January 9, 2003

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Dalton B. Floyd, Jr., Chairman, and Members, Commission on Higher Education

From: Ms. Dianne Chinnes, Chairman, Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing

Report of the Technology Grant Program (TGP) Review Panel

In accord with the legislation creating the Technology Grant Program (TGP) and the Commission's *Guidelines* for competitive proposals, the staff of the Commission selected and assembled a review panel composed of seven persons with diverse areas of expertise in the field of educational technology. (See biographies appended to the report.) The purpose of the TGP Review Panel was to select projects to be funded from among the 19 proposals which were submitted by all ten eligible institutions and one consortium.

The Commission's staff sent copies of all the proposals to the TGP Review Panel members in early November. The TGP Review Panel met on November 20, 2002, at the Commission's office for the entire day in Columbia. After extensive deliberation, the members of the Panel recommended a total of 12 of the 19 proposals for funding. In responding to the quality of the first five proposals recommended for funding, the Panel was of the opinion that these five should be fully funded to assure their implementation, given the revised distribution of lottery funds. The next seven proposals funded will receive funding in the order in which they are listed, as long as lottery funding is available.

Attached please find a list of the 12 proposals recommended for funding as displayed on **Attachment 1** and an appended report as displayed on **Attachment 2** from the TGP Review Panel. The funds requested in the proposals recommended by the Review Panel totaled less than the amount authorized for distribution by the General Assembly. Therefore, the staff suggests that in the event the entire authorized amount of funding is made available, after administrative expenses are subtracted, any dollars remaining will be distributed equally to institutions to supplement their funded proposals.

The Panel indicated a number of advantages and problems with the TGP process as it was implemented this year. Although these issues are outlined in the Review Panel's report, the advantages may be summarized as an opportunity to develop basic technology infrastructural norms for all public institutions in the state, to promote economic efficiencies in purchasing, and to establish institutional cooperation to tackle challenges which are statewide in scope.

Recommendation

The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing recommends that the Commission approve the recommendations of the Review Panel for the awarding of 12 proposals, with funds to be distributed as displayed on **Attachment 1**, in the order in which the proposals were ranked as lottery funds become available, and accept the appended report as displayed on **Attachment 2** from the TGP Review Panel. The Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing further recommends that the Commission approve any remaining funds be distributed in equal amounts to institutions to supplement their awards, after administrative expenses have been paid.

The Committee will consider this item at its meeting on January 9 and will make its recommendation to the Commission on January 9.

Cc: Attachments (2)

List of Proposals Recommended for Funding by the Technology Review Panel (TGP)

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION	NAME OF PROPOSAL	AMOUNT
Coastal Carolina	**"Enhancing Interactivity in Teaching and Learning Beyond the Classroom"**	**$797,100**
S.C. State University	**"Expanding the Use of Technology in Teaching and Management"**	**$1,066,300**
The Citadel	**"Expanding Multimedia Resources to Improve Teaching and Learning at The Citadel"**	**$498,500**
The Citadel	**" Integrated Library Management System"**	**$150,000**
USC-Beaufort	**"Network Infrastructure to Support Increased Technology Use"**	**$623,700**
USC-Aiken	"Ubiquitous Campus Computing"	$798,000
Lander University	"Enhancing Student Learning via Technology Improvements at Lander University"	$550,000
USC-Spartanburg	"Campus Networked Computing Infrastructure Upgrades"	$1,183,000
College of Charleston	"Building Learning Communities"	$998,000
Winthrop University	"Technology Replacement/Upgrades"	$854,400
Francis Marion University	"Enhancement of University-Wide Teaching and Learning Through Discipline Specific Technology Enhancements"	$799,600
Coastal Carolina	"Reaching Students Through Distance Learning"	$730,400

Dr. Rayburn Barton, Executive Director
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 200
Columbia, SC 29201

RE: Report of the Technology Grant Program (TGP) Review Panel

Dear Dr. Barton:

The Technology Grant Program (TGP) Review Panel met on November 20, 2002, in Columbia for the purpose of making recommendations to the Commission for the funding of proposals which had been submitted by South Carolina's ten teaching universities. I am pleased to enclose a copy of our report as approved by the Review Panel.

The Panel was composed of people of varied backgrounds working with a wide spectrum of issues dealing with the application of technology to teaching and learning processes in public institutions of higher education. It was my pleasure to work with them on behalf of a project that can offer such potential benefits in terms of quality, service, and efficiencies to the well-being of South Carolina's public higher education enterprise and the taxpaying public of your state.

Please review the report and do not hesitate to call me should you have any questions about the substance of the Panel's work or its recommendations.

Sincerely,

James Mingle, Ph.D. (transmitted electronically)

REPORT OF THE TECHNOLOGY GRANT

PROGRAM (TGP) REVIEW PANEL

Background, Personnel, and Process

The Technology Grant Program (TGP) Review Panel met on November 20, 2002, in Columbia, SC, at the offices of the Commission on Higher Education. The members of the Panel were:

Dr. James Mingle, Chairperson, former Executive Director of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) group
Dr. Janet Poley, President, American Distance Education Consortium
Dr. Bruce Chaloux, Director of the Southern Regional Education Board's Electronic Campus
Mr. Michael Abbiatti, Associate Commissioner for Learning Technology, Louisiana Board of Regents
Dr. Philip Moss, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Mr. Larry Johnson, Chief Technology Officer, South Carolina Budget and Control Board
Ms. Shannon Wilder, Instructional Design and Technology Specialist, Office of Instructional Support and Development, University of Georgia

Biographical abstracts of each member of the Review Panel are attached to this report as *Appendix 1.*

The purpose of the meeting was to make recommendations to the Commission for awarding funds for proposals submitted by eligible public teaching universities in South Carolina for upgrading and innovative uses of technology. This program was established by the General Assembly in 2002. After discussion with and approval by the institutions themselves, the Commission issued a set of *Guidelines* for the TGP process. A total of $10.5 million dollars is expected to be available under the provision.

Prior to arrival in Columbia, the members of the Review Panel were mailed 19 proposals which had been submitted by the eligible institutions. Each of the ten eligible four-year teaching universities submitted at least one proposal. Eight of the ten (i.e., all but Francis Marion University and South Carolina State University) had submitted two proposals. In addition, the three four-year teaching university campuses of the University of South Carolina submitted a consortial proposal. The TGP Review Panel, after a full day of deliberation, study, and discussion, recommended awarding funds to 12 of the 19

proposals. All twelve of these proposals were recommended for full funding. Each public university received at least one fully funded award. Two institutions (The Citadel and Coastal Carolina) received full funding for both proposals which they submitted.

