

## **FY 2009-10 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND REVIEW OF TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS**

### **Introduction**

A three-member proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Katherine Boswell (chair), consultant on community college policy issues, Academy for Educational Development; Dr. Russell Hamm, consultant on workforce issues, formerly with the U.S. Department of Labor; and Ms. Arleen Arnsparger, consultant and former Vice President for College Advancement at Kingsborough (NY) Community College, met February 24-26, 2010, in Baton Rouge to evaluate forty-five (45) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, a component of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund. All of these individuals had participated on several previous Two-Year Institution proposal review panels.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) all forty-five (45) Two-Year Enhancement proposals to be evaluated with their individual rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators and institutions involved, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2009-10 Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the previous year's Two-Year Institution Enhancement Report.

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

A total of \$3,071,979 was requested by applicants in the proposals. After careful review, the panel recommended full or partial funding for eighteen (18) proposals, for a total expenditure of the \$1,080,000 that was available for the program during this cycle.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Table II lists proposals that are recommended for funding if additional funds become available. Table III contains the proposals that were not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal immediately follows the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating form used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

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

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

The review panel once again commends the Louisiana Board of Regents for its continuing commitment to invest in the improvement of higher education at a time of significant fiscal constraints. Members of our team continue to hold up the Louisiana model of program enhancement to 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 particularly pleased with the support this Enhancement Program is providing to the Louisiana Community and Technical College System (LCTCS).

We particularly note the continuing improvement in proposal quality that we see in submissions to the Two-Year Enhancement program. Proposals from the colleges are doing a much better job of addressing the impact their requests will have on improving student outcomes. There has been a marked improvement in articulating measurable objectives and proposing effective evaluation mechanisms to ensure that stated outcomes are achieved.

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

A) Historically, while we have always had many more requests than we had dollars to support, the wide range in the quality of the proposed interventions made determining the cutoff between funded and unfunded activities fairly straightforward. The review team remains committed to providing concrete feedback to applicants whenever possible with suggestions on how their proposals might be improved in order for them to be more competitive in future years. However, with the significant improvement in proposal quality and focus on improving student outcomes, our decisions are becoming much more difficult. We understand that budgets are very limited in these times of fiscal deficits, but given that an ever increasing percentage of the postsecondary students in Louisiana are attending community colleges -- and many of these institutions are new and incredibly underfunded for even the most basic academic support and supplies -- we strongly recommend that the Board continue to seek additional resources to support the needs of these institutions.

B) Another issue of serious concern that we have addressed in past reports is the need to ensure and encourage more articulation between and among all of the State's postsecondary institutions. If Louisiana is going to meet its goal of a well-educated populace, it is important to establish seamless systems that encourage the easy movement of students from technical colleges to community colleges, and from community colleges to four-year colleges and universities. We are particularly encouraged by the increased evidence we see in this year's submissions of community colleges partnering with local technical colleges in their regions to deliver educational services. Even though we are aware that the BoR is currently moving towards articulation agreements among institutions of higher education, we continue to recommend a new Enhancement Program that would specifically encourage and target partnerships and articulated programs between educational sectors in the interests of creating a true K-16+ educational system. Perhaps the partnership could be a 2+2+2 partnership between a local high

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

**Staff Note: The reviewers of proposals for the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions have previously recommended that the Board of Regents consider establishing a new program that promotes collaborations and funds projects among two- and four-year campuses and technical colleges. This report again contains that recommendation. While the staff is not unsympathetic to this general thought, the Board is prohibited from awarding Support Fund money to all technical colleges except Fletcher and SOWELA by R.S. 17:3801(F) which states: “In lieu of the appropriation or allocation of funds from the Louisiana Quality Education Support Fund, the legislature shall appropriate annually for vocational-technical education purposes the amount of three million four hundred thousand dollars.”**

### **General Recommendations for Improvements to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions**

As stated earlier, the panel was heartened by the significant improvement in the overall quality of proposals this year as compared to previous years. Many proposals were resubmissions and specifically addressed the recommendations and concerns contained in the panel’s comments last year. We also saw evidence that colleges are paying greater attention to principles of grant writing, and we continue to recommend that the community college system take greater advantage of the significant experience and resources of the Board of Regents, or other external training resources, to provide grantsmanship training specifically targeted at faculty and staff from the community and technical colleges.

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

**TABLE I**  
**2010 TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT**  
**PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
1	97	021PEN-10	FLETCHER	\$134,168	\$134,168
2	96	022PEN-10	FLETCHER	\$96,843	\$76,843
3	95	007PEN-10	BPCC	\$86,368	\$86,368
4	90	001PEN-10	BRCC	\$9,500	\$9,500
5	88	008PEN-10	BPCC	\$67,075	\$60,000
5	88	009PEN-10	BPCC	\$92,722	\$61,242
5	88	028PEN-10	LSU-E	\$80,000	\$80,000
5	88	029PEN-10	NUNEZ	\$99,215	\$49,215
9	87	006PEN-10	BPCC	\$15,764	\$15,764
9	87	019PEN-10	DELGADO	\$75,089	\$75,089
11	86	034PEN-10	RPCC	\$53,954	\$53,954
12	85	004PEN-10	BPCC	\$47,349	\$40,000
12	85	005PEN-10	BPCC	\$15,739	\$11,739
14	84	010PEN-10	BPCC	\$132,674	\$90,000
15	82	044PEN-10	SOWELA	\$104,791	\$83,618
16	81	043PEN-10	SUSLA	\$23,000	\$17,500
17	80	016PEN-10	BPCC	\$80,804	\$60,000
17	80	037PEN-10	SUSLA	\$102,150	\$75,000
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$1,317,205</b>	<b>\$1,080,000</b>

**TABLE II**  
**2010 TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT**  
**PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**  
**IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
19	78	013PEN-10	BPCC	\$56,728	\$56,728
20	75	024PEN-10	FLETCHER	\$68,300	\$68,300
20	75	032PEN-10	RPCC	\$91,533	\$70,000
22	74	027PEN-10	LSU-E	\$26,500	\$26,500
23	73	014PEN-10	BPCC	\$41,302	\$19,500
24	72	015PEN-10	BPCC	\$61,436	\$35,000
24	72	038PEN-10	SUSLA	\$30,512	\$18,500
26	71	017PEN-10	BPCC	\$58,003	\$25,550
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$434,314</b>	<b>\$320,078</b>

