

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN EDUCATION
FY 2013-14**

March 2014

Prepared by:

Gail Dickinson (Chair)
Texas State University-San Marcos

Kathryn Scantlebury
University of Delaware

**FY 2013-14 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT**

EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. Gail Dickinson, Texas State University-San Marcos, Chair; and Dr. Kathryn Scantlebury, University of Delaware, conducted dialogue via phone and email during March 2014 for the purpose of evaluating fifteen (15) proposals submitted under the Education discipline to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the review: 1) the fifteen (15) Education proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2013-14 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and d) the FY 2010-11 Traditional Enhancement Report in Education.

Prior to the review, each panelist independently evaluated and annotated each of the fifteen (15) proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by both reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and the reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. The panel did not recommend funding for any proposals with a score lower than 74. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

For each proposal in Table I, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations or reviewer recommendations; however, the partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a recommended amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling \$1,723,603 were received by the panel, though this total includes proposal number 09EDU-14 which requested \$706,620 on the budget page. This appears to have been a typographical error, as the request in that proposal's budget justification totaled \$74,641. The lower total for proposal 09EDU-14, along with an overall total request of \$1,091,624 in first-year funds, was used to calculate proposal pressure, which determines the available funds for each Traditional Enhancement competition. The panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$392,439 for six (6) proposals.

The panel determined that five (5) proposals did not qualify for submission under the Education discipline in the Traditional Enhancement Program based on the taxonomy of Education sub-disciplines listed on page 16 of the RFP. These proposals were not rated and are listed at the bottom of Table II in this report.

**TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	83	06EDU-14	LaTech	\$32,789	\$29,289		
2	82	07EDU-14	LaTech	\$66,950	\$66,950		
3	81	01EDU-14	Centenary	\$84,955	\$48,405		
4	76	12EDU-14	SLU	\$63,122	\$56,000		
5	75	10EDU-14	OLHCC	\$138,235	\$120,445	\$11,196	\$0
6	74	13EDU-14	SLU	\$77,870	\$71,350		
TOTALS:				\$463,921	\$392,439	\$11,196	\$0

**TABLE II
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
7	69	02EDU-14	LSU-BR	\$19,992	\$0		
8	68	11EDU-14	SLU	\$31,564	\$0		
9	66	15EDU-14	UL-M	\$24,000	\$0		
10	41	14EDU-14	UL-L	\$147,717	\$0		
	NR	03EDU-14	LSU-BR	\$75,698	\$0		
	NR	04EDU-14	LSU-BR	\$74,500	\$0		
	NR	05EDU-14	LSUHSC-S	\$35,213	\$0		
	NR	08EDU-14	LaTech	\$144,378	\$0		
	NR	09EDU-14	OLHCC	\$74,641	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$627,703	\$0	\$0	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Centenary College of Louisiana

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preparing Candidates for a Technology-Rich Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Little

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 16 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$84,955

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$48,405

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

This proposal seeks to provide all graduate education candidates with iPads, add computers to a lab, and update classroom technology with new projectors, computers, and televisions. The candidates currently borrow iPads from a neighboring school. However, it is unclear whether the candidates are all preservice teachers (seeking certification) or practicing teachers who have iPads in their classrooms. Aside from the iPads, the technology request is largely unsupported by the description of needs. Why are desktop computers and laptop computers needed in rooms with ubiquitous iPads? Projectors are compatible with iPads so the separate computers are superfluous. Why are flat screen televisions needed along with smart boards and projection systems? It is unclear what the impact on curricula will be if iPads are already used in classes. The information about the educational innovations class listed in Dr. Salinas' vita should have been explicit in the proposal rationale. The evaluation plan is weak. An e-mail list of principals is not an appropriate evaluation of the effectiveness of a webpage. Better measures for assessing goal 3 would be an indication of how many teachers accessed the webpage, how long they spent on it, and what resources they downloaded. The webpage itself could serve as evidence for increased technology use by the candidates if they post their lessons and ideas on the page, and if these logons and submissions are tracked. Teacher workshops are not included in the goals, work plan or evaluation and therefore the 20 extra iPads and cases for them are disallowed. Partial funding of \$48,405 is recommended, with additional reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College-Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Ability of Future Teachers to Increase Physical Activity Levels Among Their Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Birgitta Baker

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 8 (of 21 points)
B.3 1 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