Those proposals recommended for funding by the Review Panel were the following twelve, divided into two groups. First, five proposals were evaluated as the strongest group of all those recommended for funding, on the basis of the criteria found in the *Guidelines*. Consistent with that evaluation, the Selection Panel recommends that the Commission fully fund these five proposals first as lottery funds become available. In that way, if some of the lottery funds which were appropriated are not actually realized for purposes of this grants competition, these five projects will at least be able to be fully implemented

1. Coastal Carolina: Enhancing Interactivity in Teaching and
   Learning Beyond the Classroom $797,100
2. South Carolina State: Expanding the Use of Technology
   in Teaching and Management $1,066,300
3. The Citadel: Expanding Multimedia Resources to Improve
   Teaching and Learning at the Citadel $498,500
4. The Citadel: Integrated Library Management System $150,000
5. USC-Beaufort: Network Infrastructure to Support
   Increased Technology Use $623,700

Secondly, a group of seven proposals were recommended for funding, as follows:

6. USC-Aiken: Ubiquitous Campus Computing $798,000
7. Lander: Enhancing Student Learning via Technology
Improvements at Lander University $550,000
8. USC-Spartanburg: Campus Networked Computing
Infrastructure Upgrades $1,183,000
9. College of Charleston: Building Learning Communities $998,000
10. Winthrop: Technology Replacement/Upgrade $854,400
11. Francis Marion: Enhancement of University-Wide
    Teaching and Learning Through Discipline-Specific
    Technology Enhancements $799,600
12. Coastal Carolina: Reaching Students Through Distance
    Learning $730,400

In the view of the Review Panel, when lottery funds become available, this second group of proposals should be funded only after the first five are fully funded.

Abstracts of all the proposals recommended for funding by the Review Panel are attached to this report as *Appendix 2*.

Unfunded Proposals

Seven proposals (six from individual institutions and the single one from a consortium) were considered unfundable in their current forms. In general, the Panel found this group of proposals to have lacked sufficient narrative and supporting budget material to convey the objectives to be achieved from the requested investment. Although declining to fund the consortial proposal for the reasons listed, the Review Panel nevertheless unanimously wished it to be known that they are philosophically in favor of consortial efforts for competitive processes like the TGP.

The Review Panel is of the opinion that the institutions might find it beneficial to receive feedback on their proposals, regardless of whether these proposals were recommended for funding or not. Accordingly, we have attached to this report the Review Panel's summary of comments on individual proposals. These are found as *Appendix 3* for the Commission staff to consider sharing with the individual institutions.

Observations of the Members regarding the Process and the Opportunity

In the course of its work, the Review Panel made several observations concerning the process and opportunity afforded by the TGP initiative. Generally, Panel members were positive about the TGP initiative both in terms of the process and with respect to the potential it presented the state of South Carolina to do something which would enhance the productivity, efficiency and effectiveness of South Carolina's public four-year teaching universities through the development of their technological base.

The Review Panel was in agreement that the language of the law which created the TGP competitive grants process provided a framework to permit development and implementation of institutional plans capable of promoting the statewide goals for higher education as found in the Commission on Higher Education's statewide plan. The Panel also agreed that the proposals—even those to which the Panel chose to award funding--did not very adequately address these same statewide goals.

The Review Panel found the *Guidelines* consistent in spirit with the broad outlines of the law creating the TGP competitive grants process, but was of the opinion that the *Guidelines* could have served better as a spearhead for addressing the elements of the State Plan of the Commission on Higher Education if they had been more focused. Despite this critique of the *Guidelines*, the Review Panel found this document to contain sufficient references to promote development of proposals for addressing statewide need, including:

- A priority for consortia to promote development of a statewide electronic library for higher education institutions
- A priority placed upon proposals directed toward historically underserved populations

- A priority placed upon proposals for reaching off-campus student populations of all types

Despite the opportunities found in the *Guidelines*, the proposals submitted were generally weak in, or devoid of reference to, addressing these concerns. Instead, the Review Panel saw the proposals focused almost exclusively on campus-based, full-time residential students and campus-based faculty members.

The question of efficiency also arose during the Review Panel's consideration of the proposals. The Panel noted an unexplained, significant range in prices for the purchase of all types of teaching technology from smart classrooms to individual computers. (For example, purchase prices for personal computers varied from $1,700 to $3,600, a wide range even allowing for different firms' estimates or pc capabilities.) The Panel was similarly concerned about the lack of effort demonstrated in the proposals to acknowledge the importance of statewide contract pricing for the purchase of technology. Moreover, in the opinion of the Panel, the proposals demonstrated a high degree of institutional disuse and disregard for collaborative efforts in purchasing equipment which rivaled their disregard for interinstitutional collaboration in the achievement of statewide higher education goals.

A second issue of concern to the Review Panel was the weakness of the evaluation component found in all the proposals. Given the language of the *Guidelines*, not to mention issues of standard accountability both within institutions and to the General Assembly, the Review Panel expected that the proposals would show significant specificity in terms of measured outcome variables by which they would evaluate the degree of success achieved from implementing their technology upgrades. The Panel was, therefore, surprised by the virtual lack of reference to these instruments in any specific way and by their complete omission in a number of the proposals.

Still another issue of concern was the apparent absence in most proposals of a plan to cover personnel costs in the future, whether for temporary, part-time or full-time employees since it is not reasonable to expect personnel costs to be covered by future grants. The stronger proposals reflected institutional commitment by covering personnel costs of new hires.

Finally, few of the proposals were explicit with respect to overall institutional commitment and sustainability beyond the life of the grant. While this was especially true with respect to personnel costs, it was also an issue which was generally noted.

Summary

The Review Panel agreed there is great merit in the legislative purposes for which the TGP was created. Moreover, the Panel recommends that the General Assembly consider providing this avenue for the dispersal of lottery funds on a long-term basis.

On the other hand, the Review Panel has concluded that the institutional proposals submitted for this first round of proposals were lacking in strengths in several significant ways. Thus, in the future, assuming that the General Assembly sees fit to reauthorize this competition, it is the Review Panel's view that the process and the outcomes should be strengthened by the addition of the following measures:

- The *Guidelines* for the competition should indicate clearly that in order to be funded proposals must show significant promise of achievable, measurable outcomes.
- The achievable, measurable outcomes should be linked to a specific element of an approved institutional plan for development of teaching and learning processes.
- The achievable measurable outcomes should also be linked explicitly to a specific statewide goal of the *State Plan for Higher Education*.
- The proposals should also be required to be reviewed by the State's Chief Information Officer to approve both their feasibility and their budgetary requests to the extent the latter are in areas affected by state contract purchase plans, when they can realize savings in purchasing equipment.
- The *Guidelines* should include a requirement for a final report containing both narrative and fiscal sub-reports in which the successes and shortcomings of the funded project's implementation are included.
- Institutional commitment of funds (including identification of the source of those funds) to maintain the processes for which the TGP is "seed money" should be an explicit requirement in all grant proposals.

Biographical Abstracts of Members of the
Technology Grant Program (TGP) Review Panel

<u>Abbiatti, Michael</u>

Mr. Abbiatti is the Associate Commissioner for Learning Technology for the Louisiana Board of Regents. He holds undergraduate and graduate technical degrees from the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville, Centenary College, and Northwestern State University with professional certification from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Formerly Director of Distance Education for Louisiana State University, Mr. Abbiatti has been recognized by Computerworld-Smithsonian Awards Program as a Laureate for leadership in design, deployment, and utilization of Information Technology for the benefit of Louisiana's citizens. He is a member of the EDNET Education Executive Advisory Board. He has been the recipient of the United State Distance Learning Association's Most Outstanding Achievement by an Individual in K-12 Award. Mr. Abbiatti served a tour as commander of a medical unit in Operation Desert Storm and led a "virtual laboratory" development team to design an electronic global training program for military medical personnel.

