engineering].” The review team agrees that systems engineering is a critical function in manufacturing productivity and, therefore, in market competitiveness. What was not persuasive was that the project design and goals would necessarily lead to improved student engagement and success since the lengthy impact statement neglected to specify goals and outcomes that might measure its real impact. Moreover, the team was not convinced that this sizeable investment in personnel support (over $92,000 in BoRSF funds for two months' compensation for a Nunez dean [the RFP specifically disallows this expense], salary and national conference travel for the consultant from UL Lafayette, salaries for two full-time graduate students, undergraduate students and a lab technician) would directly and positively affect students or even attain the project’s stated goals. Overall, the review team cannot recommend that this proposal be funded.
INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sandra Leblanc

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preparing an Up to Date EMS Workforce

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) 21

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) 26

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (0 points) X Yes _______ No

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) 86

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $149,993

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $99,085

The review team recommends $99,085 in partial funding for Nunez’s EMS-related proposal. The narrative made a strong case of need for the initiative, although it would have been stronger if it had included information about how many regional openings for emergency responders exist and what potential salaries they might earn. Reviewers commend the college on partnerships with local industry providers and for the in-kind match, and are pleased that the college is specifically committing the program to improve student outcomes on national certification exams. A 10% increase in pass rates seems a little cautious given the size of this investment, but the review team assumes that the PI is merely being conservative. Given the compelling statewide need for Enhancement funds, we do not recommend full funding for such an expensive project, but we leave it to the PI’s discretion to determine where savings may be found. Congratulations on what appears to be a very worthwhile project.
INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Byron Babin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Process Technology -- Experiential Learning (PTEC-el)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional Development (0 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Score (of 100 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: $92,445
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: $50,000

River Parishes Community College seeks funds for simulators to expand the offerings in its Applied Process Technology program. The reviewers are happy to support equipment investments and program development that are linked directly to industry growth, to employment and to local need. RPCC faculty did not receive support for last year’s Process Technology proposal but resubmitted it as a more complete and stronger proposal. We note that the student outcome – to increase program completers by 20% – is specific, measurable and attainable. The team congratulates RPCC for a sound proposal and recommends that this request be funded at the reduced level of $50,000 given the State’s overwhelming two-year college funding needs. We recommend acquiring five simulators rather than ten and purchasing fewer valve simulators. Overall, this is a good proposal.
INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Prenab Choudhury

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Chemical Industry -- The Meeting of Industry and Academia

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional Development (0 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score (of 100 points) 55

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $59,000
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

The review team is unable to recommend funding for this project at this time. While the proposal established the need for closing the gaps between industry and college curricula in order to better prepare students for career success, the proposed plan of action failed to convince us that it would result in significant teaching and learning improvements. The team was troubled by the reliance on expensive contracts for external consultants to undertake what should be roles for faculty and an industry advisory committee. There was also no documentation of a commitment of any kind from the college to implement curricular revisions if such recommendations were to be made.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020PEN-12

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Flanagan
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Technology Training Nursing Skills Lab

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)  25

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  26

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  3

7. Professional Development (0 points) X Yes  No

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)  96

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $146,084
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $100,000

RPCC seeks funds to procure computers, workstations, simulators, software and other supplies to support the expansion and upgrading of the nursing skills lab. The team congratulates BPCC for a high-quality proposal and recommends that this request be funded at the reduced level of $100,000. We agree that changes in the healthcare system are largely based on new and advancing technologies that are routinely found in hospitals and care facilities, and that it is critical that students be trained on and for these technologies. The college is working closely with healthcare providers to assure that new college technology investments align with those used in facilities where program completers will be employed, which strengthens our support for the project. Given the State’s overwhelming funding needs, however, we recommend reduced funding and that the college and its advisory groups determine what to eliminate from the budget. Overall, this is a good proposal for a sound project.
**INSTITUTION:** River Parishes Community College  
**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Sharon Flanagan  
**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Contemporary Welding Equipment and Processes for the Modern Welder

