FY 2012-13 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND REVIEW OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER THE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

A.   Introduction

A two-member Two-Year Enhancement Program proposal review team consisting of Dr. Suzanne E. Beal, professor of English at Fredrick Community College in Frederick, Maryland (chair), and Ms. Arleen Arnsparger, project manager, Community College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin, met December 17-18, 2012, via videoconference to evaluate twenty-two (22) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, a component of the Board of Regents Support Fund. Both individuals had participated on several previous Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposal review teams.

The following materials were transmitted electronically to the team before the videoconference: a) all twenty-two (22) Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposals to be evaluated, with their rating forms; b) a summary of all proposals listing titles, investigators and institutions involved, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2012-13 Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the previous year's Two-Year Institution Enhancement Proposal Review Final Report.

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

A total of $1,811,185 was requested by all proposals. After careful review, the team recommended full or partial funding for twelve (12) proposals for a total expenditure of the $1,058,500 that is anticipated to be available for the program in FY 2012-13. Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. The team set the funding bar at 80 rating points since the quality of the proposals as a whole increased this year. The single proposal recommended for funding if additional funding becomes available is found in Table II. Table III lists the nine (9) proposals that were not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal follows the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted is found in Appendix A and the rating form used by the evaluators is in Appendix B.

B.   General Recommendations

The reviewers commend the Board of Regents for its support of two-year institutions. As is the case with the rest of the nation, Louisiana community colleges face economic difficulties that the Enhancement Program helps to mitigate through its competitive opportunities.

C.   Recommendations to Applicants

We notice that a few eligible institutions did not apply for funding that can substantially enhance the quality of academic programs. The team encourages all eligible two-year institutions to take advantage of this program's opportunities.

Although the evaluation sections of the proposals continue to improve, the team reminds applicants that evaluation should focus primarily on student-learning outcomes rather than faculty performance or student satisfaction surveys.

The team observed several Best Practices for which we commend community colleges:

✓ Many applications included substantive industry partnerships, which contributed both equipment and expertise to the programs.

✓ Baccalaureate pathways are particularly critical for two-year career programs. The team is especially pleased to see strong articulations with local four-year colleges.

✓ We applaud the Middle College and other secondary/postsecondary articulation efforts included in proposals.

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

The reviewers observed that, like many colleges elsewhere, at times Louisiana community college personnel have not based some assertions on data, and that they have not been able to develop the internal capacity to create a "culture of evidence." Both reviewers strongly encourage the Board of Regents and LCTCS to offer professional development to community college faculty in the effective use of data to support their applications.

The Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions makes important contributions to community college education in Louisiana. Whether it is the purchase of state-of-the-art equipment to support career programs that contribute to local economic development or the creation of honors programs that promote academic excellence, these grants represent a key component in the development of an exemplary community college system. The reviewers are privileged to participate in this significant initiative.

TABLE I

ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS, FY 2012-13

PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FUNDS REQUESTED	FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	94	015PEN-13	RPCC	$136,829	$136,829
2	93	014PEN-13	RPCC	$149,000	$149,000
3	92	002PEN-13	BPCC	$67,006	$67,006
4	91	001PEN-13	BPCC	$83,592	$83,592
5	90	009PEN-13	DELGADO	$40,734	$40,734
6	89	008PEN-13	DELGADO	$118,500	$118,500
7	88	011PEN-13	LSUE	$127,645	$127,645
8	87	010PEN-13	DELGADO	$17,800	$17,800
9	86	018PEN-13	SUSLA	$57,000	$57,000
10	85	016PEN-13	RPCC	$107,861	$101,861
11	84	003PEN-13	BPCC	$77,805	$72,243
12	82	007PEN-13	DELGADO	$149,106	$86,290
			TOTALS:	$1,132,878	$1,058,500

TABLE II

PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE

RANK	RATING	NO.	INSTITUTION	REQUESTED	RECOMMENDED
13	75	013PEN-13	RPCC	$150,000	$150,000
			TOTAL:	$150,000	$150,000

TABLE III

PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	NO.	INSTITUTION	REQUESTED	RECOMMENDED
14	69	021PEN-13	SOWELA	$38,114	$0
15	60	012PEN-13	NUNEZ	$98,326	$0
16	55	019PEN-13	SUSLA	$51,000	$0
16	55	020PEN-13	SUSLA	$67,452	$0
18	54	017PEN-13	SUSLA	$128,944	$0
19	52	005PEN-13	BPCC	$47,154	$0
20	50	006PEN-12	DELGADO	$20,440	$0
21	47	022PEN-13	SOWELA	$13,398	$0
22	45	004PEN-12	BPCC	$63,479	$0
			TOTALS:	$528,307	$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 001PEN-13 _____

