

# **Board of Regents Support Fund, FY 2014-15**

## **Review of Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions**

### **Final Report of Consultants**

Submitted by:

**Katherine Boswell, Chair**  
President, Education Policy Associates  
Salt Lake City, Utah

and

**Russell E. Hamm**  
President, Russell E. Hamm, Inc.  
Sisters, OR

**FY 2014-15 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND REVIEW OF  
PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER THE  
ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS**

**A. Introduction**

A two-member Two-Year Institution Enhancement subprogram proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Katherine Boswell, of Education Policy Associates, Salt Lake City, Utah, and Dr. Russell E. Hamm, of Russell E. Hamm, Inc., Sisters, Oregon, met January 15-16, 2015 to evaluate twenty-five (25) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement Subprogram for Two-Year Institutions, a component of the Board of Regents Support Fund. Both individuals had participated on several previous Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposal review teams.

The panel received the following materials prior to the review: (1) the twenty-five (25) proposals and appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of the proposals listing titles, PIs, submitting institutions, and funds requested; (3) the FY 2014-15 RFP containing criteria for evaluation; and (4) the previous year's (2013-14) review report. Each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria enumerated in the RFP. After studying all proposals individually, the panel reviewed and evaluated them collectively. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for sixteen (16) proposals deemed worthy of funding. Funds of \$2,025,406 were requested by all proposals in this competition. The reviewers recommended first-year awards totaling \$1,094,000.

This report contains two tables that rank all proposals. Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals deemed highly recommended for funding with the recommended funding levels. All proposals in that table are recommended for partial funding. Table II lists proposals that are not recommended for funding.

Following the tables are: a detailed review of each proposal; a summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A); and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B).

**B. General Recommendations**

The panel applauds the Louisiana Board of Regents for its continued investment in enhancing the academic programs of the two-year college sector, particularly in light of the difficult fiscal times the State has endured. The Board is commended for its commitment to educational excellence at these new and emerging institutions. We understand that this may be the last year of this Enhancement subprogram as it is currently structured. We deeply regret the loss of this unique grants subprogram that provides institutions unusual opportunities to seek support to enhance particular academic programs, but we understand the multiple pressures that face the Board and are sure that whatever direction is taken will continue to enhance educational opportunities within the two-year sector.

**C. Recommendations to Applicants**

Participating colleges are to be commended for continuing improvement in the quality of proposals submitted to this subprogram. We see continued evidence that applicants are trying to tie measurable learning outcomes to the proposed interventions, recognizing how difficult it is to try to measure student learning in such a compressed time frame. Improved learning outcomes, nevertheless, must remain at the core of reform efforts. The colleges need to get beyond the mindset of "build it and they will come" as evidence and justification for these investments.

While this may be the final year for this particular Enhancement subprogram, as colleges explore other funding opportunities we would encourage them to think more strategically about their academic programs, partnerships and investments. Many of these programs should be part of career pathways that lead into the workforce or baccalaureate programs. In the proposals submitted we continue to see little evidence of meaningful partnerships with local secondary partners, technical schools, four-year institutions, or even local employers. Local labor market and salary data regarding the number of jobs available in a particular CTE field, or meaningful articulation agreements with four-year university partners for the academic program a college is seeking to strengthen, will go a long way in making the case that a project is a worthwhile investment of limited State funds. Communication of this type of data to major stakeholders could help encourage the Board of Regents to reinstitute an Enhancement subprogram for two-year institutions in the future.

