

# **TWD: Technology Workforce Development Grants 2006**

---

## **Program Announcement**

### **TETC Texas Youth in Technology Demonstration Project**

**Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board**

*P. O. Box 12788*

*Austin, Texas 78711-2788*

<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/Research/Techworkforce/>



**June 1, 2006**

**Program Announcement** – The Texas Commissioner of Higher Education authorizes the publication of the Program Announcement for the 2006 grant program. The Coordinating Board posts the Program Announcement on its website.

**July 1, 2006**

**Proposals Due** – Email deadline for all TWD proposals. Proposals need to be submitted as PDF files.

**August 1, 2006**

**Award Announcement** – The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board announces the 2006 grants and posts awards on the agency's website.

**September 1, 2006**

**Grants Start** – Last day for revised budgets; a project can start after Coordinating Board approves its budget.

**March 14, 2007**

**Grant Period Ends** – for *Phase I* of grants.

***Building a 21<sup>st</sup> century workforce for a 21<sup>st</sup> century Texas***

## **Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board**

Robert W. Shepard, Chairman	Harlingen
Neal W. Adams, Vice Chairman	Bedford
Lorraine Perryman, Secretary of the Board	Odessa
Laurie Bricker	Houston
Jerry Farrington	Dallas
Paul Foster	El Paso
Joe B. Hinton	Crawford
George L. McWilliams	Texarkana
Elaine Mendoza	San Antonio
Nancy R. Neal	Lubbock
Lyn Bracewell Phillips	Bastrop
Curtis E. Ransom	Dallas
A. W. "Whit" Riter	Tyler

### **Coordinating Board Mission**

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's mission is to work with the Legislature, Governor, governing boards, higher education institutions, and other entities to provide the people of Texas the widest access to higher education of the highest quality in the most efficient manner.

### **Coordinating Board Philosophy**

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will promote access to quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access is unacceptable. The Board will be open, ethical, responsive, and committed to public service. The Board will approach its work with a sense of purpose and responsibility to the people of Texas and is committed to the best use of public monies. The Coordinating Board will engage in actions that add value to Texas and to higher education; the agency will avoid efforts that do not add value or that are duplicated by other entities.

**The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, or disability in employment or the provision of services.**

***Building a 21<sup>st</sup> century workforce for a 21<sup>st</sup> century Texas***

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background and Purpose .....	1
Eligible Grantees and Participants .....	2
Resources Available .....	2
Number of Submissions.....	3
Program Components.....	3
Proposal Format .....	4
How to Submit Proposals.....	5
Proposal Review.....	5
Awards .....	5
Need More Information? .....	6

## Appendices

Appendix A – Grant Conditions.....	A1-A6
Appendix B – TWD Tracking System (Roster) .....	B-1
Appendix C – TETC Ten Best Practices .....	C1-C2
Appendix D – Instruction to Reviewers .....	D1-D2
Appendix E – Selection Criteria .....	E1
Appendix F – 2006 Proposal Evaluation Form .....	F1

## Forms

Proposal Cover Page.....	Proposal 1
Project Summary .....	Proposal 2-A and 2-B
Proposal Budget .....	Proposal 3-A
Capital Equipment List.....	Proposal 3-B
Expenditure Report.....	Expenditures 1

## **Technology Workforce Development Grants Program - 2006**

The Technology Workforce Development grants program supports *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, the state's higher education plan, (<http://www.theccb.state.tx.us/reports/pdf/0379.pdf>) by providing institutions with grants to increase enrollments and the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded in computer science and engineering. TWD includes special efforts to attract and retain underrepresented minorities and female students.

### **Background and Purpose**

The 77th Texas Legislature and the Governor enacted the Technology Workforce Development Act (Texas Education Code, Chapter 51, Subchapter X, §§ 51.851-51.860) in May 2001. The purpose of the Act is to increase both the quantity and quality of baccalaureate-level engineers and computer scientists educated in Texas universities.

The Act authorized the creation of the Texas Engineering and Technical Consortium (TETC), a non-profit consortium of Texas public and independent universities that offers engineering and computer science programs and technology companies that employ graduates of those programs. The consortium's purpose is to foster cooperative relationships and activities involving technology companies and universities that offer engineering and computer science degrees.

The Act created the Technology Workforce Development (TWD) grants program which the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (Coordinating Board) administers. To fund grants, TETC members raise private cash and in-kind contributions and solicit federal funds which the State of Texas can match equally by legislative appropriation. There was no appropriation for TWD for the 2006-2007 biennium.