<u>Chaloux, Bruce</u>

Dr. Chaloux directs the 16-state *Electronic Campus* initiative of the Southern Regional Education Board. He earned his baccalaureate degree from Castleton State College in Vermont, an MBA from University of Florida, and a Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration from Florida State University. He has nearly 30 years of teaching and administrative experience in higher education at the institutional, state, and national levels, as a faculty member, dean, and doctoral student dissertation supervisor. He has published numerous articles and chapters and has been a contributor to numerous reports on technology, distance learning, and technology-based education.

<u>Johnson, Larry</u>

Mr. Johnson was selected in 2002 to fill the newly created position of Chief Technology Officer (CTO) for the Division of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) of the South Carolina Budget and Control Board. He holds a BS degree (Magna Cum Laude) from Brigham Young University. His responsibilities are to provide leadership and guidance in developing the strategic IT direction and policy for the CIO and, by extension, the State as an enterprise. Prior to his joining state government, Mr. Johnson had a long career in business, first for six years in Washington, DC, with Electronic Data Systems as an instructor, manager, and systems engineer; and, later, for 17 years at Policy Management Systems Corporation (PMSC) in Columbia, where he held the position of Vice President of Architecture and Infrastructure for PMSC's Property and Casualty Insurance Products.

Mingle, James

Dr. Mingle chaired the TGP Review Panel. Currently he is an independent consultant and serves as Director of the Distance Learning Policy Laboratory of the Southern Regional Education Board in Atlanta, GA. He holds B.A. and M.A. degrees from the University of Akron and the Ph.D. in Higher Education from the University of Michigan. Dr. Mingle is an advisor to the Association of Governing Board's Center for Public Higher Education Trusteeship and Governance. From 1984-2000 he served as Executive Director of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) and in 1995 was a visiting fellow with Educom (now EDUCAUSE), the nation's leading higher education organization in information technology.

Moss, Philip

Dr. Moss is Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, responsible for academic programs, planning, and policy within the State System. He holds an M.Ed. in Educational Technology and a Ph.D. in Adult and Higher Education with an emphasis in Distance Education from the University of Oklahoma. In his service with the Oklahoma Regents, he has coordinated the provision of instructional technology, electronic media, and distance education over OneNet, the Oklahoma network for education and government. Prior to his work with the Regents, Dr. Moss served as Dean of Information Services and Distance Education at Western Oklahoma State. He has been President of the Oklahoma Distance Learning Association in 1999-2000 and a member of the SREB Electronic Campus Steering Committee.

Poley, Janet

Dr. Poley is CEO and President of the American Distance Education Consortium (ADEC), through which she develops collaborative distance education initiatives with 65 land grant university members working nationally and internationally. She holds three degrees from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, including a B.S. in Journalism and Home Economics, an M.S. in Nutrition, and a Ph.D. in Education. She has been involved in training, technical assistance, and program design and evaluation in more than 25 countries in Asia, Africa, and Europe. In 1994 she was recognized as one of 100 outstanding information technology leaders in government, business, and academia by Federal Computer Week. She also is the recipient of the U.S. Congress' Excalibur Award for her international aid contributions. She has been an executive administrator with the Extension Service of the US Department of Agriculture and a faculty member at University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Wilder, Shannon

Ms. Wilder is an Instructional Design and Technology Specialist at the University of Georgia in the Office of Instructional Support and Development. She holds a B.F.A. in Art, an M.Ed. in Instructional Technology, and is currently a Ph.D. candidate in Art Education at the University of Georgia. At the University of Georgia, she provides campus-wide leadership on matters relating to instruction through a variety of faculty development programs. She teaches and designs faculty development workshops and consults with faculty seeking to integrate technology into their classrooms. She is the author or co-author of several books on technology and has made numerous presentations to groups on the incorporation of technology into higher education. Her specializations include graphics and multimedia software, web development, video streaming technology, and applications of hand-held technology in the classroom.

**Proposal Abstracts of Projects Recommended
for Funding by the TGP Review Panel**

- **Top five programs recommended for immediate complete funding (1-5)**

- **Seven additional programs recommended for funding as resources become available (6-12)**

1) <u>**Coastal Carolina University #2**</u>

Abstract

Enhancing Interactivity in Teaching and Learning Beyond the Classroom

Walls

The Coastal Carolina University Technology Plan, developed through the comprehensive efforts of students, faculty, and administrators, combines strategic goals with practical implementation to increase technological capability. Assessed yearly, the detailed plan denotes strengths, weaknesses, and future plans for campus technology. Several of the weaknesses noted by this plan will be addressed through this proposal: 1) Lack of classroom technology; 2) Limited equipment for students; and, 3) Limited technical support. Therefore, the overall goal for this proposal is to utilize technology to improve and expand the teaching-learning process on the Coastal Carolina University campus. Funding of this proposal will increase technical and pedagogical expertise needed by faculty for the effective use of technology-based curriculum by creating a Faculty Technology Center and an associated faculty development program. Faculty, staff, and students will have greater access to technology resources through the development of two Technology Learning Classrooms in each academic college and one in the campus library, through upgrades to existing student computing laboratories and through the creation of a Notebook Computer Library. The proposed activities will target faculty development, address diverse student learning styles, increase the application of technology for the underserved, and remove barriers that prevent the integration of technology-enhanced instruction into various disciplines. Formative and summative measures will be used for project evaluation. Overall evaluation design will yield timeliness of project implementation, assess project successes, determine program effectiveness, and measure student/faculty satisfaction with instructional technology.

2) <u>South Carolina State University</u>

Abstract

Expanding the use of Technology in Teaching and Management

This proposed project addresses two of five technology related issues outlined in South Carolina State University's (SCSU) five-year strategic plan – (1) Increase the use of technology in instructional delivery, including web-based and other distance learning instruction and (2) Increase faculty competence in the use of technology. Over the next three years University Computing and Information Technology Services (UCITS) will take the lead in expanding the use of information technology campus wide. Before this expansion can be successfully implemented, the data network infrastructure must be extended and upgraded and a comprehensive faculty technology professional development plan implemented.

In the ever-competitive information technology marketplace, customer satisfaction reigns supreme. The challenge for University IT departments is not so much in determining how to keep faculty and students satisfied, but in how to continuously strive to enhance satisfaction and expand services while spending less to do so. Faculty and staff expect network access from their desks, classrooms and from home. Students are not only expecting, but need network access from their dorm rooms which will result in better quality in and access to teaching and learning. Our network is expected to be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. SCSU needs a network that is reliable, stable, robust and secure so that it can promote the quality and breadth of technology available to its students, faculty, and staff and to the citizens of South Carolina. Providing adequate and meaningful technology training for faculty is an ongoing challenge.

The results and recommendations from a comprehensive network study conducted by an external consultant during the spring of 2002 will serve as a blueprint for extending and enhancing network infrastructure.   Vendors working closely with the project director will implement other components of the project. The specific goals of the project are to:

- Enhance data network infrastructure and security to support student network access from dorms and off-campus.
- Implement an extensive training program for faculty, staff, and students that will increase competence in academic and administrative uses of technology.
- Upgrade computers for faculty who successfully complete the technology professional development curriculum.

- Expand network access and instructional technology tools in classrooms and the library for use by campus and community patrons.
- Implement document imaging and management solutions for library reserves and student records information.