**TABLE I**  
**Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, FY 2014-15**  
**Proposals Highly Recommended for Funding**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FUNDS REQUESTED	FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	95	001PEN-15	BRCC	\$28,859	\$26,359
2	94	002PEN-15	BRCC	\$53,924	\$51,424
3	93	009PEN-15	FTCC	\$33,671	\$30,671
4	92	012PEN-15	LSUE	\$141,465	\$125,000
5	91	003PEN-15	BPCC	\$59,175	\$50,000
6	90	016PEN-15	NUNEZ	\$149,202	\$125,000
7	89.5	007PEN-15	DEL	\$133,848	\$110,000
8	89	017PEN-15	RPCC	\$65,268	\$50,000
9	88	005PEN-15	BPCC	\$39,294	\$36,294
10	87	022PEN-15	SUSLA	\$134,427	\$105,727
11	86	018PEN-15	SUSLA	\$121,232	\$90,000
12	85.5	008PEN-15	FTCC	\$48,670	\$40,000
13	85	006PEN-15	DEL	\$125,604	\$112,310
14	84	010PEN-15	FTCC	\$30,520	\$25,815
15	82	023PEN-15	SUSLA	\$55,400	\$45,400
16	81	013PEN-15	NTCC	\$143,400	\$70,000
				\$1,363,959	\$1,094,000

**TABLE II**  
**Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions, FY 2014-15**  
**Proposals Not Recommended for Funding**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FUNDS REQUESTED	FUNDS RECOMMENDED
17	78	025PEN-15	SUSLA	\$60,850	\$0
18	71	021PEN-15	SUSLA	\$57,200	\$0
19	69	015PEN-15	NUNEZ	\$146,668	\$0
20	66	019PEN-15	SUSLA	\$34,598	\$0
21	64	020PEN-15	SUSLA	\$48,036	\$0
22	61	011PEN-15	LSUE	\$100,754	\$0
23	57	014PEN-15	NTCC	\$150,000	\$0
24	55	024PEN-15	SUSLA	\$21,180	\$0
25	10	004PEN-15	BPCC	\$42,161	\$0
				\$661,447	\$0

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 001PEN-15

**INSTITUTION:** Baton Rouge Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Kanetra Jones

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** BRCC Math 091 Project

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

<b>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</b>	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
<b>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</b>		<u>10</u>
<b>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</b>		<u>5</u>
<b>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>25</u>
<b>5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>24</u>
<b>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</b>		<u>3</u>
<b>7. Professional Development (5 points)</b>		<u>4</u>
<b>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</b>		<u>4</u>
<b>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</b>		<u>8</u>
<b>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</b>		<u>2</u>

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

**Total Score (of 100 points)**

**95**

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$28,859</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$26,359</u></u>

This is a superb proposal in support of the Math 091 Project. The applicant did an outstanding job establishing the project need and delineating strategic goals. The design was well thought out and promises to be successful. There is evidence of collaboration with the Adult Ed Department, the project was built on lessons learned at an earlier LCTCS workshop, and the project leverages resources from previous grants. Nevertheless, the panel questions peer tutors being paid benefits as well as an hourly wage. Who are the peer tutors? If faculty, they cannot be paid with this subprogram's funds; if students, they cannot be paid benefits. This should be clarified during contract negotiations. In addition, what lessons were learned from the previous BoRSF-funded project that did not accomplish the outcomes anticipated, which might be incorporated into this project? Despite these questions, the panel recommends partial funding of \$26,359 with discretion to the PI in making reductions. The pledged match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Baton Rouge Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ann Zanders

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: BRCC Simulation Expansion Project

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

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

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

      9      

Total Score (of 100 points)

     94      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>     \$53,924      </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>     \$51,424      </u>

BRCC seeks funding to expand its health care clinical learning environment by increasing the number and types of simulators. The panel recommends slightly reduced funding of \$51,424. The panel notes that this is an exceptionally well-written proposal with especially strong need and impact statements. The PI should be given discretion in determining the best use of funds. Also noted is the strong institutional match of nearly \$16,000, which should be fully maintained. The only question the panel had arose over the request for two-year software licenses, which may violate state contract requirements and should be resolved during contract negotiations. Nevertheless, this is a good project and a good proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Keith Bruce

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhanced Digital Post Production Studio at Bossier Parish Community College

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      9      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     23      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     23      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      9      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

      9      

Total Score (of 100 points)

     91      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$59,175</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u><u>\$50,000</u></u>