The Act that created the grants program also mandated the creation of an advisory committee comprised of six industry members and five academic members to provide oversight to the grant program. (See the back cover of this document for a list of members of this committee.)

In the spring of 2006, the Governor's Office committed federal Department of Labor funds to TETC to enable the ***TETC Texas Youth in Technology Demonstration Project*** (TYT). The Coordinating Board administers TYT under TWD rules (Chapter 13, Subchapter K; <http://www.theccb.state.tx.us/Rules/TAC.cfm>). The Coordinating Board receives these funds through the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC).

*The purpose of TYT is to support an increase in the number of engineering and computer science graduates from Texas institutions of higher education, and increase collaborative efforts between universities, engineering and computer science departments, and private companies in Texas.* The 2006 competition will provide the fourth cycle of grants under the TWD grants program, but all of engineering is included for the first time. *Proposals for this competition must stand on their own merits and will not be awarded for mere continuation of previous work.*

The grants program provides seed money that will enable institutions to expand enrollments in engineering and computer science programs. Larger enrollments will result in increased

legislative formula funding which will enable institutions to support the larger number of students. The grants program targets all of engineering and computer sciences.

The CB will award grants on a competitive, peer-review basis to eligible engineering and computer science institutions according to both, the TWD statute (Section 51.851; <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/ed.toc.htm>) and the TWC-CB Interagency Cooperation Agreement (<http://www.theccb.state.tx.us/reports/pdf/1158.pdf>).

See Appendix A for grant conditions.

## Eligible Grantees and Participants

Eligible Grantees are 1) accredited general academic *public teaching institutions* that offer baccalaureate degree programs in *engineering* that are accredited by ABET, Inc, or that offer baccalaureate degree programs in *computer science*, or 2) *private or independent institutions* of higher education that offer baccalaureate degree programs in *electrical engineering* that are accredited by ABET. All participating institutions must establish the *TWD student roster* for all participating departments, starting with fall 2005 (see Appendix B).

Independent institutions must match grant funds provided by the state for the proposed activity (§ 51.857(d) of Texas Education Code, Chapter 51, Subchapter X).

Eligible Participants (target students) are *high school and college students 14 to 21 years of age*.

## Resources Available

Project Leaders will have to design their projects with two budgets, for two fiscally independent phases of the program:

**Phase I** The State set the ***grant period from March 15, 2006 to March 14, 2007***. For this period the State of Texas provides \$950,000 in funds. ***The budget cap for this phase of the awards is \$95,000 for each proposal.***

**Phase II** The State is considering awarding funds for a ***second grant period in fiscal year 2007 with double the funds available for Phase I***. Funding of a second grant period under the same award is conditioned upon continuation of funding through the Texas Workforce Commission and Coordinating Board evaluation of project success. ***Proposals should include a separate budget page for Phase II of the awards (fiscal year 2007) for twice the amount of their Phase I budget.*** A budget for Phase II may not exceed \$190,000.

Grant funds for Phase I are federal funds. Funds come from *three different CFDA numbers and two funding years*: CFDA 17.259 for federal fiscal year 2005 and CFDA 17.258 and CFDA 17.260 for federal fiscal years 2005 and 2006. The Coordinating Board will distribute funds to subawardees (TWD awardees) after the projects have submitted expenditure reports (see page Expenditures-1).

## Number of Submissions

Each institution, through its Sponsored Programs Office, may submit two proposals to the competition. For public institutions, several eligible engineering departments and the computer science department may collaborate on the institution's proposal or, one department may participate by itself. For private institutions, only electrical engineering departments may participate and submit the institutions' proposal.

Each department that participates for the first time on a proposal for the TWD grants program must contact Coordinating Board staff to set up a web-based entry point for the TWD Tracking System, the "TWD Roster" (Appendix B).

## Program Components

The enabling TWC-CB interagency agreement requires a specific set of program components which the authorizing legislation supports:

- (1) *An internship program* for eligible participants aged 14 to 21 years, including those who come from a low socioeconomic background. Students will participate in work experience opportunities that help to motivate, educate, and prepare them for higher education, continuing studies, and careers, partnering with local businesses with a high demand for engineering and computer science graduates to provide these experiences.
- (2) *A scholarship or work study program* in which grants are made to participating higher education institutions to provide financial assistance to graduating high school seniors and college students through 21 years of age. Grantees may consider partnering with their Local Workforce Development Boards, community colleges, or independent school districts to collaborate on the outreach and recruitment of eligible participants.
- (3) Funding of *recruitment, retention, and mentoring best practices* to increase the participation of a diverse group of Texans in these fields of study including underrepresented groups.