**TABLE III**  
**2010 TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT**  
**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
27	68	023PEN-10	FLETCHER	\$80,174	\$0
27	68	026PEN-10	LCTCS	\$75,000	\$0
27	68	040PEN-10	SUSLA	\$76,045	\$0
30	67	002PEN-10	BRCC	\$54,264	\$0
30	67	033PEN-10	RPCC	\$47,413	\$0
32	66	042PEN-10	SUSLA	\$92,077	\$0
33	65	030PEN-10	NUNEZ	\$129,093	\$0
33	65	041PEN-10	SUSLA	\$121,759	\$0
35	64	011PEN-10	BPCC	\$14,023	\$0
36	63	020PEN-10	DELGADO	\$49,430	\$0
37	62	031PEN-10	RPCC	\$75,200	\$0
38	56	018PEN-10	BPCC	\$67,265	\$0
39	54	003PEN-10	BPCC	\$18,865	\$0
39	54	012PEN-10	BPCC	\$48,849	\$0
39	54	025PEN-10	LCTCS	\$111,000	\$0
39	54	035PEN-10	SUSLA	\$41,900	\$0
43	53	036PEN-10	SUSLA	\$97,655	\$0
44	52	039PEN-10	SUSLA	\$108,400	\$0
45	50	045PEN-10	SOWELA	\$12,048	\$0
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$1,320,460</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Idell Adams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Care and Development of Young Children Statewide Initiative

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  9   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  4   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  24  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  29  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    6  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   10  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

90
----

 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$9,500  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$9,500  </u>

COMMENTS:

The review panel recommends full funding in support of BRCC's proposed CDYC Initiative project. Research supports the observation that the quality of the teacher in the classroom is one of the greatest predictors of student success. Having highly qualified and credentialed early childhood providers is of critical importance to Louisiana's continuing efforts to improve student outcomes. Looming federal requirements that all Head Start workers have at least an AA degree with an emphasis in Early Childhood Education further emphasize the importance of community colleges like BRCC offering the credential. Under ordinary circumstances we caution against the extensive use of release time in this program. We believe, however, that Dr. Adams has demonstrated leadership in developing an AAT program in teacher education at BRCC in the past and that she is uniquely qualified to undertake this particular assignment. We recognize that the focus of this request is for curriculum development rather than full implementation, but we would like to have seen some discussion about the numbers of students that the program would serve. We particularly commend development of the online component and are pleased that long-term plans include development of a lab school, which will be a wonderful complement to the new degree program.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Sedevie

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of an AA Degree with a Concentration in Theater Production

A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)   X   yes        no

B. Description of project need    6    of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project    3    of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>   18   </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>   20   </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3   </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   1   </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>   10   </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   2   </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   4   </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score:    67    of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>   \$54,264   </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

This proposal is a funding request for "Development of an AA Degree with a Concentration in Theater Production." The evaluators believe that theater courses and equipment would be a valuable addition to the college's programs but does not recommend funding this proposal. If the concept of this proposal is considered for submission in the future, we advise strengthening several parts of the document. First, the need case was established on the belief that the growing film industry activity would drive interest and increased activity in theater/live production. The data that were included did not support this assertion. Further, the "impact" to result from this investment was not described or documented, leading reviewers to doubt that it would be significant. The goals that were described were not measurable or significant. Finally, the budget offered very little explanation for why specific expenditures were required. For example, reviewers felt that funds allocated for course development were probably not required since all these courses have been developed and are available to be taken from other college and university theater programs at no or minimal cost.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Achla Agarwal

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Communication in the Classroom

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  5   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  2   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  15  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  15  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  5  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  5  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  54   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$18,865  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

While the panel agrees that the addition of technology often adds interest to a class or provides a solution for sharing information more broadly, this proposal falls short in making a case that students will be better prepared as a result of using this technology and that their marketability will be enhanced. Is the college hearing from employers that business and computer science students are underprepared when they enter the workforce? Increasing student success rates to 90% in the targeted classes is an admirable goal. However, the current data reflecting persistence in the targeted courses as slightly below 90% and the percentage of students earning a C or better (more than 80%) do not point to serious failure in these courses that warrants the introduction of these technologies. No justification is offered for the library resources. Vendor training for faculty is, of course, necessary to ensure that faculty can make best use of the technologies. However, if engaging students adequately in course content is a concern, reviewers encourage the applicant to examine additional faculty professional development to improve pedagogical skills. There is ample evidence that technology alone does not significantly increase student learning. We recognize the value of incorporating technology into the classroom and the importance of preparing students for the workforce in business and computer science, but this proposal does not make an adequate case that student learning or persistence will be increased, or cite any data about the impact of technology on either persistence or learning. The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynn Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Adobe Certified Associate: Skill Validation through Certification

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  7   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  3   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  21  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  29  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  4  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  7  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  9  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  85   of 100 points

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**   \$47,349  

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:**   \$40,000  

**COMMENTS:**

The panel recommends that the proposal “Adobe Certified Associate: Skill Validation through Certification” be funded at \$40,000. We commend BPCC for its outreach efforts in partnering with local technical colleges and high schools, as well as workforce development and continuing education units within the institution, to provide this important training and certification. We particularly commend the documented collaboration as evidenced by letters of support and the discussion of sustainability addressed in the proposal. While the proposal did a good job of establishing the significant value of this training, in light of the overall demand for Enhancement dollars, the panel was forced to reduce the total request, with the suggestion that the savings can be found through a reduction in the number of site licenses purchased.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynn Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Test Center Projects: Testing Capacity, Credit-by-Examination, Advising, and Professional Development

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   10   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**     5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  22  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  20  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:** **85** of 100 points

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**   \$15,739  

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:**   \$11,739  

COMMENTS:

Funding is recommended at \$11,739 to support purchase of the requested equipment, software, shipping, personnel training, and other fees for the BPCC test center. The review panel felt that a compelling case was made for the need and that the goals were clear, leading to additional support and benefits for students. However, this recommendation does not support the plan to provide exam vouchers for students. While the team understands the desire to pay fees for students – thus removing barriers for students desiring testing – allocatable funds were limited by total available program funds and additional competitive projects that merited funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 006PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** Bossier Parish Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Laura Bryant

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancing the Physical Therapy Assistant Program at Bossier Parish  
Community College

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   10   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**     5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  22  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  25  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>    0  </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    5  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    8  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    8  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**   87   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$15,764  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$15,764  </u>

**COMMENTS:**

Students in Bossier Parish C.C.'s Physical Therapy Assistant program do not have access to current technology in the field, nor is there enough equipment available in their courses. In addition, many faculty indicate that students lack the necessary affective skills for their work with clients. It is reasonable that employers would expect that program graduates would be prepared to work with current technologies and equipment. Although the proposal did not indicate dissatisfaction from the field regarding students' affective skills, it is also reasonable that faculty who are trained professionals in the field would recognize that these skills are imperative when working with clients, and, therefore, must be a focus in PTA preparation. The commitment of BPCC to upgrade and update this program is clear, as indicated by the funding provided to purchase the new equipment. The panel is pleased to recommend that this proposal be fully funded.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carolyn Burroughs