The panel recommends \$50,000 in support of the Bossier Parish Enhanced Digital Post Production Studio. The applicant did a good job of documenting the demand for this type of training in BPCC's service region and describes a strong project design and strategic goals. The proposal would have been stronger if there were more evidence of collaboration with the entertainment industry and more data on student job placements. Nonetheless, the panel is convinced that the need is real and the program enhancements will significantly benefit the skills and academic outcomes of students in the CaPA production lab. The panel recommends that program leadership determine the best use of awarded funds. The pledged match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rebecca Turbeville

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening Dual Enrollment and Transfer at Bossier Parish Community College and LSUS

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

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

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

10

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$42,161</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

BPCC seeks funding to strengthen its dual enrollment and transfer program(s). This proposal lacked responses and narrative for most of the RFP-required sections. While the proposal's idea appears meritorious and useful, the incomplete proposal prohibits the award of funds. The panel recommends more care be taken to insure proposals are complete and correct upon submission.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Vercher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Serving At-Risk Students at Bossier Parish Community College

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      9      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     23      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     22      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

88

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$39,294</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u><u>\$36,294</u></u>

The panel recommends funding of \$36,294 in support of this proposal, which will serve at-risk students at Bossier Parish Community College. The applicant did a good job of establishing the need for this project, particularly in light of the significant growth in the student population while professional staffing in student services remained flat. The strategic goals were well articulated and demonstrated an understanding of the student success research literature. The project also includes a significant emphasis on professional development and measuring outcomes. The panel was pleased to see a strong commitment to better serving at-risk, underserved students who face such significant challenges. The pledged match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Guenther

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of the Biotechnology Concentration for the Associate of Applied Science Degree in Science Laboratory Technology at Delgado Community College

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     21      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     21      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      5      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

85

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$125,604</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$112,310</u>

Delgado Community College seeks funding to expand its biotechnology learning environment by increasing the number and types of laboratory equipment for student use. The panel recommends that this request be funded at \$112,310, particularly noting the proposal's effectively written sections including the introductory summary, the jobs data, and the impact statement. The use of data and target numbers in the impact statement was compelling. Overall, this is a good project well represented by a good proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Trivia Wiltz

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Chemistry and Biotechnology Program - Associate of Science Degree

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      9      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     22      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>    23.5    </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

**Total Score (of 100 points)**      89.5    

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	Requested Amount:	<u>     \$133,848     </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	Recommended Amount:	<u>     \$110,000     </u>

This is a very strong proposal to support the enhancement of the chemistry and biotechnology program at Delgado Community College. Due to significant demands across the system, the panel recommends partial funding of \$110,000 with discretion to the PI in determining reductions. The panel was particularly pleased with the level of collaboration with the college's partners in the health sciences that has been established in support of this project. The applicant did an excellent job of drawing the connection from real openings for students in the local labor market to the income potential for program graduates. The institutional match, which was impressive, may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sterling Aysen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Machining: Crafting South Louisiana's Workforce

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     20      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     20      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>     3.5      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>     10      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

85.5

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$48,670</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u><u>\$40,000</u></u>

Fletcher Technical Community College seeks funding to acquire equipment (primarily a lathe and control programming system) to strengthen its machining program to support Louisiana's oil and gas industry – critical to the economic health of the region. Of note was the significant match to "program building" through the donation of the Mori Seiki CNC Lathe. The panel recognizes the particularly effective introductory summary and the strong use of jobs data. The impact statement, however, lacked sufficient data/information; it was not clear how much direct support for trained workers would be provided to the oil industry. Overall, though, this is a solid project that is well represented by a good proposal. The panel recommends partial funding of \$40,000 with elimination of the two-year warranty on the software "Manufacturing Suite." That expense is disallowed in the RFP. The \$2,500 Other match pledged in the proposal should be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 009PEN-15

**INSTITUTION:** Fletcher Technical Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Ryan LeCompte

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Academic Learning Resource Center: Expansion for Success