**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)**  
   - 23

5. **Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)**  
   - 29

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

7. **Professional Development (0 points)**  
   - X Yes  
   - No

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)  
  - 97

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $30,518  
**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT:** $30,518

Congratulations for submitting a model proposal that is extremely well written, well documented and well supported. The team commends the PI for focusing on clearly measurable student learning outcomes, a strong need statement, obvious connections to industry and a commitment to reaching out to the public schools by providing high-quality CTE dual enrollment opportunities. We commend the reasonableness of the well-documented but modest budget request and recommend full funding.
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RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022PEN-12

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lois Fouse
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Industrial Instrumentation Technology….Meeting the Needs of the Future!
River Parishes Community College

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?  X Yes  No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)  6
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)  5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)  15
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  15
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)  3
7. Professional Development (0 points)  X Yes  No
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)  67

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount: $74,670

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount: $0

RPCC seeks funds for equipment, software, and supplies to enhance the Industrial Instrumentation Technology program. While the reviewers agree that industrial instrumentation is a vital component of manufacturing productivity and that students should be prepared on equipment similar to that employed in industry, we were not persuaded by the need statement that a sizeable number of jobs in this field are available. Further, while the program goals are aggressive (increase enrollment by 35% and completers by 30%), the proposal failed to identify the actual numbers of students who would be affected. Since the budget narrative was meager, the review team was unable to understand how sizeable the impact of this investment would be and does not recommend that this proposal be funded. We note, however, the sizeable match of a donated test bench and commend the faculty for making this happen.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023PEN-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Alak

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Funds for Completion of a Functional Biomedical Science Laboratory for Enhancement of Instructional Delivery at SUSLA

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 Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)</td>
<td>27</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 (0 points)</td>
<td>X Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Total Score (of 100 points) 84

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: $108,300
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $55,000

Congratulations to the project team. The review team is pleased to recommend partial funding of $55,000 for a much needed new biomedical science lab at SUSLA. The proposal made a good case for the need for the project, including evidence of how it will build on existing laboratory resources and have a positive impact on the curriculum. The SUSLA project team is well qualified to undertake implementation of the clearly articulated plan. Nevertheless, the proposal would have been even stronger had it contained more measurable student learning outcomes, particularly if it had data on how many students would be impacted by the new science lab. Unfortunately, given the compelling statewide need for Enhancement funds, we are unable to recommend full funding for such a large project. We sincerely hope the project team will be successful in identifying additional sources of external support that may help to address reductions in the award. The project team should determine where budget reductions should be taken.
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INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: LaTanya Brittentine
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Learning Opportunities for Success with Distance Education Students

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? □ Yes □ No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points) 5
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points) 3
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) 20
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) 15
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3
7. Professional Development (0 points) □ Yes □ No
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 0
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) 66

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $108,956
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

SUSLA seeks funds to support distance education through purchase of a Tegrity system. The review team did not find the need statement to be compelling (“students using [technology] have shown some improvement…”), and the goals and the impact of the project are modest (increase the number of enrollees by 10 students). This proposal requests funds for 500 hours of use, an annual support plan, a Quick Start package for a Tegrity system in year 1, and for system support for another three years. While the review team recognizes that this approach provides slight discounts in future years, BoRSF funds cannot support activities, including a support plan, beyond the term of the award. Although the team acknowledges that some technologies have shown remarkable strength in assisting students, this proposal failed to demonstrate that a positive student difference would occur as a result of the investment, and thus we do not recommend that this proposal be funded.
The reviewers are pleased to recommend funding of $30,000 for SUSLA’s request to support e-faculty professional development. The panel particularly commends a well-prepared need statement that expressed a strong case for the investment, and a proposal that contained measurable outcomes and a comprehensive implementation plan. For the most part the budget request was very reasonable. However, in light of the compelling statewide needs for Enhancement funds, we recommend a slight reduction in the overall budget, and suggest that the supply line item be reduced significantly. We leave it to the PI to determine where other savings may be taken.
SUSLA seeks funds for 25 computers to support remedial education. The proposal failed to convince us of the need for more computers since it neglected to note how many students would benefit from using them and it did not indicate how many students are currently barred from the labs due to overcrowding. Further, most sections of the proposal lacked the required information and data, including the complete absence of a budget and budget narrative. Although reviewers agree that remedial education benefits strongly from use of support technologies, this proposal did not make that case and thus we cannot recommend funding for it.
# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 027PEN-12