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynn Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: GED at BPCC: Helping Dreams Come True

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

    1. Demographic Data Adequate? _____x_____ Yes _____ No

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

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

    4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) — 25

    5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) — 30

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

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

    8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) — 0

    9. Project Evaluation (10 points) — 6

    10. Project Dissemination (2 points) — 2

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 91 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $83,592

Recommended Amount: $83,592

GED classes are taught as part of BPCC's Middle College, which served 411 students during 2011-12. In addition, GED classes are offered in other institutional settings. In 2013 the paper-based GED test will no longer be available. BPCC seeks to prepare for this development by enhancing the computer capability of its GED classrooms and purchasing more flexible desks. With the new computers and flexible work stations, the College hopes to encourage more students to enroll in its GED program because it is a VUE Pearson testing site, while improving GED instruction through increased flexibility of instructional space. The proposal clearly articulates the need, offers an effective rationale for the equipment, and has garnered the support of external partners. Although the evaluation plan does not specifically address either potential increases in GED enrollment or student success, the review team recommends full funding of $83,592 because of the demonstrated need.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002PEN-13

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pat Divietro

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancements to Communication Media Training Lab

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes _____ No	
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		10
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		22
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		25
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		3
7. Professional Development (0 points)	__x__ Yes _____ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		5
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		10
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		2

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

Total Score (of 100 points)   92

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	$67,006
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	$67,006

 This is a strong proposal for which the review team recommends full funding of $67,006. The co-directors have made an excellent case for the need and usefulness of this enhanced media training lab. The department has existing industry partnerships that enable students to immediately put their knowledge to work in internships, many of which likely result in employment. The co-directors are clearly expert in their field, knowledgeable of industry standards and prepared to share their knowledge with students. The immediate impact of the investment is relatively small--an anticipated 300 students--but the longer-term potential impact is evident. In addition to enhancing employment opportunities for students who complete the program, the existing articulation agreements with two universities also provide immediate opportunities for students to continue their education with a strong base of knowledge from BPCC.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003PEN-13

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Eddie Horton

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing a Proctored Testing Center

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

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

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)   9

Total Score (of 100 points)   84

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	$77,805
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	$72,243

BPCC proposes creation of a computerized testing center by enhancing a pilot project that provided supervised paper-pencil test administration. The College will repurpose and equip with technology an existing space. The new lab will allow for proctored testing of online classes as well as make-up exams for face-to-face courses, aligning BPCC with national standards for community college test administration. The successful pilot project, along with the data on growing enrollments, is testimony to the need. Although the panel supports professional development, the specific request in the proposal of $5,562 for workshops and instructional supplies is not sufficiently justified; therefore, the panel recommends partial funding of $72,243.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004PEN-13

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Allison Martin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementing Video Lecture Capture in the Classroom

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes _____ No	
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		3
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		4
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		10
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		12
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		2
7. Professional Development (0 points)	__x__ Yes _____ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		4
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		6
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		1

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)   3

Total Score (of 100 points) | 45 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $63,479

Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal's underlying assumption is that repetition of material presented in video format will, in and of itself, improve student learning and success, but the proposal offers no data to make that case. The rationale for obtaining the equipment is based on faculty assumptions that poor note-taking skills contribute to students' inability to grasp and retain material. While this is a likely contributor, the proposal offers no indication that any efforts are being made to help students improve their skills in this area, either through student success classes (proven to be effective in many colleges) or by embedding study skills instruction into discipline-based courses. Additionally, the proposal suggests that busy students do not have time to take advantage of all the services offered by the College through learning labs and tutoring, and suggests that the only alternative is to make lectures more accessible to students. While accessibility of classroom materials is indeed critical, other approaches that show promise in the field (with supporting data) are embedding additional support in the classroom through supplemental instruction, peer tutoring, required study groups, and contextualized learning. Redesigning curricula or linking courses that tie development of study skills to discipline-based courses is yet another approach.