South Carolina State University requests $1,066,300 to implement the goals of the proposed project as outlined above. Meeting these goals will enable South Carolina State University to improve the quality of teaching, learning, and service through better access to information resources by faculty, staff and students from within, as well as from outside, the University. Implementing this project will make the University competitive with other higher educational institutions in providing access to knowledge bases for students, thus preparing technology savvy graduates that can compete for employment in high-tech fields within South Carolina and globally.

3) __The Citadel #2__

Abstract

Expanding Multimedia Resources to Improve Teaching and Learning at The Citadel

The Citadel currently has 16 multimedia classrooms and auditoriums with ceiling-mounted projectors, but this is not nearly enough. All of these classrooms are booked solidly throughout the day, and new multimedia classrooms are completely scheduled almost as soon as they are designed. We are clearly moving toward a future in which multimedia resources will play an important role in almost every course we offer.

This proposal seeks $498,500 to convert 20 traditional lecture classrooms to multimedia classrooms – and to purchase multimedia instructional content for course use. We will also expand The Citadel's multimedia training and support programs for faculty by hiring a new full-time multimedia specialist. However, this position will be funded with non-grant funds and will continue after the grant ends.

Converting 20 traditional lecture classrooms to multimedia classrooms will benefit almost every student on campus. We have good reason to believe that our students will learn more, and we know from experience that they will be more engaged in the learning process.

More than doubling the number of multimedia classrooms on campus will also encourage more faculty to use multimedia resources in their courses – because they will have greater access to classrooms in which they can project these resources.

In preparing this grant proposal, the project co-director interviewed all 17 of the college's teaching department heads. All support this proposal, and they quickly identified more than 70 lecture rooms they would like converted to multimedia classrooms as soon as possible.

However, support for this project is strongest among Citadel faculty, who are frustrated by the college's shortage of multimedia classrooms and the problems they encounter when they try to use the older multimedia cart systems we originally purchased.

4) **The Citadel #1**

Abstract

Integrated Library Management System

PROJECT SUMMARY

The Citadel is requesting funds to purchase and install a new Integrated Library Management System, with additional components to enhance the current teaching and learning environment. Over the past decade, The Citadel has placed increased emphasis on the integration of multimedia technology into classrooms to supplement, and even replace, traditional teaching methodologies. From the initial development of one multimedia classroom in 1991, these limited resources have been heavily utilized throughout the academic year and in Maymester and summer sessions as well. The Citadel is committed to enhancing the teaching/learning environment. Helping each faculty member grow as a teacher is an institutional priority. This means providing students and faculty access to the latest in information management hardware and software and making available well-trained staff to help them utilize this technology effectively. The Citadel believes that the virtual library is at the very heart of any interactive learning environment. The Citadel is currently working with many of the Technical Colleges and 4-year institutions across the State to purchase an Integrated Library Management System, the foundation on which a statewide virtual library will be based. The Citadel currently has a 13-year old library system that is out of date and insufficient to support the current needs and technological expectations of its students and faculty. An Integrated Library Management System would add significantly to The Citadel's capacity to provide each classroom interactive access to electronic information for the enhancement of teaching and learning. The additional components of Digital Archival software, Virtual Reference, ILLIAD Interlibrary Loan Management software, and a meta-search product such as SFX, would provide students and faculty members, through electronic access from where ever they might be working, every function that can be performed inside the walls of the library. The Citadel is requesting $150,000 from CHE to complete this project. The cost of the Integrated Library Management System and the additional components is estimated based on a vendor's quotes for similar products.

5) USC-Beaufort #2

Abstract

Network Infrastructure to Support Increased Technology Use

Abstract/Project Summary

The University of South Carolina Beaufort is at a pivotal point in its transition from a two-year institution to a baccalaureate degree granting university. To fulfill its changed mission, USCB is seeking all necessary approvals to offer its first four-year degree program beginning in January 2003, with five additional degrees beginning in August 2003.

As part of efforts to support additional faculty, students and programs, and to raise the campus to a higher level of excellence, USCB seeks to improve the technology infrastructure that supports all university functions from classroom teaching and learning to administrative student support systems. Based on our mission, "bring[ing] the University of South Carolina's statewide mission of teaching, research, scholarship, and public service to the rapidly growing Lowcountry," this project will substantially strengthen the institution's basic grid of technology to assist faculty in teaching more effectively and staff in better supporting students.

From the onset, "lack of technology infrastructure" has replayed itself in meetings. Utilizing SEIR-TEC's technology planning resources and expertise within the USC system, this project not only focuses on the expensive yet easy target of technology infrastructure, but also continually returns to outcomes that will serve to increase student access and success. Dr. Bill Hogue, Chief Information Technology Officer from USC Columbia, has assisted USCB faculty, staff and administration with updating its IT plan during Fall 2002 and preparing this grant proposal. USCB is very committed to this project, which meets institutional goals of improved student access, creating a student-oriented admissions, registration, financial aid, and advisement systems, and better fulfilling its primary mission of teaching.

Through this grant, we seek funding to improve network connectivity within the institution among our campus sites, but also between USCB and other institutions of higher education. Faster, more reliable connectivity and improved access to library information resources will allow USCB to maximize information, faculty and staff resources for improved student success. Historically underserved students (33% of USCB students are non-traditional and 65% are low income or first generation) will be better accommodated as we improve infrastructure to institute distance education, innovative classroom technologies and improved

student services. Our non-traditional students especially need additional exposure to technology to meet the challenges of today's changing workforce, as outlined in CHE's *Strategic Plan for Higher Education: 2002*.

Improvements in connectivity infrastructure and access will not only address immediate technology needs for the growing campus, but also lay the groundwork for improvements in classroom technology, including implementation of "smart" classrooms and possibly campus-wide wireless networking. Improved connectivity will also allow seamless interfacing among other universities distance education systems, once such a system can be installed at USCB. *High-speed connectivity is the first step*. Establishing high-speed connectivity is essential to providing access to information resources bases for students and equip students with the knowledge and skills they need to compete in the regional job-market. This project's investment in USC Beaufort's infrastructure will lead ultimately to increasing recent graduates' employment in high-tech fields or within positions that require high-tech skills.

6) USC-Aiken #1
Ubiquitous Campus Computing

Abstract

Our goal is to create a ubiquitous campus computing environment by breaking through the physical barriers of traditional classroom and labs. This will be achieved by significantly increasing campus-wide access to a broader range of technological resources by a greater number of individuals and fostering programs to further integrate and support the use of technology into both academic and administrative processes. This enhanced environment will improve the teaching and learning process, provide a more student-centered computing environment and increase technology access for traditionally underserved populations. In addition this project will help us more effectively leverage institutional resources such as limited classroom and lab space. Specifically this grant focuses on the following four key areas:

1. Creating an expanded campus computing environment utilizing wireless technologies and mobile computing.
2. Creating an Assistive Technology Lab (ATL) dedicated to expanding and enhancing educational opportunities of students with a wide array of disabilities.
3. Promoting and increasing the faculty's use of educational technology to enhance classroom and distance education.
4. Creating opportunities for traditionally underserved populations (first generation college students, students with disabilities, rural students and minority students) to access technology outside of the traditional classroom/lab environment.