69

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$19,992
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal plans to triple the number of accelerometers available for use in the School of Kinesiology. The focus appears to be more on using the accelerometers for research than the instruction of education majors, though connections were made to teacher training in the goals and objectives. It is not clear how many will be used in courses taken by preservice teachers or education majors, and to what extent students will use them as part of those courses. How will the University produce better teachers, administrators or education scholars as a result of this project? Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College-Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Instruction on Human Interactions by Employing Eye-Tracking Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jan Hondzinski

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____
A.2 _____ (of 5 points)
A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 6 points)
C.2 _____ (of 1 point)
C.3 _____ (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 10 points)
B.2 _____ (of 21 points)
B.3 _____ (of 5 points)
B.4 _____ (of 5 points)
B.5 _____ (of 5 points)
B.6 _____ (of 5 points)
B.7 _____ (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score:

NR

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$75,698
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal requests equipment to study human movement. The PIs are faculty representing kinesiology, psychology and industrial engineering. There is no indication that this project has any benefit for education majors or preservice teachers. The proposal does not meet the guidelines in the RFP for submission to this competition. The panel is, therefore, unable to provide a rating, and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College-Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementing Clinical Ultrasound in Kinesiology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dennis Landin

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____
A.2 _____ (of 5 points)
A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 6 points)
C.2 _____ (of 1 point)
C.3 _____ (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 10 points)
B.2 _____ (of 21 points)
B.3 _____ (of 5 points)
B.4 _____ (of 5 points)
B.5 _____ (of 5 points)
B.6 _____ (of 5 points)
B.7 _____ (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score:

NR

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$74,500
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal from the Department of Kinesiology requests funds to equip clinical anatomy and vascular physiology laboratories with a portable ultrasound and an electromyography (EMG) machine. There is no indication that this project provides any benefit for education majors or preservice teachers. The proposal does not meet the guidelines in the RFP for submission to this competition. Therefore, the proposal is not rated and no funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Faculty Development and Technology Enhancement to Improve Medical Students' Ability to Critically Appraise Scientific Literature

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Roger Kim

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____
A.2 _____ (of 5 points)
A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 6 points)
C.2 _____ (of 1 point)
C.3 _____ (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 10 points)
B.2 _____ (of 21 points)
B.3 _____ (of 5 points)
B.4 _____ (of 5 points)
B.5 _____ (of 5 points)
B.6 _____ (of 5 points)
B.7 _____ (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score:

NR

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$35,213</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This project seeks to improve the abilities of medical students at Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-Shreveport to critically analyze scientific literature and apply it to their practices. There is no indication that this project has any benefit for education majors or preservice teachers. The proposal does not meet the guidelines in the RFP for submission to this competition. Therefore, the proposal cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Positive Adolescent Self-Image Through College Student Peer Leadership

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No
 A.2 4 (of 5 points)
 A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)
 D.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 D.2b 9 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)
 B.2 17 (of 20 points)
 B.3 7 (of 8 points)
 B.4 6 (of 8 points)
 B.5 6 (of 8 points)
 B.6 6 (of 8 points)
 B.7 3 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No

F. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$32,789

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$29,289

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

This project seeks to expand the SHARE library, previously funded by the Enhancement program, to include resources related to body image. Students in the School of Human Ecology and the Department of Kinesiology will use these resources in a service learning project aimed at improving the body image of area high school girls. Procuring equipment is not an objective, it is an activity. There is no rationale provided for the purchase of the desktop and laptop computers. It is not clear who the community partners are. However, the evaluation components of the project are strongly correlated to the objectives. The library is a valuable resource and the impact of the project is clear. Partial funding of \$29,289 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition and Installation of the Fish-Eye Projection System to Enhance Undergraduate, Graduate, and K-12 Academic Explorations at Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lindsey Keith-Vincent

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 17 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$66,950
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$66,950

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

This project seeks to update the University planetarium with the installation of a fish-eye projection system. The projection system would provide unique access to a full dome planetarium for students and enhance the academic research unit of the Science and Technology Education Center. Including goals and/or objectives that specifically address outcomes among education and physics students would have strengthened the proposal. Several of the cited impacts on curriculum and instruction are not included in the objectives or work plan (e.g., increased opportunities for unique preservice education experiences and increased authentic learning experiences for astronomy students). Given that this is an education enhancement proposal, the links to preservice teacher candidates are not described in sufficient detail. However, the work plan is solid and the overall enhancement is clear. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Effect of Heel Height on Lumbopelvic Rhythm and Electromyography During Anterior Load Lifting

