

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN EDUCATION
FY 2016-17**

March 2017

Prepared by:

Patricia Hewitt (Chair)
University of Tennessee at Martin

Emily Bonner
University of Texas at San Antonio

**FY 2016-17 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT**

EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. Patricia Hewitt, University of Tennessee at Martin, Chair; and Dr. Emily Bonner, University of Texas at San Antonio, conducted dialogue via phone and email during March 2017 for the purpose of evaluating twenty-two (22) 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: a) the twenty-two (22) Education proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) complete reviews and analysis by community college consultant Dr. Katherine Boswell, Education Policy Associates, of the two (2) proposals submitted by two-year institutions; c) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; d) the FY 2016-17 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and e) the FY 2013-14 Traditional Enhancement Report in Education.

Prior to the review, each panelist independently evaluated and annotated each of the twenty-two (22) 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 85. 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.

First-year requests totaling \$1,560,965 were received by the panel. The panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$397,702 for seven (7) proposals.

The panel determined that seven (7) 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	94	21EDU-17	ULL	\$99,992	\$98,141		
2	92	16EDU-17	SLU	\$92,510	\$80,000		
3	91	04EDU-17	LACOL	\$57,400	\$57,400		
4	89	02EDU-17	CEN	\$61,162	\$44,824		
5	88	18EDU-17	ULL	\$53,083	\$37,405		
6	86	17EDU-17	SUNO	\$48,000	\$40,000	\$0	\$0
7	85	10EDU-17	NIC	\$47,932	\$39,932		
TOTALS:				\$460,079	\$397,702	\$0	\$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
8	84	22EDU-17	ULL	\$106,921	\$0		
9	80	20EDU-17	ULL	\$94,417	\$0		
10	74	19EDU-17	ULL	\$60,125	\$0		
11	73	12EDU-17	SLU	\$41,443	\$0		
11	73	15EDU-17	SLU	\$26,180	\$0		
13	72	13EDU-17	SLU	\$109,798	\$0		
14	69	14EDU-17	SLU	\$64,752	\$0		
15	61	01EDU-17	BRCC	\$14,403	\$0		
	NR	03EDU-17	Dillard	\$5,857	\$0		
	NR	05EDU-17	LSUHSCN	\$39,976	\$0		
	NR	06EDU-17	LSUHSCN	\$76,244	\$0		
	NR	07EDU-17	LSUHSCN	\$101,301	\$0		
	NR	08EDU-17	LSUHSCS	\$211,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
	NR	09EDU-17	LaTech	\$77,261	\$0		
	NR	11EDU-17	SLCC	\$71,208	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$1,100,886	\$0	\$0	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: BRCC Faculty Training: Embedding Praxis Content Into Math
and English Courses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Steven Keeton

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

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

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

F. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$14,403
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 to increase faculty knowledge of English and Mathematics Praxis content. The way that the funds will be used is clear, but the direct tie to the mission of the institution and the specified outcomes are not. Also, it is somewhat uncertain what the benefit of the Associates of Science in Teaching (AST) designation is for students. While goals are measureable, it is unclear how these metrics will show the benefit to students. The work plan lacks details. It seems too largely focused on test preparation rather than transformative learning. While the proposal appears to emphasize faculty development, it is not clearly established how the development occurs relative to the tests. It is unclear how the program will be evaluated. The Budget Justification does not justify why faculty members should be paid to attend a summer workshop or how the requested funds are calculated. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Success for All:: UDL and 21st Century Technologies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Little

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u> </u>
A.2		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>6</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>3</u>	(of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>9</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>19</u>	(of 21 points)
B.3	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.6	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>10</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u> </u>
-----	-----	----------	----	-----------------------------

G. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$61,162</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$44,824</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 acquire equipment for training candidates to use Google Apps for Education (GAPE) within a Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework in conjunction with virtual reality technology. This is a strong proposal. It would be improved with more discussion on how training in the use of GAPE would benefit students and translate to the classroom. The technology requests are well thought out and complement existing equipment. There is no justification for the number of units requested. Partial funding of \$44,824 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: 03EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Dillard University Will W. Alexander Library Enhancing Instructional
Technology in the Information Literacy Classroom of the Dillard
University Library: Bring Your Own Mobile Device Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Charles

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>\$5,857</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.)

The Dillard University Library seeks to enhance information literacy instruction. This proposal is not intended to enhance the study of the discipline of Education or the preparation of K-12 teacher candidates or administrators. It cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Louisiana College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana College School of Education Classroom Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amy Craig

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u> </u>
A.2		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>5</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>2</u>	(of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>8</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>20</u>	(of 21 points)
B.3	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.6	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>10</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u>x</u>
-----	-----	-----------------------------	----	----------

G. Total Score:

91

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$57,400</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$57,400</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.)