To achieve these goals we are seeking funding of $798,000.00.

7) Lander University #2

Abstract

Enhancing Student Learning via Technology Improvements at Lander University

PROJECT SUMMARY

Lander University (1992-present) is proud of the liberal arts tradition, which it inherited from the Williamston Female College (1872-1904) and Lander College (1904-1992), however it carries a very strong emphasis upon traditional methods of instruction. Many of our students come from rural, lower-income and middle-income families. Twenty percent of all Lander students are African Americans. Many are the first members of their families to attend college. To improve the teaching and learning environment of the University, we plan to provide technology training and appropriate classroom and information system technology that will enable our faculty to add diversity to their instructional methods, to equip our faculty to better accommodate the different learning styles of their students, and to provide our students with technology tools that will make them more competitive in the job market.

To implement this plan, Lander University requests $550,000 from the TGP for a project to provide modern information technology to students and faculty in order to improve instructional outcomes. This project includes installing a WebCT course-management software system, expanding our pool of Smart Classrooms from 4 to 24, enlarging our pilot Faculty Laptop Project from 10 to 45 faculty members, initiating wireless technologies on our campus in order to encourage student use of laptop computers, and adding technology enhancements in our library. Most importantly, this project provides the necessary training for students and faculty through the creation of a Technology Teaching and Learning Center (TTLC).

Lander University is submitting two proposals to the South Carolina Technology Grant Program (TGP). The most effective utilization of the additional teaching/learning technology resources requested in this proposal will require the upgrade of our centralized computing system as requested in our other proposal. We feel that students, faculty, administrators, and all other constituencies of the University should have secure 24/7 access from any on-campus or off-campus location through a single all-purpose web portal to the teaching, learning, and administrative tools that they need.

The overall goals of these two complimentary projects are to: 1) improve the communication skills of our students in order to prepare them for the

electronic/global world in which they will work; 2) facilitate teaching and learning by enhancing the communication between our faculty members and their students; 3) broaden our students' understanding and use of local and global electronic resources, including those created by our faculty; 4) enable our faculty to complete their teaching, advising, and record-keeping tasks more efficiently; 5) increase the efficiency of our administrative and reporting functions so that Lander's predicted 20% increase in student enrollments will not require an equivalent increase in staffing; and 6) provide additional tools for better institutional management and planning.

This project will be led by Lander's Vice President for Academic Affairs, assisted by the Faculty / Staff Technology Committee. The Director of Computer Services and her staff of ten full-time employees and numerous part-time student workers will be responsible for all technical aspects of the project (see appended information). An evaluation of the outcomes of the project is included. The implementation of the two TGP projects will position Lander University for inter-institutional cooperation in the proposed Statewide Virtual Library, and the sharing of WebCT courses with small rural high schools and other institutions. This project responds to items IA (reaching under-served populations), IB (promoting distance education), and IIID (training health professionals) of the CHE Higher Education Strategic Plan: 2002.

8) USC-Spartanburg #2

Abstract
Campus Networked Computing Infrastructure Upgrades

The University of South Carolina Spartanburg, ranked by *US News* as one of the top five public liberal arts colleges in the South, is undergoing a period of unprecedented growth and enrollment increase. The Spartanburg campus has grown by approximately 20% to nearly 4,400 students in the past 4 years and operations at the University Center in Greenville have experienced an even higher rate of growth, surpassing 100% in the past 3 years. With over 30 new faculty members added this year alone, nearly one fourth of USCS's instructors are new colleagues. These new faculty embrace and demand technology infused pedagogy and curricula. But a number of constraints have accompanied USCS's rapid growth; among these have been seriously limited fiscal resources, classroom and laboratory space, faculty and support staff, and technology infrastructure. USCS has been funded substantially below its Mission Resource Requirement (MRR) over the past three years, and technology support for instruction has been one of many casualties of this shortfall.

USCS is committed to the most effective, innovative, and efficient use of information technology to help overcome these barriers. Goal Seven of the USCS 2002-2007 Strategic Plan calls for "robust information technology" that is ubiquitous, pervasive, and integrated into all aspects of the programs and mission of the University. Upgrading and expanding the campus networked computing environment will greatly improve access to current instructional technologies and information databases in support of teaching and learning at USCS. This will enable students to master essential skills and ultimately make them more competitive in their respective disciplines and careers. The funds requested in this proposal to the South Carolina Technology Grant Program will allow USCS to address these needs and continue to serve the population of Upstate South Carolina through excellent academic and student support programs.

This proposal describes projects in four areas; all are essential to the overarching goal of establishing and maintaining a reliable campus networked computing environment:
- Network infrastructure and security $411,376
    Including network security firewall, core network upgrades,
    Voice Over IP, network management system, and wireless networking
- Web services migration and enhancement $87,818
- Collaborative computing environment with fault-tolerant NAS $521,827
- Distance education facilities $161,979

   Total Amount Requested: **$1,183,000**

This grant will enable USCS to modernize the capabilities and security of the campus network, begin implementation of current technologies such as wireless networking and voice over IP, upgrade distance education facilities and systems, improve access to online information databases, expand and standardize the campus Web services environment, and establish a collaborative computing environment for faculty, staff, and students. The initiatives outlined in this grant proposal reflect projects that employ best practices, best-in-class solutions, cost reduction methodologies, and that are vitally important to USCS's mission to serve the people of Upstate South Carolina. The funds provided by the South Carolina Technology Grant Program will allow USCS to build the networked computing infrastructure it needs to meet these critical needs.

9) <u>College of Charleston #2</u>

Abstract

Building Learning Communities

Our grant application, Building Learning Communities, significantly expands existing educational technology resources and expertise to create new technologically enriched learning environments among faculty and students inside and beyond the classroom. The project accelerates the transformation of our most valuable asset, our mainstream faculty, by giving them the means to create learning communities on the web. In these communities, students and faculty come together in constantly evolving, largely reciprocal active learning environments that emphasize discovery, experimentation and judgment over traditional, lecture-oriented classes. The vast majority of our faculty members are neither technophobes nor early adopters of technology. They watch their innovative peers and they read about exemplary projects in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, but they have neither the time nor the support necessary to apply new and emerging information technologies to their teaching.

Although focused on faculty development, the proposed project has several interlocking components. Since we plan to significantly increase the number of courses where we use technology to learn, we must assure our faculty and students that we have an extensive, reliable computing hardware and software infrastructure.

First, we will establish a faculty institute to train 25 faculty members in the use of course management software, and other hardware, networks, and software that can be used to enhance and extend the traditional classroom experience. Although we have some support personnel in place, we will jumpstart the process by using development services from an outside firm with an appropriate record of achievement in the higher education market. Incentives for faculty development and the assistance of external consultants will enable faculty to redesign their courses with pedagogically effective uses of information technology. At the end of the institute, each participating faculty member will produce a redesigned, technologically enriched course. With a small amount of annual funding from the College, we can repeat the institute indefinitely.

Second, to meet the increased demand for technology rich learning environments, we will purchase and install new smart classrooms, computer classrooms, course management software, networks and computers for faculty.

Third, in addition to working with the 25 faculty members, we plan to integrate WebCT courseware with the SCT student information system to provide a course web page for all 2,200 courses each semester, reaching more than 11,000 students. With this in place, faculty will be able to communicate readily with students through threaded discussions, chat, and email groups.