The professional development request in the budget is devoted to attending and presenting at conferences and bringing someone to the campus to demonstrate some "best practices" for working in a digital learning environment. Little attention is given to improving pedagogy to help instructors learn how to engage students and connect them to their learning, either in a face-to-face class or using video. An existing resource offered free from the League for Innovation—"Getting Results" (available at www.league.org)—offers video and print materials that provide examples of effective teaching and use of technology. The College is piloting video-capture technology with ten instructors in the spring. If the College can, in fact, show data that indicate better student learning, persistence and course completion in these courses, then reviewers suggest the PI resubmit the proposal with supporting data and that the College invest in approaches to help students improve their skills. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 005PEN-13 _____

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Adam Viator

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Industry-Recognized Credential Exam Preparation

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? _____ Yes __x__ No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points) _____ 5 _____

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

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

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) _____ 15 _____

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

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

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) _____ 0 _____

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) _____ 5 _____

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) _____ 2 _____

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 52 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $47,154

Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal from the BPCC library staff requests funding for purchase of e-readers for students, specifically the Google Nexus 7, as well as funds to provide study materials for students who take industry certification exams. E-Readers can be optimized with current test-specific study guides, associated study materials, and recommended reading lists published by certification agencies. While the need to move to electronic library resources is evident as is the fact that most community college students lead lives that limit the amount of time they spend on campus, this proposal does not sufficiently establish a rationale for funding. Because the focus of the proposal is on industry certification materials, it should articulate connections to certifications in the programs offered by the College and engage program managers. As presented, there is no indication from workforce program faculty that these resources are needed, nor are learning outcomes, such as improved passage rates on specific examinations, delineated. The team does not recommend funding the proposal at this time, but encourages the PI to work with program faculty for resubmission in the future.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **006PEN-13**

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brenda Bryant

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Moving Forward in Honors Education

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

    1. **Demographic Data Adequate?**   x   Yes   No

    2. **Description of Project Need (10 points)**   3

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

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

    5. **Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)**   13

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

    7. **Professional Development (0 points)**   x   Yes   No

    8. **Additional Funding Sources (5 points)**   4

    9. **Project Evaluation (10 points)**   3

    10. **Project Dissemination (2 points)**   2

B. **Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)**   5

Total Score (of 100 points)   50

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	$20,440
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	$0

The principal investigator suggests that the Honors program, particularly in the sciences, needs to be improved and states that faculty struggle to develop innovative curricula. The student outcomes data presented show low completion and graduation rates, but attribute the low rates to the fact that students receive scholarships to four-year institutions and leave Delgado without completing. Is that evidence of poor curricula or of the need for a stronger Honors program? The proposal suggests that a primary outcome is to increase scholarship opportunities for students, which is something the PI indicates that students are finding with ease. The strength of this proposal is the introduction of ePortfolios, an instructional component with a proven track record in other institutions. Most of the budget is for 20 faculty and 30 students to attend a national conference, but there is little evidence to suggest that this investment will have a direct benefit beyond the individuals who attend. "Establishing Delgado Community College as a major player at the NCHC conference" is not an outcome that BoRSF monies should support. The team does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____007PEN-13_____

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Warren Duclos

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Game Design Lab

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes	_____ No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		10
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		22
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		20
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		3
7. Professional Development (0 points)	_____ Yes __x__ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		0
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		10
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		2

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | **82**

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $149,106

Recommended Amount: $86,290

Delgado Community College proposes building a new Game Design computer lab to support a new Game Design concentration within Computer Information Technology. This project supports the development goal of the College's service region to expand the media workforce. The PI has secured the support of the local economic development organization as well as a game development company. The proposal focuses on programmatic objectives, i.e., the numbers of students who will enroll and graduate. However, workforce outcomes are less clear. The proposal indicates a workforce projected to grow from 20 in its first year to 146 in 10 years, which seems to be relatively modest growth. One concern is that the need for game developers with the proposed credentials is somewhat limited. However, the proposal is well written and supported by local industry leaders. The team recommends partial funding of $86,290 for items to be determined by the PI to help the program get underway. The pledged match may be reduced proportionally with the reduced recommended funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008PEN-13