Partners for component 2 strategies (scholarship or work study program) are limited to those enumerated and do not include faith-based organizations. With regard to component 3 (strategies of recruitment, retention, and mentoring best practices), grantees may partner with other entities, including faith-based organizations, as subawardees.

The age restriction for eligible participants (target students) of "*high school and college students 14 to 21 years of age*" is mandatory for all three activities.

TETC established a set of strategies as best practices at its Best Practices conference in January 2006, at the TETC host institution campus, Southern Methodist University, Dallas (Appendix C).

## Proposal Format

Proposals must be completed in regular 11-point minimum font size and must be submitted as PDF files. Only proposals that conform to all formatting requirements and space limitations will be reviewed.

Each proposal should consist of the following elements, in the order shown:

- Proposal Cover page – Use form provided on page Proposal 1. Each proposal must have one project leader and may have no more than one project co-leader.
- Project summary – Use form provided on pages Proposal 2-A and 2-B. The “Strategies” section must fit into the boxes on the two-page form; no additional pages may be added. The summary must clearly distinguish the goals for Phases I and II of the project. The summary must include the anticipated cost and number of participants (target students) associated with each strategy.
- Proposal budgets – Use form provided on page Proposal 3-A for the budget and page Proposal 3-B for the capital equipment list. Each proposal must include separate budgets for each phase of the project. Independent institutions must list the mandated match of program funds.
- Proposal body – Margins must be 1” on all four sides. Maximum length for proposals: 8 double-spaced pages. The proposal must clearly distinguish the goals for Phases I and II of the project.
  - *Description of undergraduate program* (engineering or computer science departments):
    - Overview of historical and fall 2005 enrollments – explain numbers, quality indicators, and gender/ethnic breakdown.
    - Data showing the number of baccalaureate graduates over the last four years and placement experience during the present fiscal year.
    - Expansion goals for fall 2006 and fall 2007 (ENTERING, PROGRESSING, ADVANCED, and GRADUATED).
    - Description of program’s current academic year teaching faculty.
  - *Strategies for reaching expansion goals* – proposals should be structured in such a way that individual strategies could be funded, if necessary, by review constraints. This section should include:
    - Justification for how the strategies address increasing the number of graduating students.
    - Quantitative “best practices” quality indicators, based on nationwide experiences and/or TETC experiences.
    - Impediments to reaching expansion goals.
    - Responsibilities of key personnel.
  - *Plans for achieving self-sustainability of expanded program (if applicable), including:*
    - Quantitative goals for self-sustainability.
    - Optional letter of support by the dean. (May be included under “Other Attachments.”)
  - *Description of project assessment process showing:*
    - Mechanisms for self-assessment or third-party assessment.
    - Criteria for measuring qualitative and quantifiable success for all strategies.
  - *Budget justification, including:*
    - Description of any additional support to be provided by the institution, industry, federal grants, etc.
    - Anticipated cost associated with each strategy.

- Attachment – provide:
  - One-page resumes of key personnel (may be single-spaced).
  - Succinct (one-page) report on success or failure of previously implemented strategies.
- Other attachments (Reading these is optional for reviewers)

## **How to Submit Proposals**

Proposal submission is via PDF file, including signatures by the investigator(s) and an official authorized to sign for the institution. No changes may be made to the proposals after they were delivered to the Coordinating Board.

The deadline for receipt of proposals is July 1, 2006. Proposals will be accepted from Sponsored Programs Officers only. E-mail one PDF file for each proposal to [Reinold.Cornelius@THECB.state.tx.us](mailto:Reinold.Cornelius@THECB.state.tx.us).

For overnight delivery service or hand-delivery of computer disks, the address is Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Room 3.201, 1200 East Anderson Lane, Austin, TX 78752, telephone (512) 427-6150.

## **Proposal Review**

An external peer review panel comprised of education experts from industry as well as out-of-state academics from the fields of engineering and computer science will evaluate all proposals. The review panel has the freedom on how it derives a ranked list of proposals for funding, but it will operate under basic instructions developed by the TWD Advisory Committee (Appendix D). Appendix E lists the selection criteria, and Appendix F shows the proposal evaluation form. The review shall consider the quality of the academic program, project alignment with TYT program components, the feasibility of the institution's plans for increasing enrollments and graduates, and the cost-effectiveness of those plans.