Our evaluation process will address student and faculty satisfaction with the redesigned technology enriched courses. At the end of the grant cycle, we will host a symposium to demonstrate the results of the institute grants. Local K-12 teachers and faculty from other four-year universities in South Carolina will be invited.

The College of Charleston is requesting $998,000 from the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education to accomplish this project.

10) Winthrop #2

Abstract
Technology Replacement / Upgrade

In keeping with the Winthrop University Mission Statement to provide instructional technology and other academic service areas that support courses of study that are consonant with current methods and knowledge, Winthrop University initiated a Board of Trustee approved plan to replace and upgrade technology to ensure a state-of-the-practice environment. Representatives from all academic units, the library and administration recommended the purchase of technology equipment and software that supports the instructional program and enhances student learning, while remaining compatible with academic and industry standards.

A component of this plan is the consistent refreshing of technology in student labs and faculty offices every three years. This plan ensures that students can access the same contemporary equipment and software that is being used in industries where they will be seeking employment, including access to the internet and World Wide Web. Many faculty now integrate Internet and other technology resources into their curriculum, allowing them to stay current in their field and competitive with other institutions.

The three year plan takes advantage of purchase programs so that equipment and software can be procured at the appropriate times during the three year cycle. The student labs are refreshed at the time that demands are expected to surpass the capabilities of previously installed equipment and software. The replaced equipment is then rotated into areas of less demand that still have a need for better computing performance.

The University has identified the appropriate facilities, equipment and software to meet the instructional and learning needs of the campus community, has equipped the support staff with the necessary expertise to maintain the equipment and train faculty and staff, and secured the commitment of the Board of Trustees and campus community to meeting the technology needs of the faculty and student body. The greatest challenge faced is securing the revenue support to make this plan happen. Funding under this proposal will provide that support for the FY04 academic year.

11) <u>Francis Marion University</u>

ABSTRACT

**Enhancement of University-Wide Teaching and Learning Through
Discipline-Specific Technology Enhancements**

DEPARTMENT: All (9) academic departments, both professional schools, the university library, and academic computing services

TITLE: Enhancement of University-Wide Teaching and Learning Through Discipline Specific Technology Enhancements

SUMMARY: Francis Marion proposes a project totaling $799,600 to enhance teaching and learning in each of its academic units and in its academic library. By having each unit design, implement and evaluate a technology enhancement sub-project best fitting its current unmet technology needs, we plan to improve teaching and learning in all academic disciplines, measurably improve educational outcomes, and provide students with enhanced technology skills for careers.

Discipline-specific technology standards or national technology standards (where available) have been utilized in the selection of initiatives for sub-projects. Proposed sub-projects include replacement of obsolete equipment, smart classrooms, an enhanced library access system, technologically enhanced laboratories in the arts, sciences and languages, and specialized equipment in the sciences and mathematics. One sub-project expands the University's bandwidth to the Internet.

The University's existing faculty-elected Information Technology committee has reviewed the technical specifications of, and will monitor, the fourteen sub-projects. A representative of the Information Technology Committee will serve as overall Project Director and coordinate the sub-project directors. The Provost, the sponsored programs officer, and the VP for Administration (CIO), and their staffs will provide institutional support for the project. Evaluation of each sub-project will be included in the annual institutional effectiveness report of the respective academic units. The Project Director will complete an overall evaluation of the project.

12) Coastal Carolina University #1

ABSTRACT

REACHING STUDENTS THROUGH DISTANCE LEARNING

Coastal Carolina University seeks to better serve students in the region through distance education and has articulated this goal in the *Technology Plan* of its strategic plan, *Building a Premier University*. Acknowledging that many potential students are unserved or underserved, the University requests funding to increase access to distance education through establishing classrooms with broadcasting and receiving capability on campus and at it its three off-campus centers in Myrtle Beach, Georgetown, and Litchfield; to train faculty and student assistants in the use of the technology; to motivate faculty to develop and teach distance learning courses by providing summer stipends for these faculty; to improve library resources available to distance education students through the installation of the Millenium System; and to hire a staff person skilled in WebCT on a fulltime basis as well as an instructional design staff person on a one-half time basis. These goals coincide with the goals of the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education as stated in the *Strategic Plan for Higher Education*.

Summary Comments Intended as Feedback to Individual Institutions
Submitting Proposals for the Technology Grant Program (TGP)
Competition

PART A. PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED BY THE PANEL FOR FUNDING

Proposals numbered 1-12 have all been recommended to the Commission on Higher Education by the TGP Review Panel for funding. These proposals are listed here as rank-ordered by the Panel. The first five are recommended for full funding as soon as any lottery funds become available for distribution through the TGP. The next seven are recommended for funding as additional lottery revenue might become available.

1. Institution Submitting Proposal: Coastal Carolina University
Proposal Title: UTILIZING TECHNOLOGY TO IMPROVE AND EXPAND THE TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESS

The TGP Review Panel found a large number of strengths in this institutional proposal. Included in the characteristics which were lauded by the Panel were:

- The proposal is reasonably defined in terms of costs necessary to achieve expected outcomes.
- As the proposal shows, there is a defined plan for moving the faculty forward in their understanding and use of technology.
- The proposal demonstrates that the institution already possesses significant expertise to support the proposed project, thus making it feasible to implement.
- The proposal demonstrates a thoughtful, concerted effort on the part of the institution to look comprehensively at the institutional reality in an effort to "plug technological holes" that currently exist.
- Computer costs appear reasonable, certainly in relationship to many other proposals submitted.
- There is a good fit demonstrated in the proposal between the faculty and student relationship in technological improvements.

The only substantive matters discussed by members of the Panel to improve the proposal were:

- Use of PDAs is missing from the proposal, although the PDA technology offers some advantages over other technologies projected for use in the proposal.

2. Institution Submitting Proposal: South Carolina State University
<u>Proposal Title: UPGRADING NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRAINING FOR FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND STAFF</u>

Members of the Review Panel found the proposal well developed and well presented. Various aspects reported by members of the Panel regarding strengths of the proposal included:

- The proposal's development of much needed infrastructure at the institution.
- Linkage of the infrastructure to the mission of the institution as a teaching university.
- Seeking to prepare faculty for the challenges of the technologically advanced phase of American higher education.
- The proposal represents a single, integrated "package" wedding technology to the need for human resource development. Human resource development is also inclusive: i.e., faculty, library staff (e.g., in training for document imaging), and student training for the use of materials.
- The institution's investment in a consultant prior to submission of the proposal was evident in the strength of the proposal.
- The institution's investment in a consultant prior to submission of the proposal was evident in the strength of the proposal.

Despite the strengths evident in the proposal, the Review Panel found certain important concerns, including the following:

- A very weak evaluation and assessment plan.
- The outsourcing of the work appears to be more than for providing the institution with a period for a learning curve; instead, the time for outsourcing appears to be unending, which will create a variety of snags for on campus users and potentially much higher fees for service to the institution.
- Turning over the management of the proposed network to one vendor.
- Developing a system which with multiple dimensions appears to be offered very (perhaps even too) cheaply, begging the question of whether the proposal as stated can be implemented as promised in the proposal.