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Melissa LaCour

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Success Through Accelerated Remediation (STAR)

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes _____ No	
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		8
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		22
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		26
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		3
7. Professional Development (0 points)	__x__ Yes _____ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		4
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		10
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)   9

Total Score (of 100 points) | 89 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $118,500
Recommended Amount: $118,500

This proposal draws upon strategies that research and practice are showing will make a difference. The collaborative work between Delgado faculty and feeder high school faculty is commended. However, the proposal lacks data. Data are available from other sources that show the merits of what the PI hopes to accomplish. Using that data would have significantly strengthened this proposal. Is accelerated developmental education intended only for students before they begin college? Why not offer alternatives for students who test into developmental coursework? Other available data show students can progress more quickly through developmental courses. The primary goal is to accelerate the journey to college-level courses. The PI might consider drawing upon work already done in the field. The League for Innovations' "Significant Discussions" project, funded by the MetLife Foundation, led to models for collaboration and curricular redesign, which could perhaps be reviewed and used (an annotated resource list and bibliography is available online). The California-based IEBC's Cal-Pass work paired community college faculty and high school teachers in course redesign. Both initiatives' goal is to increase college readiness, and each comes complete with models and data that can be used. In math, specifically, the PI could review work being done by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Statway and Quantway) and the Dana Center at UT Austin (Mathways). The team recommends full funding but urges the PI to take advantage of material already in use in the field.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009PEN-13

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jennifer Limon

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Veterinary Technology To Meet Workforce Demands

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

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

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 90 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $40,734
Recommended Amount: $40,734

Delgado Community College requests funding to purchase lab equipment to improve the clinical skills of veterinary technician students. The PI established the workforce development goals of the project by asserting that "employment of veterinary technologists and technicians is expected to grow 52 percent from 2010 to 2020, much faster than the average for all occupations." Currently the department is unable to fulfill all requests for workers. Unfortunately, graduates score lower on the national board exam on clinical pathology than other parts of the exam because they lack the equipment to practice, and thus are unable to develop the necessary skills in clinical pathology and ultrasound. This proposal clearly articulates the importance of the program to workforce development as well as the program deficit this equipment will address. It also establishes clear learning outcomes to evaluate its success. The review team recommends full funding of $40,734.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **010PEN-13**

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donita Qualey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Nursing Education through a Concept-Based Curriculum

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes _____ No	
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		10
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		23
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		26
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		3
7. Professional Development (0 points)	__x__ Yes _____ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		1
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		8
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		2
B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)		9

Total Score (of 100 points)   87

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	**Requested Amount:**	$17,800
RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Recommended Amount:**	$17,800

This proposal clearly establishes the need for faculty professional development, but it also raises questions about how effective the training will be. Increasing skills in writing NCLEX-style test questions and evaluation seem to be the strongest components. The proposal does not indicate what the follow-up and mentoring portions will entail. The PI states that the single-workshop approach did not provide adequate support and though faculty gained an understanding of concepts, they struggled with implementation. How will this project be different? The team recommends full funding of $17,800 for the courses, with a caveat about rethinking the follow-up and mentoring needed for the Conceptual Teaching workshop.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011PEN-13

INSTITUTION: LSU Eunice

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Fowler

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSU Eunice Assessment Center

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

     1. Demographic Data Adequate?   __x__ Yes   _____ No

     2. Description of Project Need (10 points)   10

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

     4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)   25

     5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)   23

     6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)   3

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

     8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)   0

     9. Project Evaluation (10 points)   10

     10. Project Dissemination (2 points)   2

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 88 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $127,645

     Recommended Amount: $127,645

This excellent proposal requests funds to retrofit and expand a current computer classroom in order to shift from the paper-pencil assessment instrument, ASSET, to the computerized instrument, COMPASS. The impetus for the proposal comes from efforts to improve success in developmental mathematics by administering an assessment that maximizes precision and creates a modularized developmental mathematics instructional program. The current instrument is not adaptive to individual students. The new assessment program will have several benefits: 1) It offers a more precise diagnosis; 2) It provides for the ability to assess mathematics, reading and writing in the same space; and 3) The lab will also be used for modular mathematics instruction. The proposal clearly delineates the need and effectively articulates the rationale. The team commends the department for investigating promising practices and supplying the data that support them. The new assessment protocol will also put LSU Eunice in line with the national standard for basic skills assessment. The reviewers recommend full funding of $127,645.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 012PEN-13 _____