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Braden Romer

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____
A.2 _____ (of 5 points)
A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 6 points)
C.2 _____ (of 1 point)
C.3 _____ (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 10 points)
B.2 _____ (of 21 points)
B.3 _____ (of 5 points)
B.4 _____ (of 5 points)
B.5 _____ (of 5 points)
B.6 _____ (of 5 points)
B.7 _____ (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score:

NR

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$144,378
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal from the Department of Kinesiology seeks funds to acquire equipment for education and research necessary for kinesiology students. There is no indication that this project has any benefit for education majors or preservice teachers. The proposal does not meet the guidelines in the RFP for submission to this competition. Therefore, the proposal cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Our Lady of Holy Cross College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Educational Support for Remedial Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Victoria Dahmes

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____
A.2 _____ (of 5 points)
A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 6 points)
C.2 _____ (of 1 point)
C.3 _____ (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 10 points)
B.2 _____ (of 21 points)
B.3 _____ (of 5 points)
B.4 _____ (of 5 points)
B.5 _____ (of 5 points)
B.6 _____ (of 5 points)
B.7 _____ (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score:

NR

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$74,641*</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks equipment for the Center for Teaching and focuses on improving developmental instruction resources for students in all departments at OLHCC. There is no indication that this project has any benefit for education majors or preservice teachers. The proposal does not meet the guidelines in the RFP for submission to this competition. Therefore, the proposal cannot be rated and no funding is recommended.

*Note: The proposal budget page requested \$706,620; the amount cited here is derived from the budget justification.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Our Lady of Holy Cross College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: OLHCC E-TIP

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Fawn Ukpolo

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 1 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
 B.2 15 (of 21 points)
 B.3 3 (of 5 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 4 (of 5 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 3 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$138,235</u>	<u>\$11,196</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$120,445</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This project seeks to upgrade classroom technologies to align them with technologies available to teachers in K-12 settings and to assist in implementing Common Core State Standards and PARCC assessments into the College's curriculum. The classroom technologies currently available are inadequate. Given the focus on updating the technology for instructional use, it is surprising that none of the objectives examine faculty instructional technology practices. It is not clear what the function of the E-TIP website is. Workshop participation lists and agendas are records of attendance, not measures of training outcomes. Better measures could include syllabi changes, self-reported changes in instructional practices, or student reports of instructional practices. The proposal does not include enough faculty development to support extensive use of the requested equipment. This raises the question of whether faculty will effectively use the requested equipment. Some of the training appears to be superfluous. For example, do faculty really need training in the use of document cameras? The budget does not itemize costs, thus reviewers cannot judge if costs are justified and reasonable. However, the need for the technology is clear, the instructional goals are important and the work plan is solid. The justification for the six MacBooks is not compelling since the faculty all have iPads, therefore funding for these is not recommended. Partial funding of \$120,445 in year one and no funds in year two are recommended, with reductions (except for the Macbooks) to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: STEMS [Strengthening Teacher Education in Middle School] for STEM

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Denise Gautreaux

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)
B.2 14 (of 21 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score:

68

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$31,564
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This project seeks to incorporate LEGO MINDSTORMS robotics into preservice middle school teacher mathematics preparation. The field component of this project is with "proficient and above" students at a STEM magnet school. This project would be strengthened by partnerships with non-magnet as well as magnet schools. Preservice teachers could coordinate an after-school robotics program for non-magnet children. Using these strategies with "proficient and above" students in a magnet program only reinforces widely held misconceptions that constructivist strategies are for the "smart" kids. Goal 1/objective 1 is not clearly developed. None of the activities in the work plan address goal 2/objective 2 or either of the objectives in Goal 3. It is proposed that the team will use robotics to teach STEM, but it is not clear how this would be integrated into a middle school curriculum. A key issue in Common Core is student literacy and argumentation skills, but how this project would develop those skills is not addressed. Evidence is not provided that the PI or other personnel have expertise with the proposed program. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project BRIDGES: Borrowing Resources that Help Students Integrate, Develop, Grasp, and Engage their Senses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Colleen Klein-Ezell

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 17 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

76

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$63,122
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$56,000