**INSTITUTION:**  Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Joyce Cottonham

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancement of the Writing Center with Computer-assisted Instructions

## 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)  
   - 21

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  
   - 24

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

7. Professional Development (0 points)  
   - X Yes  
   - No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  
   - 3

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):** 80

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**  
**Requested Amount:** $67,900

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**  
**Recommended Amount:** $33,500

We recommend partial funding of $33,500 to support SUSLA’s request for additional equipment and software to upgrade the out-of-date Writing Center. The proposal did a good job of establishing the significant need for updating the equipment and software resources of a Writing Lab that serves 2,831 students. The proposal would have been even stronger if it had more measurable teaching and learning outcomes. Nonetheless, the reviewers recognize the difficulties inherent in quantifying the impact of this type of investment. Unfortunately, as with many other requests this year, the team recommends reduced funding given the significant statewide demand for very limited resources. We hope that savings may be found through some equipment purchases or discounts. Other reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS**
**FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 028PEN-12

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Angelia Turner

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Let's Go LTC: Achieving Student Access and Success Through Virtual Tutoring and Computer Literacy

**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) 2

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) 15

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) 15

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) 3

7. Professional Development (0 points) [X] Yes [ ] No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) 0

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) 57**

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**

**Requested Amount:** $145,935

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**Recommended Amount:** $0

SUSLA seeks funds for supplies, advertising, texts, and a Smartthinking system for the college’s distance education initiatives. The proposal’s need statement and the project summary were somewhat confusing. In the summary the team noted that students are challenged to navigate SUSLA’s Web system and that they fail to enroll as a result, which is a major problem. Further, the proposal argues that students do not get textbooks in time for classes because they lack funds, which is also a challenge. The solutions the proposal offers, however, do not seem to address these problems. No mention is made of redesigning the Web pages or the enrollment system, which seems to us to be the best and most direct fix for the navigation problems. The proposed purchase and delivery of books to any and all students across the State who enroll in a distance education course at SUSLA seem primarily to be the State’s responsibility, not that of an individual college. Finally, there was little explanation of the Smartthinking purchase. This proposal presented real problems, but misdirected solutions. The team recommends that this proposal not be funded.
The team recommends $80,000 to improve student access and success at Sowela through establishment of an Academic Student Success Center. The proposal made a strong case for the need for additional academic and student support services for the targeted at-risk population. This proposal would have been even stronger if the actual number of students with disabilities had been included. Nonetheless, the team is convinced that the need is real and that the proposed plan will contribute to improved student outcomes. We do not recommend funding for the three tables and slabs, 15 chairs, and 50 stackable chairs for study groups, which are disallowed items under the guidelines of the Enhancement Program. The team hopes that the PI will be successful in identifying additional sources of support that may make up for reduction in the budget, especially for the disallowed furniture purchases totaling $8,354.87. Reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI, though the review team suspects that some savings may be found in the equipment budget and number of tutors.
Sowela seeks funds to 1) develop faculty who will create a student Honors Institute, 2) furnish a computer lab for use by Honors faculty and students, 3) send Honors faculty and students to NCHC for professional development with a consultant, and 4) revise curricula to better educate and retain exemplary community college students. The team acknowledges the usefulness of organizations that support successful students; the Honors Institute would likely perform that function at Sowela. However, the need for and goals and objectives of the proposed Honors Institute were insufficiently explained. Although the PIs provided the numbers of students who would be qualified and how many would be served by the Institute, they did not explain what its services would entail. For example, how does one help students “ease into the college experience”? How would the computer lab be used? Considerable resources were requested for personnel training and consulting services ($32,550) and for operating the Institute ($14,268), although reviewers did not know specifically what the operational costs would include. The impact of this investment was not described in terms of measurable outcomes. The review team does not recommend funding this proposal.
### Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?  
   - 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)  
   - 23