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

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

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate? _____ x _____ Yes _____ No

2. Description of Project Need (10 points) _____ 7 _____

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

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) _____ 16 _____

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) _____ 15 _____

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

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

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) _____ 1 _____

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) _____ 5 _____

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) _____ 2 _____

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points) _____ 8 _____

Total Score (of 100 points) | 60 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $98,326

Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal falls short of making a case for enhancing the culinary arts program. Although it points to a 47% overall increase in student enrollment at Nunez since Katrina, no data were presented that show that the culinary arts program is experiencing a corresponding increase. Project goals include using the large pieces of equipment to be purchased to attract more students to the program, which suggests that enrollment is currently lagging. Nunez received substantial funding in 2007 that provided a fully equipped culinary arts trailer in which all courses are still taught, and no data were presented that indicate that students enrolled in the program are leaving without certification due to inadequate facilities and training or detail enrollment increases would substantiate the need for additional facilities. That raises the question of whether BoRSF funding would fill an existing need or try to create demand that does not exist. The PI should have included data related to workforce needs. Are industry jobs currently going unfilled because of a lack of qualified candidates? Also missing are descriptions of enhanced or redesigned curricula or faculty professional development opportunities. Part of the amount requested for personnel training seems to cover work already done to compile the list of equipment needed. The culinary items budget has been researched and is clearly presented. Based on the lack of clarity in the proposal, the reviewers recommend no funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 013PEN-13 _____

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Flanagan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Job-Ready Graduates through Integrated Technologies!

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

    1. Demographic Data Adequate? _____ Yes __x__ No

    2. Description of Project Need (10 points) _____ 5 _____

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

    4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) _____ 20 _____

    5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) _____ 25 _____

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

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

    8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) _____ 0 _____

    9. Project Evaluation (10 points) _____ 5 _____

    10. Project Dissemination (2 points) _____ 2 _____

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 75 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY   Requested Amount: $150,000 (if additional funds
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $150,000 become available)

RPCC plans to upgrade its Industrial Instrumentation and Process Technology program with the purchase of training and safety equipment. According to the principal investigator, "the lack of adequate equipment in the Industrial Instrumentation Technology area was noted in the 2009 ATMAE accreditation site visit and subsequent report for Industrial Instrumentation Technology, PTEC and Drafting and Design Technology." The proposal provided data on industry need and support from local industry; it also made a strong case that hands-on instruction with state-of-the-art equipment can increase student recruitment and enhance student success. The proposal is less forthcoming regarding the number of students who are currently enrolled. Since the proposal strongly emphasizes recruitment goals, the team concludes that enrollment may be low. However, this is a well-written, cogently argued proposal that should be supported fully if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014PEN-13

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Flanagan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Supporting Change to Meet Workforce Needs

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes _____ No	
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		10
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		25
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		26
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		3
7. Professional Development (0 points)	__x__ Yes _____ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		2
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		10
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		2

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

10

Total Score (of 100 points) ⬛ 93

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $149,000

Recommended Amount: $149,000

This proposal is recommended for full funding since it addresses all five of LCTCS's Guiding Principles and is supported by excellent data and letters from an array of RPCC partners who currently work with, support, and benefit from the programs RPCC offers. The partnerships include area industry and economic development entities, and feeder high schools. The proposal clearly articulates current and anticipated workforce needs. Clearly students exiting RPCC's technology programs will need training on industry-standard equipment that is not available now. The team's only question is whether area companies might donate some equipment or provide settings in which students can work on industry-owned equipment during their programs of study (in addition to current internship opportunities). The proposal addresses the need to raise students' expectations regarding the need for degree attainment and to bring speakers from industry into the classroom to help students move from short-term, high-paycheck thinking to the longer-term potential gains from earning a degree. RPCC's technology programs have a proven track record of securing and successfully implementing major grants. RPCC is clearly a major player in increasing the economic vitality of southeast Louisiana and this enhancement to its technology programs will continue that tradition. The team does note one negative--the small number of students who will be immediately impacted--but the future potential seems strong.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 015PEN-13 _____