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

This proposal seeks to integrate the needs of special education teachers and regular classroom teachers in their joint quest to achieve mastery of the Common Core State Standards for all students. This project builds on two previous projects supported by the BoRSF. The goals and objectives are vague. It is not clear how many preservice and in-service teachers will be trained or how many modules will be developed. What is the plan to integrate this into the teacher preparation curriculum so that the training becomes institutionalized? Does the project rely solely on the web-based modules? Workshop agendas are not evaluation tools. A better measure of a workshop's success would be that teachers check out the materials for use in their classrooms and submit a follow-up survey after classroom use. Goal 2 is only superficially addressed in the work plan and evaluation. The \$6,000 request for additional speakers and trainers is substantial. The University should be able to provide MS Office for Mac (\$250). Overall, the project leadership is strong, the goals are admirable and the enhancement is solid in an important area. Partial funding of \$56,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13EDU-14

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Need for and Potential Benefits of a Play Analyzer Software Program in a Master's Level School Counseling Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Reshelle Marino

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 1 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 14 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

74

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$77,870
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$71,350

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

This project seeks to update video recording technology for supervising counseling interns. The program would be the first in Louisiana with this type of software system. The goals and objectives of the proposal are reversed. The work plan does not include artifacts that measure (support) objective 2. There are problems with checking out equipment to two students concurrently. If the equipment is lost, which student is liable? It would be better to have a central check-out system where students individually check out equipment. University libraries have successfully implemented similar systems with a 24-hour time limit on high-need items such as camcorders. The University should supply Microsoft Office and antiviral software for faculty. Students should purchase their own flash drives or external hard drives (as a textbook expense) since these will be difficult to track, and the increased probability that sensitive information could be left on shared equipment is very high. However, the overall enhancement is solid and impacts an important academic area. Partial funding of \$71,350 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14EDU-14

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Future Teachers' Content Knowledge and
Pedagogical Content Knowledge on Fraction

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yuxin Ma

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 2 (of 5 points)
A.3 2 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

**D. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 1 (of 2 points)
D.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
D.2b 1 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 2 (of 10 points)
B.2 12 (of 20 points)
B.3 2 (of 8 points)
B.4 2 (of 8 points)
B.5 2 (of 8 points)
B.6 2 (of 8 points)
B.7 1 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 41 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$147,717
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This project seeks to develop mobile apps for teaching fractions. The goal is to impact the content and pedagogical content knowledge of preservice teachers. The objectives, work plan and evaluation are very clear. However, the number of elementary education majors is not provided. The PI appears unaware of the extensive research on pedagogical math content knowledge conducted by Deborah Ball and her colleagues. The proposal provides no data that suggest students need enhanced math instruction such as student performance in current math courses, and only generic information about preservice elementary education in Louisiana. The proposal lacks a review of current software programs available for this work. It does not provide any evidence that such programs impact instruction and student learning, which is claimed from previous funding. The PI does not provide evidence of publications from previous BORSF support, nor is there an indication that this software will be available for preservice teachers to use with their students. Additionally, the twelve months of salary for a programmer and summer salary for three faculty members appear excessive for the work described. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15EDU-14

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Enhanced New Media Curriculum for Teacher Candidates

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mike Beutner

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 2 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 9 (of 12 points)