The School of Education at Louisiana College seeks technological resources to enhance instruction. This is a strong application. The need is clearly established. While the equipment will clearly improve the learning environment for faculty and students, the goals could be better tied to specific educational objectives. However, the request is sound and the budget is reasonable. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Innovative Educational Home Health Simulation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katherine Carter

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>\$39,976</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 to educate Occupational Therapy and Nursing students to provide care in a home settings. It is not related to the discipline of Education or the preparation of K-12 teacher and administrator candidates. It cannot be rated and no funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Integration of Point-of-Care Ultrasound into a Nurse
Practitioner Curriculum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leanne Fowler

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 _____

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>\$76,244</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 to enhance the nurse practitioner curriculum by providing point-of-care ultrasound education and training to second- and third-year students. The project is not related to the discipline of Education or the preparation of K-12 teacher and administrator candidates. It cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Safe Medication Administration Education through
the Use of an Automated Medication Dispenser [AMD] in a
Simulated Clinical Environment for BSN Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rose Schaubhut

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>\$101,301</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 to enhance medication administration instruction for nursing students. It is not related to the discipline of Education or the preparation of K-12 teacher and administrator candidates. It cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Ultrasound in Medical Curriculum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sumitra Miriyala

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$211,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</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 proposal seeks to enhance the medical curriculum by improving ultrasound education for medical students. It is not related to the discipline of Education or the preparation of K-12 teacher and administrator candidates. It cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Fashion From High School to College to Career: Enhancing
Programs Through Expanded Collaborative Learning
Environment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural

Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

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

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____

F. 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>\$77,261</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 to enhance the Fashion Merchandising and Retail Studies (FMRS) program. It is not related to the discipline of Education or the preparation of K-12 teacher or administrator candidates. It cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: iBITTY: Improving Behavior and Instruction Using Technology
Tools with Youth

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Vavasour

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 7 (of 8 points)
B.4 7 (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:

85

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$47,932</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$39,932</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 to enhance instruction by introducing teacher candidates to behavior intervention techniques that incorporate technology. It is a strong proposal that focuses on an interesting topic. The structure is based on a previous BoRSF-supported project related to reading intervention. The goals are clear and are well-linked to the objectives. The work plan is sound and the budget is reasonable. Partial funding of \$39,932 is recommended with no support recommended for conference travel. Other reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11EDU-17

INSTITUTION: South Louisiana Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technological & Curricula Enhancements in Adult Basic Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathryn Chauveaux

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: \$71,208

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.)

The proposal seeks to improve the delivery of adult education at SLCC. The proposal does not focus on enhancing the study of the discipline of Education or the preparation of K-12 teacher and administrator candidates. It cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The LionUp Summer Academy: Aligning Teacher Candidates'
Content Knowledge with Middle Schoolers'

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Celina Echols

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. 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 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)
B.2 16 (of 20 points)
B.3 5 (of 8 points)
B.4 5 (of 8 points)
B.5 5 (of 8 points)
B.6 5 (of 8 points)
B.7 2 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

F. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$41,443</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 to partner teacher candidates with master teachers to prepare middle school students for ACT and college readiness exams. This is a very important topic. However, the goals are vague and not specifically tied to the enhancement. The objectives are not measurable. The impact on the curriculum is not clearly established. The budget consists mainly of salary and personnel costs. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Centro RealPresence: Placing Students at the Center of
Collaboration

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Holly Kihm

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 4 (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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 14 (of 21 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$109,798

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 to establish a multi-institutional effort with Pennington Biomedical Research Center to enhance courses related to physical education and youth weight management. It is a very interesting project, but the exact applications of the requested various equipment pieces are not established. Without additional detail about the relationship between the budget request and the project objectives, funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mursion Avatar Enhancement Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Melanie Lemoine

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (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 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 4 (of 8 points)
B.4 5 (of 8 points)
B.5 5 (of 8 points)
B.6 5 (of 8 points)
B.7 2 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

F. Total Score:

69

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$64,752</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.)

The proposal seeks to enhance the Mursion Avatar Enhancement Program, which provides simulated classroom experiences for candidates in education fields. The bulk of the request is for one-year software licenses and salary support for the PI, though equipment is also requested to establish a mobile lab. Specific data should be provided that establish the effectiveness of the program and the need for expansion. The text states that the licenses are requested to make the program sustainable rather than relying on month-to-month fees. However, no evidence is provided that these costs would be covered beyond the one-year life of the project. The PI release time would also be for one year and does not appear to be a sustainable investment in the program. Specific tasks are not listed that the PI would be able to accomplish with salary support which would offer permanent or sustainable input to the organization, improvement and expansion of the program. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Expansion of a Play Analyzer Software System in a
Master's Level Counseling Program to Enhance Real-World
Readiness