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)  
   - 27

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

7. Professional Development (0 points)  
   - Yes  
   - No

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)  
   - 5

9. Project Evaluation (10 points)  
   - 10

10. Project Dissemination (2 points)  
    - 2

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

- Total Score (of 100 points)  
  - 94

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested Amount:</th>
<th>$49,714</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Amount:</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reviewers recommend almost full funding of $45,000 for Sowela’s well-written and -documented plan to upgrade current Chemistry and Physics education and laboratory facilities. The review team commends the PIs for concrete efforts to collaborate with their university partner, McNeese State University, in standardizing laboratory experiences that will ease student transfer between the two- and four-year sectors. The proposal made a strong case for how these investments in upgraded equipment will improve student learning outcomes, and strengthen and expand curricular offerings. A solid implementation plan and detailed budget rationale were described. We leave it to the PIs’ discretion to identify where savings may be found, but suggest looking for reductions in the equipment line item.
APPENDIX A

Summary 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-12</td>
<td>Sells, Laura</td>
<td>BRCC's Center for Teaching Enhancement</td>
<td>Baton Rouge Community College</td>
<td>$89,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002PEN-12</td>
<td>Bruce, Keith</td>
<td>Enhancement of Post Production Lab Environment</td>
<td>Bossier Parish Community College</td>
<td>$52,162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003PEN-12</td>
<td>Cox, Margaret</td>
<td>Expanding Teaching and Enhancing Learning in the Microbiology Laboratory</td>
<td>Bossier Parish Community College</td>
<td>$65,794.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004PEN-12</td>
<td>Emory, Cammie</td>
<td>Active Learning for Anatomy Physiology Certificate Level Students</td>
<td>Bossier Parish Community College</td>
<td>$95,295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005PEN-12</td>
<td>Rondeau, Chris</td>
<td>Implementing Mobile Electronic Devices into Cyber Information Technology Instruction</td>
<td>Bossier Parish Community College</td>
<td>$92,791.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006PEN-12</td>
<td>Qualey, Donita</td>
<td>Nursing Student Success in the Digital Era</td>
<td>Delgado Community College</td>
<td>$138,482.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007PEN-12</td>
<td>Bowman, Sharon</td>
<td>Using iPads Across the Curriculum to Enhance Student Engagement at Louisiana Delta Community College and River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>Louisiana Delta Community College</td>
<td>$134,514.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008PEN-12</td>
<td>Bradley, Kirk</td>
<td>Enhancing program completion through effective supportive learning initiatives (SLI)</td>
<td>Louisiana Delta Community College</td>
<td>$95,834.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009PEN-12</td>
<td>Gibbs, Richard</td>
<td>Instrumentation Upgrade For Laboratory and Classroom Instruction</td>
<td>Louisiana Delta Community College</td>
<td>$36,710.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010PEN-12</td>
<td>Hammack, Robert</td>
<td>Enhancing PTEC Simulations in the Louisiana Delta</td>
<td>Louisiana Delta Community College</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011PEN-12</td>
<td>Hammack, Robert</td>
<td>Forensic Science</td>
<td>Louisiana Delta Community College</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012PEN-12</td>
<td>Lewis, Clara</td>
<td>Enhancing Students Learning Experiences through Learning Communities and Service-The Ladelta Learn-N-Serve Project</td>
<td>Louisiana Delta Community College</td>
<td>$60,338.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013PEN-12</td>
<td>Huval, Chad</td>
<td>Laboratory Improvements to Enhance the Teaching and Learning of the Chemical Sciences at LSU Eunice</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Eunice</td>
<td>$149,471.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014PEN-12</td>
<td>Landry, Fred</td>
<td>Louisiana Rural Business Cooperative and Entrepreneurship Training Laboratory</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Eunice</td>
<td>$114,726.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015PEN-12</td>
<td>McLaughlin, Robert</td>
<td>Digital Radiography Laboratory</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Eunice</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016PEN-12</td>
<td>Foret, George</td>
<td>Curriculum Development for Systems Engineering on a Multi-Disciplinary Approach</td>
<td>Nunez Community College</td>