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Active Learning Strategies for Anatomy Classes at Bossier Parish  
Community College

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**     9     of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**     5     of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project    24    of 25 points

D.2. Impact of the project    29    of 30 points

D.3. Faculty and staff expertise     3     of 3 points

D.4. Professional development        0 points

D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration     4     of 5 points

D.6. Project evaluation     9     of 10 points

D.7. Project dissemination     2     of 2 points

D.8. Budget page and budget narrative    10    of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

95
----

 of 100 points

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**     \$86,368    

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:**     \$86,368    

COMMENTS:

Nicely done! This is a well-written and -documented proposal that made a strong case for the development of a new active learning approach in teaching the critical allied health gateway course of Anatomy. The panel commends the proposal team for using supporting data and demonstrating the success of this approach through a well-documented pilot project. Every aspect of the proposal was clearly written, well thought out and supported. The panel recommends full funding of \$86,368.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 008PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** Bossier Parish Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Margaret Cox

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Validation and Calibration in Chemistry and Biotechnology Programs  
at Bossier Parish Community College

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**   X   yes        no

**B. Description of project need**   8   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**   5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  20  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  25  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    5  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>   10  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   10  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:** 

88
----

 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$67,075  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$60,000  </u>

**COMMENTS:**

This BPCC PI submitted a well-conceived and useful project in Validation and Calibration in Chemistry and Biotechnology. We agree with the applicant that biotechnology is a strong and growing field for the U.S. and Louisiana. Partial funding of \$60,000 is recommended to support the biotechnology program. The evaluation panel was impressed with the project concept; however, full funding was inhibited by total available program funds and strong competitive projects. Therefore, we expect the funds recommended to be dedicated to equipment, software and required supplies. Funds requested for personnel training, however, will need to be found elsewhere. In future proposals please note that at least two areas of proposal development should be strengthened: one is that the proposal should offer a stronger “impact” case since few students apparently will be affected by the project, and the other is that biotechnology job availability should be documented.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Luke Dowden

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strategic Improvements in Accelerated Learning at Bossier Parish  
Community College

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   10   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**     5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  22  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  25  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    5  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    7  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:** **88** of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$92,722  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$61,242  </u>

COMMENTS:

Studies show that Louisiana adult learners prefer online and hybrid courses, and fast-track courses that will enable them to attain their academic goals more rapidly. Further study of BPCC's online offerings identify several gaps that the college seeks to address: increase the number of hybrid courses offered, update hybrid and online course models, increase the conversion rate of students from interest to application, and increase professional development for faculty teaching online and hybrid courses.

This proposal draws on data from all related studies and makes a strong case for addressing all components in the proposal. Although 300 students would be the initial target population, it is reasonable to assume that significantly more students will be impacted over a longer period of time. The proposal adequately supports the request for funds to strengthen and enhance the curriculum. The panel recommends that the proposal receive partial funding in the amount of \$61,242.

(Comments continue on next page)

Proposal 009PEN-10 (continued)

However, there are three areas that raise questions/concerns for the panel:

1. The request for \$15,000 to contract with Regis University: the organization identified as the consultant for the communications plan is the same organization that recommended the need for such a plan. How will a communications plan with targeted messages – no matter how it is delivered – convert inquiries into applications and support students through graduation? Has a similar plan converted requests for information into enrollments and improved student success at other colleges? The proposal does not refer to data from colleges that have implemented a plan similar to the plan proposed by Regis for BPPC.
2. The request for \$15,000 for a marketing plan: your own data indicate many requests for information about online programs. Are you not adequately reaching the intended audience? The panel suggests that given the plan outlined in this proposal, it might be more beneficial at this point to focus on strengthening the online and hybrid course offerings and “closing the deal” with those currently inquiring than to put money and time into attracting new students. In addition, though the college is prepared to invest \$10,000 in a marketing effort, the proposal does not delineate how those funds — or the additional marketing money requested — will be allocated.

Funding totaling \$30,000 for the marketing plan and contract with Regis is not recommended.

3. It is reasonable for faculty and staff to attend the Commission for Accelerated Programs 2010 conference. However, the proposal includes a number of additional learning opportunities for faculty and staff, and the reviewers recommend the participation of no more than three (3) attendees with BoRSF funding who will in turn share their learning with colleagues. A breakdown of anticipated conference expenditures for the three faculty should be provided when contracts with the BoR are negotiated.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Gay

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Compressed Video Equipment for Distance Learning at Bossier Parish Community College

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  8   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  3   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  21  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  27  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>    0  </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    7  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   10  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  84   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$132,674  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$90,000  </u>

COMMENTS:

The proposal review panel is pleased to recommend that Bossier Parish Community College receive \$90,000 in support of its proposal "Compressed Video Equipment for Distance Learning." The applicants did a good job of establishing the significant need for this investment in new distance learning infrastructure. We particularly commend BPCC for its collaboration with regional technical colleges and other workforce and educational entities in the State in providing education and training offerings via technology. While the panel recognizes that compressed video delivery systems are very expensive, in light of the significant demand for resources from this Enhancement fund and competing statewide requests, we have reluctantly been forced to recommend a reduction in the total amount recommended. After careful review of the system components requested, we are confident that while this budget may not support the ideal turnkey operating system, the dollars we are recommending are enough to build a quality distance education delivery system that will accomplish the goals identified in the proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mechelle Harris

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Tools for Learning: Interactive Classroom Settings

A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)   X   yes        no

B. Description of project need    4    of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project    5    of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>   20   </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>   10   </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3   </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   0   </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>   10   </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   2   </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   10   </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score:    64    of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>   \$14,023   </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

Funding is not recommended for this Interactive Classroom Settings proposal to acquire the Qwizdom interactive “Clicker” system. Evaluators have a committed interest in using appropriate technologies to improve student learning and make education more efficient and effective, but we were not persuaded that use of the Qwizdom system would lead to significant improvements. If this proposal is considered for submission in the future, we advise strengthening several parts of the document. First, the need case was weak because it did not strongly tie use of the technology to improved student learning outcomes or persistence: a necessity. Further, the reasons or the need for the inclusion of the table describing the occupational projections for business and computer professionals remain unclear to us. How does the table’s information support the need for clickers? Finally, the assertion that clickers will overcome the challenges that faculty face when trying to interact with students overlooks the myriad of strategies and approaches that faculty regularly and successfully employ.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Della Jeter

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Resources for Project MOMs Students

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  6   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  4   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  12  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  15  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>   0  </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>   5  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   5  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  54   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$48,849  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