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 4 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (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 66 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 13 (of 20 points)
B.3 5 (of 8 points)
B.4 5 (of 8 points)
B.5 5 (of 8 points)
B.6 5 (of 8 points)
B.7 4 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No

F. Total Score:

73

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$26,180</u>
	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 to enhance a Master's level counseling program by expanding a software-based instructional system. Limited evidence is provided to justify expansion. There is a lack of clarity on how the funds would be used. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project S.T.E.A.M [Supporting Technology Enhancement in Education, Art and Measurement]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Camille Yates

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

92

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$92,510</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$80,000</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 to enhance pedagogy and instructional techniques in the STEAM Education curriculum. It is an interesting project. This is a critical area and new standards in Education suggest targeting these skills. The request should have included data about current and recent projects to provide evidence of their effectiveness. The personnel costs are relatively high. Reduced funding of \$80,000 is recommended. Reductions should 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: 17EDU-17

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Birth-Kindergarten [Birth-K] Program Enhancement Through Partnerships, Professional Development, and New Student Learning Technologies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jenita Hegwood

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 5 (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 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (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:

86

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$48,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$40,000</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.)

SUNO's College of Education and Human Development seeks to enhance curriculum and faculty development with instructional technology. The project creatively builds on existing infrastructure. It will improve partnerships between the College and K-12 schools. It will improve training in critical skills for teacher candidates and improve their ability to deliver content through technology. The plan to collect data and present a paper lacks details. The budget should be further itemized. Partial funding of \$40,000 in year one is recommended, with no support for conference travel or paper publication. Further reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. There is no institutional match.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 18EDU-17

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: UL Lafayette Reading Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Albertaeve Abington-Pitre

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u> </u>
A.2		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>6</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>3</u>	(of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>9</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>19</u>	(of 21 points)
B.3	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.6	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>10</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u> </u>
-----	-----	----------	----	-----------------------------

G. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$53,083

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$37,405

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.)

ULL's College of Education seeks to update the materials in the Reading Center to improve teacher training. The proposal is well written with clear objectives. The candidates are preparing to serve a high-need population in a critical area of readiness, and the need for upgrading preparation is clearly established. No justification is provided for the specific number of Chromebooks and iPads requested. Partial funding of \$37,405 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. There is no institutional match.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 19EDU-17

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Curriculum Development Project to Support Phase One of
the Year-long Residency for Middle and Secondary Teacher
Candidates

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Toby Daspit

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 8 (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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 6 (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: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$60,125
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 to enhance the curriculum with recorded lessons and improve writing and reflection skills of middle and secondary teacher candidates. The rationale is not compelling. Videotaping and analyzing can be a highly effective practice. However, it is not clearly established that the approach described and equipment requested are the most efficient means of accomplishing the stated goals. The amount of person-hours appears high. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 20EDU-17

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Software Solution & Technology to Enhance Supervision &
Training in Counselor Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Latifey LaFleur

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (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 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 15 (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 3 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$94,417</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.)

The Department of Counselor Education seeks to incorporate video recording and playback capabilities in the Counseling Laboratory. The evaluation plan lacks details. It is not clearly established how this project would impact students in the classroom or improve faculty pedagogy. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 21EDU-17

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Teacher Preparation Through Collaborative Learning
Spaces with a STEM Focus

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Douglas Williams

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 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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

94

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$99,992</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$98,141</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.)

The College of Education seeks to enhance four collaborative learning spaces to prepare pre-service teachers to utilize innovative strategies. This is a very well written proposal. The need is clearly established. The goals and work plan are sound. Not all of the requested technology is effectively tied to the goals and objectives. Partial funding of \$98,141 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. There is no institutional match.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 22EDU-17

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Innovate Learning: Enhancing Pre-service Teachers' Ability to
Teach Innovation, Science, Engineering and Computational
Thinking through Biomimicry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Douglas Williams

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 6 (of 8 points)
B.4 6 (of 8 points)
B.5 7 (of 8 points)
B.6 5 (of 8 points)
B.7 4 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

F. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$106,921</u>
	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 to incorporate biomimicry and design thinking into the curriculum for STEM teacher candidates. It is a strong proposal. The goals are worthy and the objectives are clear. The case for need and impact is less compelling than a competing proposal from the same PI. Funding is not recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Education
for the FY 2016-17 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	Project Title	Amount Requested		
						Year 1	Year 2	Total
001EDU-17	Mr. Steven Keeton	Baton Rouge Community College	1 Year	NE	BRCC Faculty Training: Embedding Praxis Content Into Math and English Courses	\$14,403.00	\$0.00	\$14,403.00
002EDU-17	Dr. Sharon Little	Centenary College	1 Year	E	Success for All:: UDL and 21st Century Technologies	\$61,162.00	\$0.00	\$61,162.00
003EDU-17	Ms. Cynthia Charles	Dillard University	1 Year	E	Dillard University Will W. Alexander Library Enhancing Instructional Technology in the Information Literacy Classroom of The Dillard University Library: Bring Your Own Mobile Device Project	\$5,857.00	\$0.00	\$5,857.00
004EDU-17	Dr. Amy Craig	Louisiana College	1 Year	E	Louisiana College School of Education Classroom Enhancement	\$57,400.00	\$0.00	\$57,400.00
005EDU-17	Dr. Katherine Carter	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans	1 Year	E	Innovative Educational Home Health Simulation	\$39,976.00	\$0.00	\$39,976.00
006EDU-17	Dr. Leanne Fowler	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans	1 Year	E	The Integration of Point-of-Care Ultrasound into a Nurse Practitioner Curriculum	\$76,244.00	\$0.00	\$76,244.00
007EDU-17	Dr. Rose Schaubhut	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans	1 Year	E	Increasing Safe Medication Administration Education Through the Use of an Automated Medication Dispenser [AMD] in a Simulated Clinical Environment for BSN Students	\$101,301.00	\$0.00	\$101,301.00
008EDU-17	Dr. Sumitra Miriyala	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center Shreveport	2 Years	E	Ultrasound in Medical Curriculum	\$211,000.00	\$0.00	\$211,000.00
009EDU-17	Dr. Kathleen Heiden	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	NE	Fashion From High School to College to Career: Enhancing Programs Through Expanded Collaborative Learning Environment	\$77,261.00	\$0.00	\$77,261.00
010EDU-17	Dr. Cynthia Vavasseur	Nicholls State University	1 Year	NE	iBITTY: Improving Behavior and Instruction using Technology Tools with Youth	\$47,932.00	\$0.00	\$47,932.00
011EDU-17	Ms. Kathryn Chauveaux	South Louisiana Community College	1 Year	E	Technological & Curricula Enhancements in Adult Basic Education	\$71,208.00	\$0.00	\$71,208.00
012EDU-17	Dr. Celina Echols	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	NE	The LionUp Summer Academy: Aligning Teacher Candidates' Content Knowledge with Middle Schoolers'	\$41,443.00	\$0.00	\$41,443.00
013EDU-17	Dr. Holly Kihm	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	E	Centro RealPresence: Placing Students at the Center of Collaboration	\$109,798.00	\$0.00	\$109,798.00

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Education
for the FY 2016-17 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	Project Title	Amount Requested		
						Year 1	Year 2	Total
014EDU-17	Dr. Melanie Lemoine	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	NE	Mursion Avatar Enhancement Program	\$64,752.00	\$0.00	\$64,752.00
015EDU-17	Dr. Reshelle Marino	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	NE	The Expansion of a Play Analyzer Software System in a Master's Level Counseling Program to Enhance Real-World Readiness	\$26,180.00	\$0.00	\$26,180.00
016EDU-17	Dr. Camille Yates	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	E	Project S.T.E.A.M [Supporting Technology Enhancement in Education, Art and Measurement]	\$92,510.00	\$0.00	\$92,510.00
017EDU-17	Dr. Jenita Hegwood	Southern University at New Orleans	2 Years	E	Birth-Kindergarten [Birth-K] Program Enhancement Through Partnerships, Professional Development, and New Student Learning Technologies	\$48,000.00	\$0.00	\$48,000.00
018EDU-17	Dr. Albertaeve Abington-Pitre	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	UL Lafayette Reading Center	\$53,083.00	\$0.00	\$53,083.00
019EDU-17	Dr. Toby Daspit	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	A Curriculum Development Project to Support Phase One of the Year-long Residency for Middle and Secondary Teacher Candidates	\$60,125.00	\$0.00	\$60,125.00
020EDU-17	Dr. Latifey LaFleur	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	A Software Solution & Technology to Enhance Supervision & Training in Counselor Education	\$94,417.00	\$0.00	\$94,417.00
021EDU-17	Dr. Douglas Williams	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	Improving Teacher Preparation Through Collaborative Learning Spaces with a STEM Focus	\$99,992.00	\$0.00	\$99,992.00
022EDU-17	Dr. Douglas Williams	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	Innovate Learning: Enhancing Pre-service Teachers' Ability to Teach Innovation, Science, Engineering and Computational Thinking through Biomimicry	\$106,921.00	\$0.00	\$106,921.00
Total Number of Proposals submitted			22					
Total Money Requested for First Year			\$1,560,965.00					
Total Money Requested for Second Year			\$0.00					
Total Money Requested			\$1,560,965.00					

Appendix B

Rating Forms

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

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 _____
- _____ of 5 pts. 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: _____

(Form 6.11, rev 2015)

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

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: _____

(Form 6.12, rev 2015)