3. Institution Submitting Proposal: The Citadel

Proposal Title: EXPANDING MULTIMEDIA RESOURCES TO IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING AT THE CITADEL

The focus of the proposed project is in the doubling of multimedia classrooms at the institution to be concluded within a short period of time. This proposal from The Citadel had wider support on the faculty, apparently, than the one for the library technology, if only because the language of the proposal was explicit in its statement that all 17 of the department chairs of the institution had been consulted as part of the process for its development.

The Review Panel found considerable elements in this proposal to be well developed. A list of comments from the Panel follows:

- The proposal describes a specific, quantifiable institutional commitment and plan for faculty development through MERLOT. In today's educational environment, to have smart classrooms is important and the institution is doing what it can to forward this change.
- The very presence of smart classrooms is an incentive for faculty to begin to ask how they can change their teaching styles to incorporate technology into their student presentations.
- Institutional management of the technology systems at the Citadel appears to be well conceived as alluded to in the proposal.

The Review Panel also articulated several concerns about the proposal, as follows:

- While the proposal permits and promotes distance education, it seems unfocused on the needs of nontraditional, historically underserved populations of students.
- Several elements of the proposal (e.g., the purchase of VCRs) appear very expensive or relatively unnecessary, but are said to be needed by the institution.

Although these concerns should be considered by the institution, the Review Panel was comfortable in the merits of the proposal.

4. Institution Submitting Proposal: The Citadel
Proposal Title: INTEGRATED LIBRARY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR
THE CITADEL'S DANIEL LIBRARY

The TGP Review Panel found this grant full of strengths as follows:

- The proposal is necessary for the institution.
- As written, the proposal speaks to the *Guidelines* for the TGP in helping to promote the involvement of the institution with the statewide electronic library initiative.
- Provided that the funds received are used in appropriate ways, the proposal will enhance collaboration with other public and private institutions of higher education in South Carolina.
- The proposal appears both feasible and highly cost efficient as written.

The Panel found no weaknesses in this grant proposal with the possible exception of there being no identifiable "plan" through which the anticipated collaboration will occur.

5. Institution Submitting Proposal: University of South Carolina-Beaufort
Proposal Title: IMPROVE CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGIES, DISTANCE
LEARNING AND LIBRARY RESOURCES

Members of the Review Panel found this proposal impressive on several accounts, as follows:

- The proposal's convincing demonstration of institutional need.
- The critical nature of having this project implemented before the other proposal from the institution could successfully be implemented.
- The evident response of this proposal to the mission of the institution in transition from two-year to four-year status.
- The fact that this proposal seriously addresses the issue of reaching underserved populations by a definable, available technology (i.e., satellite)
- Significant administrative support for the project as witnessed by a letter from the Chief Executive Officer of the campus.

6. Institution Submitting Proposal: USC- Aiken

Proposal Title: UBIQUITOUS CAMPUS COMPUTING

This proposal seeks to develop wireless computing, mobile computing, assistive technologies, technology access to underserved populations, and distance education/educational technology at the USC-A campus. As such it is one of the few proposals submitted that speaks so directly to a great need in South Carolina and an articulated priority within the *Guidelines* of the TGP initiative.

The following comments from the Review Panel speak to the value of the proposal:

Despite the reference to a "capacity problem" on the campus server in the
- other proposal from USC-A, the Review Panel found this proposal able to be implemented.
- The priorities for distance education, and distance education to serve underserved populations, are in line with the Commission's *Guidelines* for the TGP.
- The proposal is feasible within the proposed budget targets listed.

7. Institution Submitting Proposal: Lander University

Proposal Title: ENHANCING STUDENT LEARNING VIA TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENTS AT LANDER UNIVERSITY

In considering the two proposals from Lander University, the TGP Review Panel noted that the first proposal from the institution contained explicit language to the effect that the implementation of that project was absolutely necessary to the successful implementation of the proposal here, entitled "Enhancing Student Learning Via Technology Improvements at Lander University." After having reviewed both proposals thoroughly, the Review Panel unanimously concluded that this proposal is possible to implement without taking into account the other one. Further, in the opinion of the Review Panel the current proposal has some important positive, distinguishing characteristics which make it one the Panel chose to fund.

The following characteristics of this proposal were noted by the Review Panel during its review as positive contributions:
- Improvement of the teaching and learning process is a priority under the *Guidelines*; this proposal addresses both that process thoughtfully.

- The elements found in this proposal include WebCT, laptop computers, wireless technology, and an evaluation component. All of these are integrated in the proposal.

In a critique of the proposal the Review Panel noted the following points:

- The proposal contains language indicating that the elements within it must be set up in a linear fashion. While the Review Panel agrees that these elements together can be and should be integrated in the teaching/learning process, it disagrees that this philosophical position for planning necessarily entails a linear design for implementation.
- The proposal under discussion on this page is much better written and much more compelling than the other Lander University proposal. Therefore, assuming that the other one is useful, the institution should find the money elsewhere to fund it.

A thoughtful, prior commitment on the part of the institution to fund two necessary support staff persons for the project outside the proposal.

8. Institution Submitting Proposal: USC-Spartanburg

Proposal Title: CAMPUS NETWORKED COMPUTING INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES

Members of the TGP Review Panel reviewed this proposal and found it contained sufficient merit for funding.

The following are comments representative of the Review Panel's views on the proposal:

- The proposal is infrastructure-related.
- The proposal appears campus-centered and will integrate the campus in substantially important ways.
- The proposal appears at least modestly to support some of the *Guidelines* for the TGP.

9. Institution Submitting Proposal: College of Charleston
Proposal Title: BUILDING LEARNING COMMUNITIES

The members of the Review Panel evaluated this proposal as fundable. The following comments are representative of the Panel's response to the proposal:

- The proposal meaningfully involves faculty innovators while providing assistance to mainstream faculty to make them more comfortable with using technology for teaching and learning.
- The proposal provides a meaningful discussion of the term "learning community."
- The proposal underscores the development of an institutional infrastructure.

Despite these positive elements, the Review Panel found the proposal had some significant issues which diminished its effectiveness, even though it was fundable. These issues include:

- The costs associated with acquisition appear greatly out of proportion to what purchase of certain goods are known to be available.
- There appears to be a disregard for state purchasing plans which artificially inflates the costs.

10. Institution Submitting Proposal: Winthrop University
Proposal Title: TECHNOLOGY REPLACEMENT/UPGRADE

The Review Panel evaluated this proposal as worthwhile for funding. While it lacked significant innovation, it nevertheless provided some important first-level technology for faculty and student use. In the view of the members of the panel, this proposal might have been significantly strengthened by significantly more detail about the anticipated, measurable teaching/learning outcomes of the project and from a tying of the project to statewide goals.

Despite these strengths, members of the Review Panel found costs cited in the proposal to be relatively high and cautioned that these costs should be reviewed before purchases are made.

11. Institution Submitting Proposal: Francis Marion University

Proposal Title: ENHANCEMENT OF TEACHING AND LEARNING: REPLACEMENT OF OBSOLETE EQUIPMENT

Members of the Review Panel found several elements in this proposal to commend it for funding, as follows:

- The proposal was written by persons who either were academicians or sympathetic to them.
- There is a decentralized, but campus-wide, approach taken in the proposal so that specific information is available for individual disciplines (e.g., chemistry) and academic units (viz., the library).