This is a confusing proposal. Although it cites the need for transportation and childcare support for economically disadvantaged students in the GED and Project MOMs programs, the budget request primarily covers computer equipment, related supplies and library materials. The rationale for equipment, upgraded software and other supplies is not explained in the proposal. Your own data show a fairly consistent trend of increasing enrollment but decreasing success in the GED program, yet your proposal did not adequately tie the data to your request or explain how everything requested in the budget will address this lack of performance and lead to increased student success. The panel recognizes the financial challenges faced by many community college students and the need for support services that enable them to attend school and achieve their academic goals. However, this proposal did not clearly indicate why the requested materials are needed or make the case that the funds requested will enhance students' chances of success. This proposal is not recommended for funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Powell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Post Production Lab Environment at Bossier Parish  
Community College

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

X  yes   no

**B. Description of project need**

7  of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

3  of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 26 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 3 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

78
----

 of 100 points

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$56,728

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$56,728

(if additional funds become available)

**COMMENTS:**

The review panel commends BPCC's Department of Telecommunications for its continuing efforts to provide state-of-the-art education and training opportunities to students from across the State. The applicant made a good case for the value added that would be provided to students with the addition of a post production lab for telecommunications students. Unfortunately, due to the significant demand on fund resources, the proposal did not meet the cut-off score (we set the score for funded proposals at 80 or over this year) that are recommended for funding at this time. If additional resources are made available later, we recommend that the post production lab be reconsidered for full funding. The proposal would have been stronger had it had a more compelling case connecting local workforce needs with the program and evidence of collaboration or demand and/or support from industry.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 014PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** Bossier Parish Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Linda Sonnier

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Fall Prevention for Construction Technology at Bossier Parish  
Community College

- A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

    X     yes                               no
- B. Description of project need**     5     of 10 points
- C. Strategic Goals of the Project**     5     of 5 points
- D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**
  - D.1. Design of the proposed project     20     of 25 points
  - D.2. Impact of the project     15     of 30 points
  - D.3. Faculty and staff expertise     3     of 3 points
  - D.4. Professional development          0 points
  - D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration     5     of 5 points
  - D.6. Project evaluation     8     of 10 points
  - D.7. Project dissemination     2     of 2 points
  - D.8. Budget page and budget narrative    10    of 10 points
- E. Total Score:** 

73
----

 of 100 points

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**            **Requested Amount:**     \$41,302      
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**        **Recommended Amount:**     \$19,500      
(if additional funds become available)

COMMENTS:

Bossier Parish Community College requests funds for a “Fall Prevention for Construction” project. While the panel believes that the goal of the project is important – to reduce worksite injuries – the adequate need case was not compelling. We were puzzled that while a couple of letters supported the training concept, there was limited explanation or demand for the need for training from construction businesses. Also, if companies really believe that the training is important, we were curious as to why businesses are not providing some fiscal support for the project as well. Additionally, we concluded that the sizeable investments in computers and other equipment were not justified by the short amount of time the training would be held (only four quarterly, day-long classes?). Also, there seems to be some overlap between this proposal and another from the college (proposal 015PEN-10), leading the panel to wonder about departmental coordination in fund seeking. Perhaps submitting a single proposal might have been more effective. Finally, because evaluators believe in the importance of this project’s goal, we recommend funding in the amount of \$19,500 if additional funds become available. The PI may spend these funds on any budgetary priority.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Linda Sonnier

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Focus Four Construction Safety Hazards Training at Bossier Parish Community College

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  8   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  20  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  15  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>   0  </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   6  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  72   of 100 points

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**   \$61,436  

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:**   \$35,000  

(if additional funds become available)

**COMMENTS:**

This proposal addresses a clear need to provide training to workers in the construction industry to reduce accidents at construction sites. The proposal spells out a clear training model and training evaluation through demonstration of proficiency. The hands-on and bilingual training seem well-tailored to the target population. However, given the stated industry need, the panel questions why there is no investment from industry partners in the training program. Additionally, it appears that the materials to be purchased with the requested funds would be used four times per year only for day-long training sessions and stored the remainder of the time. The panel does not see this as efficient use of Enhancement Fund dollars. Why does the proposal request so many laptops for the type of training being offered? If proposal writers are interested in future consideration within the Two-Year Enhancement Program, reviewers suggest that they consider a shared-cost model with industry and also ways to make use of requested materials more than four days per year. One final point: we are puzzled by the submission of two separate proposals for training that seem to overlap. A better choice might have been to combine both proposals to show greater efficiency and impact for a reduced cost. Nevertheless, given the need for increased safety on construction sites, we recommend partial funding of \$35,000 if additional funding becomes available. The funds may be expended at the PI's discretion.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pam Stogsdill

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology for Teaching Math

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  8   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  4   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  22  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  26  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>    0  </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    0  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    8  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    7  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

80
----

 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$80,804  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$60,000  </u>

COMMENTS:

The panel commends BPCC and its Division of Mathematics for recognizing the emerging evidence regarding the value of using technology to support improved outcomes in math instruction. At community colleges across the country mathematics courses unfortunately tend too often to serve as gatekeepers, blocking the successful progression of students through their programs of study. Given significant competing needs, the panel recommends that the project be funded at a reduced level of \$60,000. The panel commends the applicant for the analysis of current retention and success data; however, we remind the PI that just having a well-equipped math lab, in and of itself, does not ensure that teaching pedagogy will change and student success rates improve. It is critically important that the project team follow through in providing professional development and support to math instructors so that full advantage is taken of the technologies that can support different learning styles and needs of math students. The funds may be expended at the PI's discretion.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shelli Ulrich

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strategies to Reduce Recidivism: Construction Technology Training

A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)   X   yes        no

B. Description of project need     7     of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project     5     of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>    15    </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>    20    </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3    </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>    0    </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    0    </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    10    </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    1    </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    10    </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score:     71     of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:     \$58,003    

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:     \$25,550    

(if additional funds become available)

COMMENTS:

Funding of \$25,550 is recommended if additional funds become available for the "Strategies to Reduce Recidivism" proposal to provide construction training for inmates. The panel believes in the importance of this project and is impressed with the goals and intent of this project, believing that a real need exists. However, allocatable funds were limited by total available program funds and stronger, more competitive projects. We recognize the importance of addressing the high recidivism rate in Louisiana, but the data presented in your need statement do not "connect the dots" between high recidivism and training in construction. Does data exist to show that inmates who train in construction are less likely to return to prison? Will construction companies provide jobs to those released from prison? We also noted that a total of only 30 individuals would be included in the program and believe that the investment in computers and supplies would be underutilized. The courses offered by Bossier (materials, contracting, blueprint reading, etc.) are not likely to be courses initially required by an inmate who is seeking to enter the construction field, after his/her term is served. The training by LTC probably would be the most critical as it is hands-on and basic.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Womack

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expansion and Enrichment of CNA Program

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes        no

**B. Description of project need**

  10   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

   4   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  15  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  10  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>   5  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   5  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