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

<b>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</b>	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
<b>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</b>		<u>10</u>
<b>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</b>		<u>4</u>
<b>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>24</u>
<b>5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>22</u>
<b>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</b>		<u>3</u>
<b>7. Professional Development (5 points)</b>		<u>4</u>
<b>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</b>		<u>5</u>
<b>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</b>		<u>9</u>
<b>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</b>		<u>2</u>

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

**Total Score (of 100 points)**

93

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$33,671</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$30,671</u></u>

The panel recommends supporting Fletcher Technical Community College's establishment of an expanded Academic Learning Resource Center. The proposal was well written with a strong needs statement that justifies expansion of services. Fletcher is clearly building on the success of previous grants. The panel was pleased to see the connection to the college's QEP Program and recommends partial funding of \$30,671 for this reasonable budget request. Reductions should be made at the discretion of the PI. Despite the reduction, the pledged institutional match (\$19,400) for the ALRC's expansion and the hiring of staff should be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Suzanne Martin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Library Services with New and Emerging Technologies

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      6      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     24      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     18      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      6      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points) 

84
----

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$30,520</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$25,815</u>

Fletcher Technical Community College seeks funding to enhance its library and provide student services with additional student computers, chargers and necessary supplies. Particularly effective were the design and impact sections. Partial funding of \$25,815 is recommended. Although the panel supports travel and expenses for the State library association meeting (\$1,524), it also recommends elimination of EDUCAUSE personnel training since it is the more expensive (\$4,706) of the two sessions. The institutional match for supplies may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award. Overall, this is a good proposal and project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University - Eunice

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian Stephens

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Dietary Bioactives and Alzheimer's Disease

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      6      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      2      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     18      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     16      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      0      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      4      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

**Total Score (of 100 points)**      61      

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>     \$100,754     </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

While the proposal “Dietary Bioactives and Alzheimer’s Disease” was well written, it did little to establish the need for this project among LSUE’s student population. There was no evidence that this investment would lead to improved student outcomes at a rural-serving two-year college. The proposal seemed primarily designed to support the research interests of the faculty. While the proposed research is undoubtedly valuable, this proposal did not make the case that it was a fitting use of scarce State funds for two-year campus enhancement. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University - Eunice

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jamie Thibodeaux

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Modular Math: Increasing Student Success Through Course Redesign

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>10</u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>5</u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>21</u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>21</u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>3</u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>5</u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>5</u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>10</u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>2</u>

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

10

Total Score (of 100 points)

92

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$141,465</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u><u>\$125,000</u></u>

LSU Eunice seeks funding to create and enhance its math learning environment. Funding is primarily sought for pod seating, networking, and installation of necessary equipment and supplies. The design section and the impact statement were particularly effectively written. The panel commends LSU Eunice and recommends partial funding of \$125,000 with discretion to the PI in managing budget reductions. The institutional match, which is impressive, may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount. Overall, this is a good proposal and a good project.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 013PEN-15

**INSTITUTION:** Northshore Technical Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Tina Tinney

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Broadening the Scope: An Enhanced Media Awareness Plan

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

<b>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</b>	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
<b>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</b>		<u>9</u>
<b>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</b>		<u>4</u>
<b>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>22</u>
<b>5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>21</u>
<b>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</b>		<u>3</u>
<b>7. Professional Development (5 points)</b>		<u>3</u>
<b>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</b>		<u>3</u>
<b>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</b>		<u>7</u>
<b>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</b>		<u>2</u>