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Flanagan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Future - Virtual Reality Arc Welding Trainer

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

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

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 94 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $136,829

Recommended Amount: $136,829

River Parishes Community College offers the only welding program in the area. This well-constructed proposal substantiates the positive employment outlook for welders and demonstrates the efficacy of the proposed equipment to enhance instruction. In addition, the proposal includes letters of support from local industry that testify to the need for well-educated welders and to the effectiveness of virtual training. The most compelling aspect of the proposal is that the evaluation includes data, both graduation rates and placement rates. The panel recommends full funding of $136,829.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016PEN-13

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Savitha Pinnepalli

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Faculty Orientation Geared towards Student Engagement Techniques, Assessments and Technology Tools to Increase Retention in Online Classes

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes _____ No	
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		10
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		5
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		22
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		25
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		3
7. Professional Development (0 points)	__x__ Yes _____ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		2
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		8
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)   8

Total Score (of 100 points) | 85 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $107,861
Recommended Amount: $101,861

This proposal focuses appropriately on the technology request and emphasizes the professional development needed to improve online teaching, not just training faculty in use of the technology. The proposal would benefit from more specificity about the experts to be brought to the campus to teach about ePortfolios and effective online teaching. EPortfolios have a proven track record. The proposal would be strengthened by greater emphasis on the skill development and engagement techniques that will be the focus of the professional development. Drawing upon proven expertise of an LSU faculty member and considering avenues for sharing the learning beyond RPCC are worthy components. Another positive element of the proposal is the incorporation of strategies to teach students how to learn more effectively and successfully in an online learning environment. This proposal is recommended for funding at the reduced level of $101,861, eliminating conference travel. Providing Enhancement funds to support specific conference presentations in anticipation of the possibility of proposal acceptance is not recommended. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 017PEN-13 _____

INSTITUTION: Southern University Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Iris Champion

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

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

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

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)   5

Total Score (of 100 points) | 54 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	$128,944
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	$0

The goal of the project is to increase student success and retention in college-level mathematics by transforming two regular classrooms with flexible computer workstations. The conversion will enhance the College's math redesign program by creating a classroom learning environment that can accommodate both lectures and electronically mediated instruction. The math redesign begun in 2009 has purportedly resulted in better retention and success in the courses in which it has been implemented. Since space limitations at the College prohibit the addition of stand-alone computer labs, flexible workstations are one solution. However, the proposal is very difficult to follow as written, even though it presented an argument for the need for the stations and their potential to enhance student success. The plans for evaluation of students using the online learning system were described only generally; no measurable targets for student achievement were provided. The panel does not recommend funding the proposal at this time, but suggests that the investigator revamp and rewrite this potentially worthy proposal and submit it next year.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 018PEN-13

INSTITUTION: Southern University Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joyce Cottonham

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Embracing Technology in the English Classroom

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

    1. Demographic Data Adequate?   __x__ Yes   _____ No

    2. Description of Project Need (10 points)   8

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

    4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)   22

    5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)   28

    6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)   3

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

    8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)   0

    9. Project Evaluation (10 points)   8

    10. Project Dissemination (2 points)   2

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 86 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY   Requested Amount: $57,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $57,000

Southern University Shreveport is building upon a 2010 BoRSF award that provided one Smart classroom. The proposal shows some data that point to the impact of that investment on students' perception of the effectiveness of the classroom compared to a traditional classroom. The team did not find data relating to objective outcomes in student learning, course completion and course grades. However, there are data external to SUSLA that demonstrate the effectiveness of integrating technology in the classroom and there is widespread acknowledgement among employers and educators that incorporating technology into the learning environment is critical. The student population impacted by this investment is primarily African-American, many of whom are first-generation college students who come from lower-income homes where technology use might be limited. Having technology available in the educational setting is particularly important for this population to enhance learning and prepare students for the workplace. This proposal is recommended for full funding of $57,000.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: _____ 019PEN-13 _____

INSTITUTION: Southern University Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ilko Iliev

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Smart E-Classroom: From Micro- to Macro World of Instruction

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

_____ Yes ___x___

1. Demographic Data Adequate?

2. Description of Project Need (10 points) ___5___

3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points) ___5___

4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points) ___15___

5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points) ___20___

6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points) ___3___

_____ Yes ___x___

7. Professional Development (0 points)

8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points) ___0___

9. Project Evaluation (10 points) ___5___

10. Project Dissemination (2 points) ___2___

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

Total Score (of 100 points) | 55 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $51,000