56 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$67,265  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

According to this proposal, 120 community members will potentially be served through additional community workshops targeting family caregivers and personal care assistants. While the proposal makes a case regarding limitations of the current BPCC program, it does not clearly address how those barriers will be overcome. In essence, the proposal repeats the same information throughout. The budget includes general amounts of money that include materials for workshops with no specific indication of what those materials might be. The library items might include some of the titles and electronic books indicated, but the narrative does not discuss the current availability of materials and electronic access, let alone how these additions will enhance offerings to students. The bulk of funds is earmarked for salaries, but there are no specifics about how the faculty will be allocating their time. Reviewers applaud the community partnerships listed in the proposal; however, the proposal simply did not provide enough specifics to merit support at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bettie Abbate

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Horticulture Drafting/Computer/Technology Lab Project

A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)        X   yes             no

B. Description of project need        9   of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project        4   of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	21	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	27	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	3	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	4	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	8	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	2	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	9	of 10 points

E. Total Score:      87 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	\$75,089
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	\$75,089

COMMENTS:

The review panel is pleased to recommend full funding of \$75,089 for the Horticulture Technology Program requested by Delgado Community College. The proposal made a good case for how the proposed lab will meet an identified industry need. We commend the growth and documented licensure pass rates for students enrolled in the Horticulture program and are confident that the inclusion of this technology will further enhance the quality and preparation of Delgado's graduates in the program. Well done.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ashley Chitwood

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Delgado Laptop Access for Student Success On-line (LASSO)

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  5   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  20  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  10  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>    0  </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    0  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    9  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    9  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  63   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$49,430  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$0    </u>

COMMENTS:

This is a request to fund the "Laptop Access" project that would establish a computer loan system for students. At this time funding is not recommended for the project. Though the panel was impressed with the goals and intent of this project, allocatable funds were limited by total available program funds and stronger, more competitive projects. If this proposal concept is considered for submission in the future, we advise strengthening several parts of the document. First, the need case did not strongly tie the use of the technology to improved student learning outcomes or persistence: a necessity. The assertion that students who do not take online courses do not take them because they lack computers might not be true. Do students, even those who possess computers, desire to take distance learning courses? Second, we found no documentation regarding the percentage of students who do have computers. Finally, our experience with other colleges' "loan" programs for equipment tell us that they are fraught with problems of loss, theft, lack of control, and use for other than intended purposes.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Adrienne Bethancourt

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementing High-Fidelity Simulations in the Nursing Clinical Lab Setting and Beyond

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  10   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

   5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  25  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  28  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   5  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

97
----

 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u> \$134,168 </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u> \$134,168 </u>

COMMENTS:

This outstanding proposal clearly describes Fletcher's need to effectively grow its new registered nurse program and enhance its existing practical nursing program. The requested funds would make it possible for Fletcher's growing numbers of students to complete their programs with greatly enhanced knowledge and experience that can only be gained through work with patients or high-fidelity simulations. In addition, through strong community collaboration, Fletcher proposes extending the reach of its training programs beyond the classroom in order to provide continuing education for practitioners already working in the field. Fletcher, you have made your case clearly and eloquently! The panel applauds the degree of specificity in each section of the proposal. It is clear that you are poised to immediately implement the components of this award once funds become available. The panel is pleased to recommend full funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 022PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** Fletcher Technical Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** John Hamner

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Development and Implementation of a Production Safety Systems  
Course and Training Laboratory

<b>A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)</b>	<u>  X  </u> yes	<u>      </u> no
<b>B. Description of project need</b>	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points
<b>C. Strategic Goals of the Project</b>	<u>    5    </u>	of 5 points
<b>D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)</b>		
D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  24  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  29  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3    </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    4    </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    9    </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2    </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   10   </u>	of 10 points
<b>E. Total Score:</b>	<u>  96  </u>	of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$96,843  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$76,843  </u>

**COMMENTS:**

The reviewers commend Fletcher Technical Community College on a particularly well-written and -documented proposal in support of the creation of a production safety systems course and laboratory. The project need statement was well developed, outcomes were measurable, and the support from industry was clearly established. We have no doubt of the significant need to be addressed and value that will be added by this important new curricular offering. Reluctantly, however, the panel was forced by the weight of compelling needs from across the State to reduce the total amount recommended for the project by \$20,000 to a total of \$76,843. We leave it up to the PI to determine where budget savings can be found in the project.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 024PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** Fletcher Technical Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Fathia Williams

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Expanding Collaboration Between a Community College and a University  
for Enhanced Professional Development

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   8   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**   5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  20  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  20  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    5  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    6  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    7  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**   75   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$68,300  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$68,300  </u>
		(if additional funds become available)

**COMMENTS:**

Fletcher has made a strong case for a professional development partnership between the college and Nicholls. The proposal shows that Nicholls' Center for Advancing Faculty Engagement (CAFE) currently offers an array of learning opportunities that will now be available to Fletcher faculty. However, the reviewers would have liked to see some link between the faculty learning opportunities and improved student engagement, persistence, and academic outcomes. Could the evaluation component include some measure of the student experience? Is there any requirement that faculty participate in these opportunities? Are there incentives for the faculty to participate? In your experience, are adjunct faculty likely to participate or might incentives be helpful to attract them? Recognizing the need for faculty development, we recommend full funding of \$68,300 if additional funds become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 025PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Community and Technical College System

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Robert Johnson

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Mobile Global: LCTCOnline Mobile Learning Initiative

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   not applicable             yes             no

**B. Description of project need**   5   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**   2   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  15  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  17  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    2  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    2  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    4  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    5  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**   54   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$111,000  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

**COMMENTS:**

Unfortunately, the panel does not recommend funding for the proposed Mobile Global Online Learning Initiative at this time. The panel commends LCTCS for recognizing the emerging potential for mobile technology to deliver education and training to citizens of the State. However, the proposal as written failed to make a compelling case for why the proposed plan of providing 100 faculty with i-Phones and requiring their participation in a series of webinars would lead to any significant changes in course delivery or improved student outcomes. We recommend that if LCTCS wants to pursue this particular curricular delivery mode and seek funding from the Two-Year Enhancement Program in the future, a better developed plan be established that documents exactly how the technology would be used to support course delivery, how student learning would be improved, and how faculty would be adequately trained and held accountable for using the technology in a substantive fashion. Without that additional documentation the panel cannot recommend any investment of limited Enhancement funds to support a project that remains ill defined.





# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027PEN-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alan Levine

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Chemistry Laboratory Upgrade at LSUE

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

X  yes   no

**B. Description of project need**

8  of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

5  of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 20 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 2 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 1 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

74
----

 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:  \$26,500

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:  \$26,500

(if additional funds become available)

COMMENTS:

The evaluation panel understands that LSU-Eunice does not have current organic chemistry equipment and that updating equipment purchased in 1993 would benefit the program. The applicant estimates that over the life of the instrument, approximately 200 students would be served -- a relatively low number. The proposal does not make a case for why, other than the age of current equipment, this purchase would be important for student learning. What is the impact on students of using old equipment? What would be the advantage of having new equipment in terms of what students learn and whether new equipment would better prepare them for jobs or transfer to a university? How does organic chemistry fit into degree programs and workforce preparation in the service area? If additional funds become available within this program, the panel suggests that this proposal be fully funded at \$26,500 to strengthen offerings in organic chemistry at the college.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028PEN-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert McLaughlin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment to Enhance Radiologic Technology Program at LSUE

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

X  yes   no

**B. Description of project need**

10  of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

5  of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 23 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 28 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 4 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 5 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 8 </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

88
----

 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:  \$80,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:  \$80,000

COMMENTS:

The panel is pleased to recommend full funding of \$80,000 for the proposal to enhance the Radiologic Technology program at Louisiana State University-Eunice. The proposal was well written, well documented and comprehensive. The applicant did an excellent job of making the case for the significant unmet needs of industry in the number of radiologic technicians being trained. The case was further strengthened by the inclusion of evidence that the program advisory committee from industry and recent graduates had specifically identified the need for graduates to have C-Arm fluoroscopy training. Identified learning outcomes were clear and measurable. We commend the PI on the excellent program and look forward to hearing about the future success of your graduates as they continue their education and contribute to improved health care services in central Louisiana.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 030PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** Nunez Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Christine Thomas

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Individually Nspired Mathematical Activities Through Technology

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   7   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**   2   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  20  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  15  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>   0  </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   1  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>   6  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**   65   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$129,093  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

**COMMENTS:**

The panel welcomes proposals focused on improving instruction in developmental math, an area of significant attrition among community college students. We recognize that technology is an important tool both to engage students and provide mechanisms designed to enhance their learning. However, this proposal pays little attention to improving pedagogy. What is the college doing to address teaching practice and enhance faculty knowledge about how to improve student engagement and learning? Technology alone will not lead to improved student learning. Data cited in the proposal about benefits of using this technology come from a case study at Maricopa. The study was conducted by the vendor, not by an external evaluator. Is there another external study that might have been cited? One note about the budget: reviewers look for as accurate pricing as possible; the 10% lump sum added to the budget for shipping considerably exceeds the 3% standard that is generally negotiated for equipment purchases. The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal as it stands.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031PEN-10

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon LaGarde

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: College for All High School Graduates

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   6   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**   3   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  18  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  20  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>    2  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>    0  </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>    3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>    4  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>    1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>    5  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**   62   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$75,200  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

While the panel commends RPCC on its worthy goal of promoting the necessity of postsecondary education to undecided high school students and their families in the service region, we do not recommend funding at this time. The proposal lacks sufficient detail to determine whether the ambitious goals of proposed outreach efforts could indeed be met. It needs far more detail on the implementation plan; on how and where the new outreach coordinators would work; and even more important, given this is a one-year award, how the program would be sustained after the initial launch. The proposal indicates that students will be tracked for five years, but there is no documentation about how that will be accomplished. The proposal also suggests that among other services provided, families will receive one-on-one career planning and counseling, but there are no data to support how such families will be identified or whether the outreach coordinators would be qualified to provide such counseling. The budget includes a request for rental space, which is typically considered an indirect expense. This is an ambitious proposal that has a great deal of merit; nevertheless, it could benefit from additional planning and development.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 033PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** River Parishes Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Allison Vicknair

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** River Parishes Community College and LTC Region 3 Student Services Support Through Electronic Access

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   8   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**   4   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 15 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 15 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  5 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  5 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**  67  of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$47,413</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$0  </u>

**COMMENTS:**

The panel welcomes proposals that show collaboration between multiple institutions. However, this proposal is somewhat confusing. It appears quite broad and we struggled to understand the focus. Is it specifically targeting first-generation and previously underserved students? If so, how will having enhanced online services benefit these populations? Is it designed to increase the comfort level of adult learners who might be unfamiliar with technology and as a result make their skills more attractive to potential employers? If so, how will having enhanced online services lead to improved computer skills? Is it designed to attract students who might not otherwise enroll? If so, how? Unclear also is how the applicants arrived at all the figures listed in the budget. The reviewers recommend that future proposals be more clearly focused and the relationship made clearer between each of the components and the desired outcomes. The reviewers do not recommend funding this proposal as it stands.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034PEN-10

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Douglas Weatherly

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: River Parishes Community College Collaborative Writing Center: A Multi-Discipline/Multi-Use Academic Resource Center for Students

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**       8       of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**       4       of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>      22      </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>      27      </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>      3      </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      0      </u>	points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>      5      </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>      8      </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>      2      </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>      7      </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:** 86 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>      \$53,954      </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$53,954      </u>

COMMENTS:

The panel is pleased to recommend full funding of \$53,954 for the River Parishes proposal to establish a collaborative writing center. The proposal was well written, documented with solid research, and measurable – with solid student outcomes data. It included a significant in-kind contribution from the college and evidence of a partnership with Delgado. We strongly encourage the project team to continue efforts to embed writing across the curriculum and engage all college faculty in re-examining how they can incorporate emerging research on teaching and learning into their courses. Nicely done!



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mahailier Broom

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Scan, Convert and Recovery of Student Records

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  7   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  4   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  18  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  10  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  1  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  3  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  0  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  7  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

53
----

 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$97,655  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

No doubt the college needs to secure records and store them – particularly on the heels of natural disasters that have plagued Louisiana – and make them accessible. However the project addressed in this proposal falls short of what Enhancement funds are intended to support. No case is made for how this project would benefit student learning or support students during their college experiences. Though the proposal indicates in the “impact” section that the project will “enhance the advisement and placement of students,” no information is provided to show how that will be accomplished. The proposal is very short on data that demonstrate evidence that stated goals meet current needs. More information is needed if reviewers can consider funding this proposal in the future. The proposal is not recommended for funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 037PEN-10

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

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Iris Champion

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Opening the Door to Cyberspace: Increasing Student Access and  
Success in the Virtual World Through E-Faculty Development

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**   9   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**   3   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  21  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  26  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  2  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  7  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  7  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:** **80** of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$102,150</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$75,000</u></u>

**COMMENTS:**

The panel recommends partial funding of \$75,000 for this proposal from SUSLA. The applicant articulated a strong need for additional faculty development and support in distance learning technology in order to improve instructional delivery and student learning outcomes. We commend the plan to develop extensive in-house training sessions to train faculty in the use of distance learning technologies, the development of a series of professional development webinars, and the preparation of a training manual that will serve as an ongoing resource. However, given the significant demands for resources across the State, we were unable to support the full request for travel to conferences and equipment. We are confident that significant savings can be found in both equipment purchases and in limiting the number of faculty who attend external conferences. The breakdown for who will attend conferences and how much money will be allocated for each trip (at State rates per PPM 49) will need to be provided to the BoR during contract negotiations.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 039PEN-10