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

**Total Score (of 100 points)**

81

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$143,400

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$70,000

The panel debated whether to support another marketing proposal from NTCC that pushes the envelope in terms of the types of activities typically funded in this subprogram. The panel decided that the applicant had done an excellent job of articulating the case for continued marketing efforts but believes, however, that given its stated importance the campus should identify sustainable resources to support this effort long-term rather than relying on competitive grant funding. Such a project from NTCC should not be submitted to this subprogram again. Nevertheless, two compelling arguments included the well-documented needs statement and the positive impact that last year's investment had on student participation. The proposal was well designed, had a strong needs statement and was backed with much data. Less compelling were the lack of measurable outcomes and the high costs associated with these outreach efforts. The panel recommends \$70,000 and maintenance of the full institutional match, but also recommends eliminating \$44,000 for a professionally designed Mardi Gras float. Both reviewers have worked at colleges that build floats for local parades using student labor at a fraction of the cost. Moreover, a motor vehicle is an ineligible expense in the Enhancement Program and a poor investment of scarce academic resources across higher education in Louisiana. Additional reductions may be made at the PI's discretion, based on review of the budget to determine the outreach efforts that provide the greatest return on investment.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Northshore Technical Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tina Tinney

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Keep Trucking with Northshore Technical Community College

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     15      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     15      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      0      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      0      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

57

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$150,000</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

Funding is requested to support NTCC's Diesel Powered Equipment Technology program by acquiring a class 8 diesel truck. The panel agrees with the assertion that the program and its students will benefit by accessing and working on a new piece of technology, but seriously questions if obtaining a new truck is the best investment. There may be more cost-effective alternatives, such as slightly used or donated vehicles. Beyond this basic concern, the proposal was not compelling. Of note were sections such as the needs statement, where sound data indicating the numbers of actual jobs available (9% growth over 10 years) were missing. The panel was also curious about how the program meets the needs of the college's non-trucking clients including the construction and marine industries. Overall, there appeared to be a need for further investment in the program but this proposal failed to make a strong case for that investment. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Alternative to Traditional Biology

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     18      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     17      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      6      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

69

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$146,668</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

There is little question that the need for additional science laboratory enhancements at Nunez Community College is significant. Although the potential opportunities for students are hinted at in the proposal, it lacked specific information on how the curriculum would be changed, what jobs the students would be prepared to fill, and what sorts of measurable learning outcomes would be achieved. Given the significant overlap with another proposal from Nunez seeking support for the enhancement of Bio 2200, the Louisiana Wetlands course, the panel does not recommend funding this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 016PEN-15

**INSTITUTION:** Nunez Community College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Stephen Waddell

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancement of Bio 2200 [Louisiana Wetlands]

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

<b>1. Demographic Data Adequate?</b>	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
<b>2. Description of Project Need (10 points)</b>		<u>8</u>
<b>3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)</b>		<u>5</u>
<b>4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>22</u>
<b>5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)</b>		<u>22</u>
<b>6. Faculty &amp; Staff Expertise (3 points)</b>		<u>3</u>
<b>7. Professional Development (5 points)</b>		<u>5</u>
<b>8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)</b>		<u>3</u>
<b>9. Project Evaluation (10 points)</b>		<u>10</u>
<b>10. Project Dissemination (2 points)</b>		<u>2</u>

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

**Total Score (of 100 points)** 90

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$149,202</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u><u>\$125,000</u></u>

Nunez Community College seeks funding to enhance the Biology 2200 program with purchase of a greenhouse and a wetlands pond environment. The panel acknowledges the challenges faced by Nunez following Hurricane Katrina and the need to rebuild almost the entire science program. Further, the panel recognizes the proposal's emphasis on the wetlands, a high State priority for preservation and restoration as barriers to future flooding. The panel recommends that this request be funded partially at \$125,000 with removal of the PI's salary request (\$13,332), which did not seem to represent the "compelling or unusual circumstance" required by the RFP. The pledged institutional match is necessary to sustain the project and should be fully maintained. This is a good project represented by a good proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017PEN-15

INSTITUTION: River Parishes Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jared Eusea

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Quality Matters Training for Faculty at RPCC

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      9      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     23      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     21      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

89

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$65,268</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$50,000</u>

The RPCC applicant did an excellent job of establishing the significant need for additional faculty development to improve and standardize the quality of online education at RPCC. The project was well conceptualized with significant strategic goals and a corresponding design that should ensure its success. The panel recommends partial funding of \$50,000 with full maintenance of the pledged institutional match. Reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Alak