Recommended Amount: $0

The proposal requests funds to equip a Smart classroom for use by science and allied health program students. The classroom is intended to enhance teaching and learning in these disciplines by providing access to current technology. The reviewers agree that Smart technology can support student success; however, this proposal does not make a sufficiently articulated case. There are substantial problems with the proposal: 1) The budget request is very confusing. The cover sheet requests $51,000 in Support Funds but the project summary lists that need at $75,000. Only a partial budget justification is found in the text. 2) The rationale for employing technology in the classroom is overly general and not well supported by the specifics of the affected program. 3) Much of the proposal's text is difficult to follow because of awkward sentence construction and grammatical errors. The review team suggests that this potentially worthy proposal be rewritten and resubmitted, but does not recommend funding it as presented.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020PEN-13

INSTITUTION: Southern University Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raegan Stearns

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Southern University at Shreveport Archives Information Literacy Enhancement

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	__x__ Yes _____ No	
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		7
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		3
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		15
5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)		15
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		3
7. Professional Development (0 points)	__x__ Yes _____ No	
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		0
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		5
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		2
B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)		5

Total Score (of 100 points) | 55 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	$67,452
	Recommended Amount:	$0

The merits of making historical documents available to students cannot be disputed. However, it is unclear from the proposal how the availability of the archival materials alone will greatly enhance the skill development of students who are learning how to use library resources in order to increase their information literacy. There is no institutional investment and no other support or collaborative partnerships. The team does not recommend the proposal for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021PEN-13

INSTITUTION: SOWELA Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Barry Humphus

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Building a Foundation: The Creation of SOWELA's Honors Institute

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

    1. Demographic Data Adequate?   __x__ Yes   _____ No

    2. Description of Project Need (10 points)   8

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

    4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)   18

    5. Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)   21

    6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)   3

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

    8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)   0

    9. Project Evaluation (10 points)   6

    10. Project Dissemination (2 points)   2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)   6

Total Score (of 100 points) | 69 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY   Requested Amount: $38,114
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0

This proposal would provide faculty training and computer lab equipment to develop an Honors Institute at SOWELA, one of fastest growing community colleges in the nation. The creation of an Honors program can result in the recruitment of high-achieving students who might otherwise not attend the College, which, in turn, can affect College retention and success rates. It is laudable that the project enjoys institutional support evidenced by current funding for the Honors coordinators. In addition, NCHC Standards and Best Practices provide the framework for program development. The team appreciates the importance of an institutionally supported Honors program to the overall success of the College; however, there are serious problems with the proposal. First, although Best Practices recommend a designated space for Honors programs, the reviewers' consensus is that a computer lab is not the best space for the meeting and community building between Honors faculty and students that is so important for program success. More importantly, there are serious flaws in the budget and justification since some figures are irreconcilable. The review team does not support funding at this time but suggests that the PI submit a reworked proposal in a future competition.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022PEN-13

INSTITUTION: SOWELA Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Mendez

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creating a Center for the Development of New Course Material

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 Points)

1. **Demographic Data Adequate?**   __x__ Yes   _____ No

2. **Description of Project Need (10 points)**   5

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

4. **Design of Proposed Project (25 points)**   12

5. **Impact of Proposed Project (30 points)**   12

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

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

8. **Additional Funding Sources (5 points)**   0

9. **Project Evaluation (10 points)**   5

10. **Project Dissemination (2 points)**   2

B. Budget and Budget Narrative (Total of 10 points)   5

Total Score (of 100 points) | 47 |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY   **Requested Amount:** $13,398
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** $0