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

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Nathaniel Manning

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Internationalizing the Business Curricula at Two-Year Community Colleges

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

\_\_\_\_\_ yes                        X   no

**B. Description of project need**

  5   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  4   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  15  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  10  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>    0  </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  5  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  6  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  52   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$108,400  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$0    </u>

**COMMENTS:**

This proposal is incomplete: it does not articulate the specific need for an International Business and Economics Research Center. What is the current workforce need? Which community and industry partners are asking for skilled workers in international business? Are there existing jobs waiting to be filled? While the proposal indicates that SUSLA seeks to promote global business opportunities in the State, is this need for a research center driven solely by the college's interest in entering the international business arena or is there an expressed need that SUSLA is filling with this program? Although the proposal defines a plan for internationalizing the business curriculum, the budget supports only the creation of a computer lab and there is no link shown between this computer lab and the outcomes delineated in the proposal. The panel is very aware of the need to attract new business opportunities to Louisiana as well as the importance of preparing students to work in a global environment. However, this proposal does not adequately address those issues. We do not recommend that this proposal be funded.







# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raegan Stearns

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Southern University at Shreveport Black Ethnic Archives Enhancement

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  7   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  5   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  20  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  15  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>   3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development		0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>   3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>   2  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>   1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  10  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

66
----

 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$92,077  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

COMMENTS:

The applicant makes clear the importance of preserving the archival materials and asserts that this project might make the archives more appealing to university researchers. However, what about the college's own students? This proposal does not make clear how archiving the materials will be used in instruction, tie into the curriculum, or increase student learning. According to the proposal, there is currently scarce use of archival materials. What will increase the usage? Even though the proposal indicates that faculty might be more comfortable using the archived materials, there is no plan to work with faculty to embed use of these materials into instruction. The proposal seems to be focused more on promoting use of the archives by outside researchers than it is on creating new opportunities for using them within the college. National data show — and many community colleges confirm — that traditional library use is dropping. What will lead to increased library usage at SUSLA and then possibly increased use of these materials? Given the apparent focus of this proposal, is there another entity that might more appropriately fund this proposal? The proposal is not recommended for funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043PEN-10

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tuesday Williams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Stengthening Freshman Students Success Through a Retention Initiative

A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)

  X   yes                             no

B. Description of project need

  8   of 10 points

C. Strategic Goals of the Project

  4   of 5 points

D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  21  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  25  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  4  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>      </u>	0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  3  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  7  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  2  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  7  </u>	of 10 points

E. Total Score:

81
----

 of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$23,000  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$17,500  </u>

COMMENTS:

The panel is pleased to recommend \$17,500 in support of this proposal. We are very familiar with research that supports the positive impact on retention of student success courses and interventions, and we commend SUSLA for its commitment to student engagement and success, and its desire to improve retention rates by 10% from the current baseline of 57%. Cohort programs that provide freshman students with opportunities for exposure to campus services, study skills, and one-on-one mentoring have been demonstrated to contribute to improved student outcomes. Unfortunately, because of significant demands on program funds we are unable to fully fund the request. The supplies requested in the budget seemed excessive, and while the resource library may be useful, the panel was unable to support that part of that request without further documentation of the types of materials to be purchased and how they would add value to the program. If the PI wishes to purchase materials, she must fully explain and provide a rationale for why they are needed when contracts with the BoR are negotiated.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 044PEN-10

INSTITUTION: SOWELA Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christine Collins

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening Student Success Among Students with Disabilities

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

X  yes   no

**B. Description of project need**

10  of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

5  of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u> 20 </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u> 25 </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u> 3 </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u> 0 </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u> 0 </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u> 10 </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u> 2 </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u> 7 </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

82
----

 of 100 points

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$104,791

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$83,618

COMMENTS:

Congratulations to SOWELA and this applicant for submitting a well-conceived and useful project for Strengthening Student Success Among Students with Disabilities. We note that this is the first time that SOWELA has competed in this program – welcome. Funding of \$83,618 is recommended to support acquiring (1) the computer/printer equipment, (2) the software, (3) the supplies, and (4) approximately \$50,000 for note-taking support for students with disabilities. We understand the need and the legal requirement to provide support to students with disabilities, but are unable to fund the proposal fully. Allocatable funds were limited by total available program funds and other competitive projects. The PI presented a clear and compelling need case and the goals were consistent with the need. If the PI should seek additional funds elsewhere to operate this project, we advise you to build a stronger impact statement. The one in this proposal was too general, lacking specific numbers of students who would be served. It would be useful for reviewers to more fully understand the per-student costs based upon the natures and types of students' disabilities. Overall, though, this proposal was well done.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 045PEN-10

**INSTITUTION:** SOWELA Technical Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Barry Humphus

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Does Classroom Management Software Improve Course Performance in College?

**A. Demographic data included, adequate (0 points)**

  X   yes                             no

**B. Description of project need**

  7   of 10 points

**C. Strategic Goals of the Project**

  3   of 5 points

**D. Proposal Narrative (total of 75 points)**

D.1. Design of the proposed project	<u>  12  </u>	of 25 points
D.2. Impact of the project	<u>  10  </u>	of 30 points
D.3. Faculty and staff expertise	<u>  3  </u>	of 3 points
D.4. Professional development	<u>  0  </u>	of 0 points
D.5. Additional funding sources/evidence of collaboration	<u>  1  </u>	of 5 points
D.6. Project evaluation	<u>  5  </u>	of 10 points
D.7. Project dissemination	<u>  1  </u>	of 2 points
D.8. Budget page and budget narrative	<u>  8  </u>	of 10 points

**E. Total Score:**

  50   of 100 points

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$12,048  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$0  </u>

**COMMENTS:**

This project appears to be an attempt to “teacher-proof” the curriculum. The computers will be equipped to “minimize distractions” so faculty can more easily focus students on course material while they are in class. While the panel recognizes that this project is intended as a research proposal, Enhancement funds are not designed to support research projects, but are intended to enhance student learning and success. The reviewers (who have all experienced the challenges of serving as faculty) cannot support a proposal that relies solely on computer-based classroom management and does not address helping faculty learn effective classroom management strategies and improve their pedagogical skills so they can create more compelling and engaging courses. This proposal is not recommended for funding.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **Summary of Proposals**

**Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions  
for the FY 2009-10 Review Cycle**

Proposal #	PI Name	Project Title	Institution	First Year Req. amount
001-PEN-10	Adams, Idell	Care and Development of Young Children Statewide Initiative	Baton Rouge Community College	\$9,500.00
002-PEN-10	Sedevie, David	Development of an AA Degree with a Concentration in Theater Production	Baton Rouge Community College	\$54,264.00
003-PEN-10	Agarwal, Achla	Communication in the Classroom	Bossier Parish Community College	\$18,865.00
004-PEN-10	Brown, Lynn	Adobe Certified Associate: Student and Teacher Skill Validation Through Certification	Bossier Parish Community College	\$47,349.00
005-PEN-10	Brown, Lynn	Test Center Projects: Testing Capacity, Credit-by-Examination Advising, and Professional Development	Bossier Parish Community College	\$15,739.00
006-PEN-10	Bryant, Laura	Enhancing the Physical Therapy Assistant Program at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$15,764.00
007-PEN-10	Burroughs, Carolyn	Active Learning Strategies for Anatomy Classes at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$86,368.00
008-PEN-10	Cox, Margaret	Validation and Calibration in Chemistry and Biotechnology Programs at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$67,075.00
009-PEN-10	Dowden, Luke	Strategic Improvements in Accelerated Learning at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$92,722.00
010-PEN-10	Gay, Kathleen	Compressed Video Equipment for Distance Learning at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$132,674.00
011-PEN-10	Harris, Mechelle	Tools for Learning: Interactive Classroom Settings	Bossier Parish Community College	\$14,023.00
012-PEN-10	Jeter, Della	Resources for Project MOMs Students	Bossier Parish Community College	\$48,849.00
013-PEN-10	Powell, Larry	Enhancement of Post Production Lab Environment at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$56,728.00
014-PEN-10	Sonnier, Linda	Fall Prevention for Construction Technology at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$41,302.00
015-PEN-10	Sonnier, Linda	Focus Four Construction Safety Hazards Training at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$61,436.00

016-PEN-10	Stogsdill,Pam	Technology for Teaching Math	Bossier Parish Community College	\$80,804.00
017-PEN-10	Ulrich,Shelli	Strategies to Reduce Recidivism: Construction Technology Training	Bossier Parish Community College	\$58,003.00
018-PEN-10	Womack,Donna	Expansion and Enrichment of CNA Program	Bossier Parish Community College	\$67,265.00
019-PEN-10	Abbate,Bettie	Horticulture Drafting/ Computer/ Technology Lab Project	Delgado Community College	\$75,089.00
020-PEN-10	Chitwood,Ashley	Delgado Laptop Access for Student Success On-line (LASSO)	Delgado Community College	\$49,430.00
021-PEN-10	Bethancourt,Adrienne	Implementing High-fidelity Simulations in the Nursing Clinical Lab Setting and Beyond	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$134,168.00
022-PEN-10	Hamner,John	Development and Implementation of a Production Safety Systems Course and Training Laboratory	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$96,843.00
023-PEN-10	Votaw,Michelle	Expanding the Capacity and Enhancing the Ergonomic Quality of a Computer Lab	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$80,174.00
024-PEN-10	Williams,Fathia	Expanding Collaboration Between a Community College and a University for Enhanced Professional Development	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$68,300.00
025-PEN-10	Johnson,Robert	Mobile Global: LCTCOnline Mobile Learning Initiative	Louisiana Community And Technical College System	\$111,000.00
026-PEN-10	Pinsel,Jerry	Partnering for Transformation: New Directions for Troubled Youth	Louisiana Community And Technical College System	\$75,000.00
027-PEN-10	Levine,Alan	Chemistry Laboratory Upgrade at LSUE	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice	\$26,500.00
028-PEN-10	McLaughlin,Robert	Equipment to Enhance Radiologic Technology Program at LSUE	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice	\$80,000.00
029-PEN-10	Loria,Tonia	Five Star Quality Center for Child Care Professionals	Nunez Community College	\$99,215.00
030-PEN-10	Thomas,Christine	Individually Nspired Mathematical Activities Through Technology	Nunez Community College	\$129,092.97
031-PEN-10	LaGarde,Sharon	College for All High School Graduates	River Parishes Community College	\$75,200.00
032-PEN-10	Sullivan,Julia	River Parishes Community College and LTC Region 9 Mobile Biology and Computing Labs	River Parishes Community College	\$91,533.00
033-PEN-10	Vicknair,Allison	River Parishes Community College and LTC Region 3 Student Services Support Through Electronic Access	River Parishes Community College	\$47,413.00
034-PEN-10	Weatherly,Douglas	River Parishes Community College Collaborative Writing Center: A Multi-Discipline/Multi-Use Academic Resource Center for Students	River Parishes Community College	\$53,954.00
035-PEN-10	Bigham,Sandra	Student Transition Project	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$41,900.00
036-PEN-10	Broom,Mahailier	Scan, Convert and Recovery of Student Records	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$97,655.00

037-PEN-10	Champion,Dr. Iris	Opening the Door to Cyberspace: Increasing Student Access and Success in the Virtual World through E-Faculty Development	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$102,150.00
038-PEN-10	Cooper,Carneta	Acquiring funds to help with the implementation of the Southern University Upstage Drama Troupe	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$30,512.00
039-PEN-10	Manning,Nathaniel	Internationalizing the Business Curricula at Two-Year Community Colleges	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$108,400.00
040-PEN-10	O'Riley,Jane Redden	Enhanced Information Literacy Laboratory	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$76,045.00
041-PEN-10	Robinson,Carrie	The SMART Class Project	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$121,759.00
042-PEN-10	Stearns,Raegan	Southern University at Shreveport Black Ethnic Archives Enhancement	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$92,077.00
043-PEN-10	Williams,Tuesday	Strengthening Freshman Students Success through a Retention Initiative	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	\$23,000.00
044-PEN-10	Collins,Christine	Strengthening Student Success Among Students with Disabilities	SOWELA Technical Community College	\$104,791.00
045-PEN-10	Humphus,Barry	Does Classroom Management Software Improve Course Performance in College?	SOWELA Technical Community College	\$12,048.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	45
Total Money Requested	\$3,071,978.97



## **APPENDIX B**

### **Rating Form Used in This Competition**

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

**RATING FORM FOR TWO-YEAR ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS, FY 2009-10**

**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. Demographic Data (0 points)**

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?

**B. 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?

**C. 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 applicant identify outcome goals/objectives and the process goals/objectives separately. Can they be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?

**D. Proposal Narrative (Total of 75 points)**

**1. 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, 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?

**2. 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 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??

**3. 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

**4. Professional Development (0 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?

**5. 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 the 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 support documents convincing?

**6. Project Evaluation (\_\_\_\_ of 10 points)**

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

**7. 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?

**E. 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, p. 5) 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: \_\_\_\_\_