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Learning by Augmentation of Classroom Instructions with  
Hands-on Laboratory Exercises

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     22      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     23      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      0      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>     10      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

     10      

Total Score (of 100 points)

     86      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$121,232</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$90,000</u>

Southern University at Shreveport seeks funding to enhance its health- and science-oriented programs by acquiring basic laboratory equipment to enhance existing resources. The panel acknowledges sections of the proposal that were particularly effective including the opening summary and the project need and design. This is a good proposal and a good project. The panel recommends partial funding of \$90,000 with discretion to the PI in determining the best use of resources.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cleopatra Allen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: SUSLA Emerging Leader Development Initiative

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     16      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     15      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

      6      

Total Score (of 100 points)

     66      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$34,598</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>     \$0      </u>

The PI of the proposed project has identified a real need for developing leadership skills not only at Southern University at Shreveport but also across the nation. This proposal, however, did not provide a sufficient argument that the proposed intervention would successfully accomplish worthy project goals. Moreover, there was little evidence that an asynchronous online course approach is an appropriate or effective training method in leadership development, which by its nature is all about interpersonal interaction. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Iris Champion

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: On the Move: Increasing Computer Science Majors Through High School  
Business Course [BCA] Re-design

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>6</u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>4</u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>20</u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>15</u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>3</u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>3</u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>0</u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>5</u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>2</u>

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

6

Total Score (of 100 points)

64

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$48,036</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

Southern University at Shreveport seeks funding to increase the number of students entering the computer science program. The panel agrees with the assertion that some effort should be made to attract more students but seriously questions if buying robots and placing them in high schools is the overall best investment. Certainly building a high school pipeline for students is a good strategy, but might a different approach be more effective? The panel noted that there was only a single letter of support from one of the two participating high schools, which raised the question of whether there was wide support for the project at the secondary level. The panel also noted that the request to travel to conferences appears to be disassociated from the focus of the project. The proposal was less than compelling and lacked an effective solution to a real problem. The panel does not recommend funding.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joyce Cottonham

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Embracing Technology in the English Classroom

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      6      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     15      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     20      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      6      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

      7      

Total Score (of 100 points)

     71      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>     \$57,200      </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>      \$0      </u>

While this proposal made a good case for the value of enhanced media support in English instruction, the request was essentially duplicated in another SUSLA proposal requesting support for a new media center for the Humanities. Considering both proposals, the panel decided that the second proposal was broader and would be better able to meet the needs articulated in this proposal. For that reason the panel does not recommend funding this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephanie Graham

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Higher Plane: Creating Graduates that Possess the Knowledge, Skills  
and Abilities to Be Successful Aircraft Maintenance Mechanics

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     25      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     18      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

     10      

Total Score (of 100 points)

     87      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$134,427</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$105,727</u>

Southern University at Shreveport seeks funding to enhance its aircraft maintenance program by acquiring an airplane engine and supporting equipment. The project need and design sections were particularly effective. The PI made compelling arguments for the importance of this program to the regional air transportation community and demonstrated that the added equipment augments existing resources. The panel recommends that the proposal be partially funded at \$105,727 and does not support funding for student examination fees (\$13,700) or for three attendees at a professional conference. Only one should attend. The estimates for his/her travel expenses, moreover, seem to be higher than current State travel rates specified in PPM-49. This should be resolved during contract negotiations.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lonnie McCray

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multimedia Lab

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     21      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     22      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      8      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

      8      

Total Score (of 100 points)

     82      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$55,400</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u><u>\$45,400</u></u>

The panel commends SUSLA for the continuing commitment of faculty and staff to seek additional resources to enhance the educational offerings at the college. The applicant argued well for the need for additional multimedia resources to enhance the English and Humanities curricula. The panel recommends partial funding of \$45,400 to support the new multimedia lab with discretion to the project team in determining the best use of awarded funds.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jalisa Shaw

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Criminal Justice Practicum - CJUS 298