<td>$119,063.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017PEN-12</td>
<td>LeBlanc, Sandra</td>
<td>Preparing an Up to Date EMS Workforce</td>
<td>Nunez Community College</td>
<td>$149,993.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018PEN-12</td>
<td>Babin, Byron</td>
<td>Process Technology - Experiential Learning (PTEC-el)</td>
<td>River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>$92,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019PEN-12</td>
<td>Choudhury, Prenab</td>
<td>The Chemical Industry - The Meeting of Industry and Academia</td>
<td>River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>$59,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020PEN-12</td>
<td>Flanagan, Sharon</td>
<td>Advanced Technology Training Nursing Skills Lab</td>
<td>River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>$146,084.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021PEN-12</td>
<td>Flanagan, Sharon</td>
<td>Contemporary Welding Equipment and Processes for the Modern Welder</td>
<td>River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>$30,518.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022PEN-12</td>
<td>Fouse, Lois</td>
<td>Industrial Instrumentation Technology...Meeting the Needs of the Future! River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>River Parishes Community College</td>
<td>$74,670.00</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>023PEN-12</td>
<td>Alak, John</td>
<td>Acquisition of Funds for Completion of A Functional Biomedical Science Laboratory For Enhancement of Instructional Delivery At SUSLA.</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Shreveport</td>
<td>$108,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024PEN-12</td>
<td>Brittentine, LaTanya</td>
<td>Enhancing the Learning Opportunities for Success with Distance Education Students</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Shreveport</td>
<td>$108,956.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025PEN-12</td>
<td>Champion, Dr. Iris</td>
<td>Learning Anywhere and Everywhere: Increasing Student Success in the Virtual Classroom through E-Faculty Development</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Shreveport</td>
<td>$35,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026PEN-12</td>
<td>Cooper, Carneta</td>
<td>Addition of Laptops for Remedial Reading &amp; English Classes to Formally Acquaint Students with Online Supplemental Materials</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Shreveport</td>
<td>$31,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027PEN-12</td>
<td>Cottonham, Joyce</td>
<td>Enhancement of the Writing Center with Computer assisted Instructions</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Shreveport</td>
<td>$67,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028PEN-12</td>
<td>Turner, Angelia</td>
<td>Let’s Go LTC: Achieving Student Access and Success through Virtual Tutoring and Computer Literacy</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Shreveport</td>
<td>$145,935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029PEN-12</td>
<td>Collins, Christine</td>
<td>Improving Student Access and Success through Academic Student Success Center</td>
<td>Sowela Technical Community College</td>
<td>$132,494.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030PEN-12</td>
<td>Humphus, Barry</td>
<td>Building a Foundation: The Creation of SOWELA’s Honors Institute</td>
<td>Sowela Technical Community College</td>
<td>$77,432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031PEN-12</td>
<td>Mendez, James</td>
<td>Using Collaboration and Modern Lab Equipment to Enhance Chemistry and Physics Education</td>
<td>Sowela Technical Community College</td>
<td>$49,714.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Proposals submitted: 31
Total Money Requested: $2,865,376.00
APPENDIX B

Rating Form
APPENDIX
BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
RATING FORM FOR TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS, FY 2011-12

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 for 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 or division?

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

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 (0 points, but a required component)**
   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 costs, if any, stated and adequately explained? Are equipment and supply costs appropriate? Is the proposed budget adequately justified in the budget narrative? Have any guidelines regarding disallowed budgetary items (stated in the RFP, pp. 10-11) been violated?

**REVIEWER NOTES:**

**BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount: $_________________________  Recommended Amount: $_________________________

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: ___________________________________________  Date: ______________________

Two-Year Enhancement, Rev. 7/2011)