On the other hand, the very strengths of the proposal also constituted the basis of many of its weaknesses, as the Review Panel saw it. These weaknesses need to be corrected in any future institutional proposal by Francis Marion University through the TGP. They include:

- The proposal appears sometimes to be 14 unconnected plans or "wish list" since it is not overtly tied to any existing institutional plan.
- There does not appear to be any learning from each other in any of the 14 units' requests.
- The budget lacks important detail about what is to be purchased.
- There is no definition of teaching/learning processes which are to be addressed by this proposal.

The Review Panel wishes to point out that in a future competition this proposal's drawbacks –despite some strengths which the proposal contains--will prevent a proposal being funded if the Panel's recommendations for changes in the *Guidelines* are adopted.

12. Institution Submitting Proposal: Coastal Carolina

Proposal Title: REACHING STUDENTS THROUGH DISTANCE LEARNING

This proposal was reviewed carefully by the Review Panel and approved for funding. The following comments are representative of the Panel's response to the proposal:

- A significant portion of this proposal's funds will be assigned to upgrading electronic library resources which appear to be in sync with the statewide effort at an integrated electronic library.
- The proposal is focused on distance education in a meaningful way.

- The institution is committed to reaching students at the sites it proposes to stock with the requested technologies.
- The proposal is feasible in time and given the resources anticipated through this grant proposal.

On a critical side the Panel felt the proposal could have been significantly strengthened, as the following demonstrate:

- An evaluation component.
- More specificity on anticipated learning outcomes.

PART B. PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

The following seven proposals were not recommended fundable by the Review Panel. They are not rank-ordered. The Panel felt that feedback to the institutions for these proposals was potentially as important to the institutions as for those proposals recommended for funding.

Institution Submitting Proposal: College of Charleston
Proposal Title: LEVERAGING DIGITAL LEARNING RESOURCES

The Review Panel concluded after careful examination of the proposal that it should not be funded. The following reasons were cited by the Review Panel for their decision:

- Resources requested were disproportional to the functions indicated.
- Outcomes anticipated are not well defined.
- There is no definable plan for evaluation of outcomes, even though the proposal discusses the hiring of external reviewers.

Institution Submitting Proposal: Lander University
Proposal Title: AN ENTERPRISE COMPUTING SOLUTION FOR LANDER UNIVERSITY

This proposal has as its specific focus "Phase I of the replacement of our inadequate academic/administrative computing system."   The Review Panel, however, is of the opinion that the proposal as it is currently written does not meet the criteria of the Guidelines and, therefore, should not be recommended to the Commission for funding under the TGP. The Review Panel cites the following issues connected with this proposal in the hope that it will be of help to the

institution to refine and reconsider its position of the need for this proposed computing solution and the relationship of that computing solution to the teaching/learning process at Lander.

- Student Information Systems are inherently expensive and principally administrative in their orientation.
- The priorities of the Guidelines for the TGP favor teaching/learning processes, reaching underserved populations of students, etc. This proposal is absent significant language to show how any of the priorities mentioned in the Guidelines will be advanced by implementing the proposal.
- Despite the fact that the proposal is considered by the institution as "Phase I", the Review Panel finds no essential, necessary connection between its implementation and the other Lander proposal on the teaching/learning process at the institution.

Institution Submitting Proposal: USC-Aiken
Proposal Title: INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

This proposal seeks to upgrade the student computing areas, teaching classrooms, server computers, planetarium, and campus phone system.   The Review Panel recognizes the interest that the institution has in providing updates in these areas and found the planetarium idea by itself to offer merit for consideration.   However, the proposal as a unit was evaluated to have multiple problems in its development.   Comments from the Review Panel about this proposal include the following:

- The proposal is a collection of ideas rather than a planning effort.
- The most useful element in the proposal is the planetarium.   This, however, is an item which is peripheral to the USC-A mission.
- This collection of items does not provide a convincing link to any of the specific priorities found in the *Guidelines* of the TGP initiative.
- The other USCA proposal seeks funds for a wireless environment; this proposal states that the institution has capacity problems on the server, thus raising issues of institutional capability.

For these reasons, the proposal was considerable unfundable under the current *Guidelines* of the TGP.

Institution Submitting Proposal: USC Consortium

Title of Proposal: DISTANCE EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT DELIVERY SYSTEMS

The Review Panel found the Consortium Grant Proposal not to meet the criteria for funding as established by the TGP *Guidelines*. While it commended the three institutional campuses involved for the spirit of cooperation and collaboration which such a proposal shows, the Panel found the proposal significantly lacking in important elements, as follows:

- Although the proposal is apparently about teacher training, it is imprecise about how it is intended to address this population focus.
- The proposal is imprecise in terms of such things as anticipated learning outcomes, evaluations of outcomes, and organizational relationships necessary for successful implementation.
- Language in the proposal is sometimes incorrect as, for example, reference being made to digital delivery as if it were tied to satellite broadcast. In fact, digital delivery is unrelated to the signal by which it is broadcast.

Institution Submitting Proposal: USC-Spartanburg

Proposal Title: TECHNOLOGY ENRICHED STUDENT LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

The Review Panel found this proposal not fundable as written. The following comments are representative of the thinking of the Review Panel concerning this proposal:

- There is no defined plan which can be found in this proposal.
- The proposal contains little that demonstrates any relationship to or direct tie with either the TGP *Guidelines* or the statewide *Strategic Plan for Higher Education.*
- With few exceptions, the materials requested are not tied to specific functions or identifiable outcomes.

Institution Submitting Proposal: USC-Beaufort

Title of Proposal: TEACHING AND LEARNING WITH TECHNOLOGY

The Review Panel analyzed the proposal closely and determined that it is not fundable as written. The Panel members noted in their comments the commitment of the USC-B staff to the proposal and the institution's written description of need. However, the proposal lacked credibility with such

statements as "USC-B has a one-time opportunity to infuse technology and interactive multimedia elements into all its new four-year degree programs before a pen-and-paper precedence is set." The Panel also noted a lack of specificity regarding the off-campus students to be served by this proposal. The proposal would have been strengthened by:

- Clear relationships shown between it and the TGP *Guidelines*
- An evaluation component with some specific elements rigorously spelled out.

Institution Submitting Proposal: Winthrop University
Proposal Title: SMART CLASSROOMS

After careful review of this proposal, members of the Review Panel chose not to fund it. The proposal to provide smart classrooms appears already to have gained approval under the institution's plan for upgrades. The proposal does not demonstrate innovation. It makes only slight reference to statewide goals and that reference is out of context. The proposal is lacking references to institutional commitment to reaching underserved students through this investment.

There is some mention in the proposal of how the smart classrooms will be maintained once purchased, but no specifics. The evaluation component is exceedingly brief and lacking in specificity. It does not show tight linkages between anticipated outcomes for teaching and learning and how feedback is to be evaluated. The costs associated with the purchase of equipment are listed without regard to statewide purchase agreements or the statewide procurement prices. The proposal suggests that Winthrop is determined as part of its institutional commitment to provide smart classrooms anyway; this grant would simply have speeded the process.

- Materials requested appear to be high in price relative to cost structures known generally to members of the Review Panel and, in particular, as found in the state purchasing contracts.