**D. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)
D.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
D.2b 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 0 (of 10 points)
B.2 10 (of 20 points)
B.3 5 (of 8 points)
B.4 6 (of 8 points)
B.5 8 (of 8 points)
B.6 8 (of 8 points)
B.7 1 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$24,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks funding for two graduate assistants who will help revise a required instructional technology course. The proposed intervention does affect all teacher candidates so the impact on curriculum could be far reaching. The materials developed will be made freely available to Louisiana educational institutions. The graduate assistants will identify exemplars, create tutorials and generate step-by-step directions for teachers to upload files. It is not clear what will happen to student files after they graduate. Will teacher candidates be able to access and modify their accounts after graduation? What is the plan for intellectual property and distribution rights of student-created content? It would be helpful if the proposal included a more complete description of what the students currently do in the course. This would help the panel understand the impact on existing resources. The needs assessment and conferring with course faculty (objectives 1 -3) should have been done prior to the grant application. This would have given the panel an idea of the scope of work to be done by the graduate assistants. As described, it appears to be a one-graduate-assistant job (20 hours per week). The listed objectives are actually the work plan. Objectives should indicate what the work plan will produce along with the responsible parties. It appears that a combination of graduate assistants and the PI will guide activities, but who is responsible for what should be explicit. Given that there are no true objectives, there is no evaluation plan. No funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Education
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001EDU-14	Dr. Sharon Little	Centenary College	1 Year	E	New Request	Preparing Candidates for a Technology-Rich Classroom	\$84,955.00	\$0.00	\$84,955.00
002EDU-14	Dr. Birgitta Baker	Louisiana State University and A & M College Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing the ability of future teachers to increase physical activity levels among their students	\$19,992.00	\$0.00	\$19,992.00
003EDU-14	Dr. Jan Hondzinski	Louisiana State University and A & M College Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Instruction on Human Interactions by Employing Eye Tracking Technology	\$75,698.00	\$0.00	\$75,698.00
004EDU-14	Prof. Dennis Landin	Louisiana State University and A & M College Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	New Request	Implementing Clinical Ultrasound in Kinesiology	\$74,500.00	\$0.00	\$74,500.00
005EDU-14	Dr. Roger Kim	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center Shreveport	1 Year	E	New Request	Faculty Development and Technology Enhancement to Improve Medical Students Ability to Critically Appraise Scientific	\$35,213.00	\$0.00	\$35,213.00
006EDU-14	Dr. Kathleen Heiden	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	NE	New Request	Enhancing Positive Adolescent Self-Image Through College Student Peer Leadership	\$32,789.00	\$0.00	\$32,789.00
007EDU-14	Mrs. Lindsey Keith-Vincent	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	of the Fish-Eye Projection System to Enhance Undergraduate, Graduate, and K-12 Academic Explorations at Louisiana Tech University	\$66,950.00	\$0.00	\$66,950.00
008EDU-14	Dr. Braden Romer	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	The Effect of Heel Height on Lumbopelvic Rhythm and Electromyography During Anterior Load Lifting	\$144,378.00	\$0.00	\$144,378.00

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Education
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
009EDU-14	Dr. VICTORIA DAHMES	Our Lady of Holy Cross College	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Educational Support for Remedial Education	\$706,620.00	\$0.00	\$706,620.00
010EDU-14	Dr. Fawn Ukpolo	Our Lady of Holy Cross College	2 Years	E	New Request	OLHCC E-TIP	\$138,235.00	\$11,196.00	\$149,431.00
011EDU-14	Mrs. Denise Gautreaux	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	E	New Request	STEMS [Strengthening Teacher Education in Middle School] for STEM	\$31,564.00	\$0.00	\$31,564.00
012EDU-14	Dr. Colleen Klein-Ezell	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	E	New Request	Borrowing Resources that help students Integrate, Develop, Grasp, and Engage their Senses	\$63,122.00	\$0.00	\$63,122.00
013EDU-14	Dr. Reshelle Marino	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	E	New Request	The Need for and Potential Benefits of a Play Analyzer Software Program in a Master's Level School Counseling Program	\$77,870.00	\$0.00	\$77,870.00
014EDU-14	Dr. Yuxin Ma	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	New Request	Enhancing Future Teachers' Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Content Knowledge on Fraction	\$147,717.00	\$0.00	\$147,717.00
015EDU-14	Dr. Mike Beutner	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1 Year	NE	New Request	An Enhanced New Media Curriculum for Teacher Candidates	\$24,000.00	\$0.00	\$24,000.00

***The RFP restricts second year funding requests to no more than \$50,000.**

Total Number of Proposals submitted	15
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$1,723,603.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$11,196.00
Total Money Requested	\$1,734,799.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

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

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—56 points

- ____ of 10 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- ____ of 21 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity and a schedule of// activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/ unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and/or quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.7 To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

C. EQUIPMENT—10 points

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

D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points

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

E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—12 points

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

_____ of 10 pts. E.2 To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned

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

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____ Recommended Amount \$ _____

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

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

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—66 points

- _____ of 10 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity and a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- _____ of 8 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence—commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- _____ of 8 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- _____ of 8 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- _____ of 8 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- _____ of 4 pts. B.7 To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points

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

D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—12 points

- _____ of 2 pts. D.1 To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship or strengthen an existing relationship with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, or another college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?
- _____ of 10 pts. D.2 To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

E. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned

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

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

___ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____ Recommended Amount \$ _____

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____