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      5      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      5      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     15      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     15      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      0      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      0      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      5      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

      5      

Total Score (of 100 points)

55

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$21,180</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

Funding to equip a multimedia classroom with additional computers is sought. The panel agrees with the PI's assertion that a focus on "community-based policing" is one proven strategy for addressing crime in communities. However, the relationship between strengthening the criminal justice program's community policing education efforts and investments in classroom technology was not clearly described. CJUS 298 is described as a "valuable out-of-classroom" experience and the proposal emphasizes the need for students to "work in and around the community," yet the budget is composed of items that would be primarily used in the classroom. The proposal was less than compelling, lacked an effective solution to a real problem, and did not demonstrate an effective impact. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025PEN-15

INSTITUTION: Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wanda Waller

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Music Technology Enhancement Laboratory

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

1. Demographic Data Adequate?	<u>  x  </u> Yes	<u>      </u> No
2. Description of Project Need (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
3. Strategic Goals of the Project (5 points)		<u>      4      </u>
4. Design of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     21      </u>
5. Impact of Proposed Project (25 points)		<u>     20      </u>
6. Faculty & Staff Expertise (3 points)		<u>      3      </u>
7. Professional Development (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
8. Additional Funding Sources (5 points)		<u>      3      </u>
9. Project Evaluation (10 points)		<u>      7      </u>
10. Project Dissemination (2 points)		<u>      2      </u>

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

Total Score (of 100 points)

     78      

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>     \$60,850      </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>      \$0      </u>

After careful review of all proposals, the panel does not recommend this proposal for funding. Although it established a need for advanced technologies in a contemporary music laboratory, the proposal would have been much stronger if additional specifics had been provided outlining which classes would be impacted, in what ways, and how many students would ultimately be served. The PI should have provided additional data on the regional labor market and economic opportunities for graduates with this training. The panel is well aware of the significant needs SUSLA faces and suggests that the applicant seek an alternative source of funding for this equipment.

# **Appendix A**

## **Summary List of Proposals**

Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions  
for the FY 2014-15 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Project Title	Institution	First Year Req. amount
001PEN-15	Mrs. Kanetra Jones	BRCC Math 091 Project	Baton Rouge Community College	\$28,859.00
002PEN-15	Mrs. Ann Zanders	BRCC Simulation Expansion Project	Baton Rouge Community College	\$53,924.00
003PEN-15	Mr. Keith Bruce	Enhanced Digital Post Production Studio at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$59,175.00
004PEN-15	Ms. Rebecca Turbeville	Strengthening Dual Enrollment and Transfer at Bossier Parish Community College and LSUS	Bossier Parish Community College	\$42,161.00
005PEN-15	Ms. Kathleen Vercher	Serving At-Risk Students at Bossier Parish Community College	Bossier Parish Community College	\$39,294.00
006PEN-15	Dr. James Guenther	Development of the Biotechnology Concentration for the Associate of Applied Science Degree in Science Laboratory Technology at Delgado Community College	Delgado Community College	\$125,604.00
007PEN-15	Dr. Trivia Wiltz	Enhancement of the Chemistry and Biotechnology Program-Associate of Science Degree	Delgado Community College	\$133,848.00
008PEN-15	Mr. Sterling Aysen	Machining: Crafting South Louisiana's Workforce	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$48,670.00
009PEN-15	Mr. Ryan LeCompte	Academic Learning Resource Center: Expansion for Success	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$33,671.00
010PEN-15	Mrs. Suzanne Martin	Enhancement of Library Services with New and Emerging Technologies	Fletcher Technical Community College	\$30,520.00
011PEN-15	Mr. Brian Stephens	Dietary bioactives and Alzheimer's disease	Louisiana State University at Eunice	\$100,754.00
012PEN-15	Mrs. Jamie Thibodeaux	Modular Math: Increasing Student Success Through Course Redesign	Louisiana State University at Eunice	\$141,465.00
013PEN-15	Dr. Tina Tinney	Broadening the Scope: an Enhanced Media Awareness Plan	Northshore Technical Community College	\$143,400.00
014PEN-15	Dr. Tina Tinney	Keep Trucking with Northshore Technical Community College	Northshore Technical Community College	\$150,000.00
015PEN-15	Mr. Stephen Waddell	An Alternative to Traditional Biology	Nunez Community College	\$146,668.00
016PEN-15	Mr. Stephen Waddell	Enhancement of Bio 2200 [Louisiana Wetlands]	Nunez Community College	\$149,202.00
017PEN-15	Mr. Jared Eusea	Quality Matters Training for Faculty at RPCC	River Parishes Community College	\$65,268.00
018PEN-15	Dr. John Alak	Enhancing Learning by augmentation of classroom instructions with hand-on laboratory exercises.	Southern University at Shreveport	\$121,232.00
019PEN-15	Mrs. Cleopatra Allen	SUSLA Emerging Leader Development Initiative	Southern University at Shreveport	\$34,598.00
020PEN-15	Dr. Iris Champion	On the Move: Increasing Computer Science Majors through High School Business Course [BCA] Re-design	Southern University at Shreveport	\$48,036.00
021PEN-15	Mrs. Joyce Cottonham	Embracing Technology in the English Classroom	Southern University at Shreveport	\$57,200.00