The proposal implies that there are there are practically no course materials available that are in use at other community colleges that could meet SOWELA students' learning needs. The PI's solution is to request Support Funds to create a center for the development of new course materials specifically geared to SOWELA students to be written and published by the College's faculty and staff. The reviewers find it difficult to fathom that SOWELA students will not have to acquire the same knowledge and skills that other community college students need in order to earn a living and contribute to their communities. The rationale for the work is not convincing. An evaluation based on quantity of materials generated, with no learning outcomes for students other than those who contribute to the graphic presentation of new materials, is inadequate. While the team agrees that textbook costs are unreasonably high and alternatives must be made available (many community colleges are, in fact, working with their students to find alternatives), the College should seek other avenues to help students acquire the course materials they need. This proposal is not recommended for funding.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions
for the FY 2012-13 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Project Title	Institution	First Year Req. amount
001PEN-13	Brown,Lynn	GED at BPCC: Helping Dreams Come True	Bossier Parish Community College	$83,592.00
002PEN-13	Divietro,Pat	Enhancements to Communication Media Training Lab	Bossier Parish Community College	$67,006.00
003PEN-13	Horton,Eddie	Establishing a Proctored Testing Center	Bossier Parish Community College	$77,805.00
004PEN-13	Martin,Allison	Implementing Video Lecture Capture in the Classroom	Bossier Parish Community College	$63,479.00
005PEN-13	Viator,Adam	Industry-Recognized Credential Exam Preparation	Bossier Parish Community College	$47,154.00
006PEN-13	Bryant,Brenda	Moving Forward in Honors Education	Delgado Community College	$20,440.00
007PEN-13	Duclos,Warren	Game Design Lab	Delgado Community College	$149,106.00
008PEN-13	LaCour,Melissa	Success Through Accelerated Remediation (STAR)	Delgado Community College	$118,500.00
009PEN-13	Limon,Jennifer	Enhancing Veterinary Technology to Meet Workforce Demands	Delgado Community College	$40,734.00
010PEN-13	Qualey,Donita	Enhancing Nursing Education through a Concept-Based Curriculum	Delgado Community College	$17,800.00
011PEN-13	Fowler,Paul	LSU Eunice Assessment Center	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice	$127,645.00
012PEN-13	Waddell,Stephen	Enhancing the Culinary Arts Program in a Community College	Nunez Community College	$98,326.00
013PEN-13	Flanagan,Sharon	Increasing Job-Ready Graduates through Integrated Technologies!	River Parishes Community College	$150,000.00
014PEN-13	Flanagan,Sharon	Supporting Change to Meet Workforce Needs	River Parishes Community College	$149,000.00
015PEN-13	Flanagan,Sharon	The Future - Virtual Reality Arc Welding Trainer	River Parishes Community College	$136,829.00
016PEN-13	Pinnepalli,Savitha	Faculty orientation geared towards student engagement techniques, assessments and technology tools to increase retention in online classes.	River Parishes Community College	$107,861.00
017PEN-13	Champion,Iris	New Age Learning: Raising Student Success in College-Level Math Courses through Virtual Student Accessibility	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	$128,944.00
018PEN-13	Cottonham,Joyce	Embracing Technology in the English Classroom	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	$57,000.00

Proposal #	PI Name	Project Title	Institution	First Year Req. amount
019PEN-13	Iliev,Ilko	Enhancement of Smart E-Classroom: From Micro- to Macro World of Instruction.	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	$51,000.00
020PEN-13	Stearns,Raegan	Southern University at Shreveport Archives Information Literacy Enhancement	Southern University and A&M College at Shreveport	$67,452.00
021PEN-13	Humphus,Barry	Building a Foundation: The Creation of SOWELA's Honors Institute	Sowela Technical Community College	$38,114.00
022PEN-13	Mendez,James	Creating a Center for the Development of New Course Material	Sowela Technical Community College	$13,398.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	22
Total Money Requested	$1,811,185.00

Appendix B

Rating Form

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

Proposal Number: _____   Project Director: _____

A. Proposal Narrative (Total of 90 points)

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

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

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

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

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

6. **Faculty and Staff Expertise (_____ of 3 points)**
   To what extent will the project enhance faculty and staff expertise? Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified and trained to implement this project?

7. **Professional Development (0 points, but a required component)**
   Does the applicant describe the need for any professional development activities? What is the primary purpose(s) of the activities? Are the professional development activities connected to the primary activities of the project? Is faculty/staff training tied to each aspect of the proposal (need, objectives, activities, evaluation)? If special training will be required for project participants, has an appropriate plan been developed? What is the anticipated impact of professional development?

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

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

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

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

REVIEWER NOTES:

BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS
Requested Amount: $_____ Recommended Amount: $_____

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution:_____ Date:_____