Proposals Submitted to the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions  
for the FY 2014-15 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Project Title	Institution	First Year Req. amount
022PEN-15	Ms. Stephanie Graham	"A Higher Plane: Creating Graduates that Possess the Knowledge, Skills and Abilities to be Successful Aircraft Maintenance Mechanics"	Southern University at Shreveport	\$134,427.00
023PEN-15	Dr. Lonnie McCray	Multimedia Lab	Southern University at Shreveport	\$55,400.00
024PEN-15	Ms. Jalisa Shaw	Enhancing Criminal Justice Practicum – CJUS 298	Southern University at Shreveport	\$21,180.00
025PEN-15	Dr. Wanda Waller	Music Technology Enhancement Laboratory	Southern University at Shreveport	\$60,850.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	25
Total Money Requested	\$2,025,406.00



# **APPENDIX B**

## **Rating Form**

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM FOR TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS  
RATING FORM, FY 2014-15**

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

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Director: \_\_\_\_\_

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

**1. Demographic Data (0 points, but a required component)**

Has the applicant adequately described the demographic data about the campus that will benefit from the proposed project, and relevant institutional or departmental resources, if appropriate?

**2. Description of Project Need (\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points)**

Has the applicant adequately described project needs and related them to the goals and measurable objectives? To what extent will the needs of the project, if funded, enhance the affected campus, entity, department/division or unit?

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

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

**4. Design of Proposed Project (\_\_\_\_\_ of 25 points)**

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

**5. Impact of the Project (\_\_\_\_\_ of 25 points)**

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

**6. Faculty and Staff Expertise (\_\_\_\_\_ of 3 points)**

To what extent will the project enhance faculty and staff expertise? Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified and trained to implement this project?

FY 2013-14 BoR Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions RFP

**7. Professional Development (\_\_\_\_\_ of 5 points)**

Does the applicant describe the need for any professional development activities? What is the primary purpose(s) of the activities? Are the professional development activities connected to the primary activities of the project? Is faculty/staff training tied to each aspect of the proposal (need,

objectives, activities, evaluation)? If special training will be required for project participants, has an appropriate plan been developed? What is the anticipated impact of professional development?

**8. Additional Funding Sources and Evidence of Collaboration (\_\_\_\_ of 5 points)**

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

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

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

**10. Project Dissemination (\_\_\_\_ of 2 points)**

Are the plans for dissemination of best practices clearly specified and attainable? Is the plan adequate to fully disseminate results of the project?

**B. Budget Page and Budget Narrative (\_\_\_\_ of 10 points)**

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

**REVIEWERS' BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount: \$\_\_\_\_\_ Recommended Amount: \$\_\_\_\_\_