The review panel shall deliver a ranked list of competitively selected proposals to the Commissioner. The Coordinating Board's Technology Workforce Grants Advisory Committee will review the selections of the reviewers and the recommendations of the staff and make recommendations to the Board (Board Rules Chapter 13, Subchapter K, Section 13.194). The review panel may strike or adjust budgets up or down for selected strategies. The Coordinating Board will make the final decision regarding awards.

Proposals will be selected based on assessments of: (a) program quality, (b) adherence to requirements outlined as program components, (c) feasibility, and (d) cost effectiveness of proposed plan. Cost effectiveness is determined by "weighing" the number of expected eligible participants versus cost. Reviewers shall also give special consideration to strategies targeting minorities and female students, as well as collaboration with allowed non-academic partners. See Appendix E for additional information on selection criteria.

## **Awards**

The top-ranked proposals will receive funds at budgets recommended by the review panel until the available award money is exhausted.

Awards for Phase I of the projects shall be for the period August 1, 2006 through March 14, 2007.

Reimbursement of grant expenditures will be based on submitted expenditure reports (see page Expenditures 1 in this announcement). The Act requires that independent institutions match any state contributions (§ 51.857(d) of Texas Education Code, Chapter 51, Subchapter X).

See Appendix A for grant conditions.

### **Need More Information?**

For further information on the 2006 TETC-TYT grant competition, the TWD Student Roster, or the TWD grants program, contact Reinold Cornelius at [Reinold.Cornelius@theccb.state.tx.us](mailto:Reinold.Cornelius@theccb.state.tx.us) or 512-427-6150. For further information on the Texas Engineering and Technical Consortium, contact Misti Compton at [MCompton@engr.smu.edu](mailto:MCompton@engr.smu.edu) or 214-768-3159.

**Appendix A**  
**GRANT CONDITIONS**  
**Technology Workforce Development Grants Program – 2006**  
**TETC Texas Youth in Technology Demonstration Project**

---

**1. Terms of Agreement**

The Technology Workforce Development (TWD) Grant Program Announcement and Grantee's proposal are incorporated into these grant conditions by reference for all necessary purposes and shall constitute the agreement of the parties. These grant conditions shall prevail in all cases of conflict arising from the terms of the TWD Grant Program Announcement, Grantee's proposal, the grant agreement, and these grant conditions.

**2. Organizational accountability system**

Each grantee institution shall have a system established in writing to ensure that appropriate officials provide necessary organizational reviews and approvals for the expenditure of funds and for monitoring project performance and adherence to grant terms and conditions. The grantee institution agrees to audit a project with its internal audit staff and to furnish a copy of audit conducted to the Coordinating Board.

**3. Audit and records**

Financial records, supporting documents, statistical records and other material pertinent to this grant shall be retained by the grantee for three years following submission of the final project report and shall be made available to the Coordinating Board upon request. This material, the organizational prior-approval system, and the internal project audits are subject to review by the State Auditor and by Coordinating Board staff. The acceptance of state funds acts as acceptance of the authority of the State Auditor's Office, or any successor agency, to conduct an audit or investigation in connection with those funds. Grantee institution shall cooperate fully with the State Auditor's Office or its successor in

the conduct of the audit or investigation, including providing all records requested.

**4. Allowable costs**

All reasonable costs are allowable with the following specifications:

- No overhead (indirect cost recovery) may be charged to these funds.
- Public and independent institutions may include fringe benefits in project costs. (State program funds were appropriated from general revenue dedicated and not from general revenue funds.)
- Capital equipment will be defined by the grantee institution.
- Only capital equipment included in project costs, and specified and justified in the approved equipment list, may be purchased with grant funds.
- No equipment may be purchased later than three months before the end of the Coordinating Board approved grant period.
- No meal or drink expenses may be charged against State appropriated program funds coming from the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, regardless of whether they originated from State, industry, or federal sources.
- Over the life of the grant, no more than a cumulative total of \$10,000 may be moved across budget categories (personnel, capital equipment, travel, other direct costs) without prior Coordinating Board approval.
- Foreign travel is not allowable.
- Additional budget changes will require completion of a Budget Change Request form and submission through the institution's Office of Sponsored Projects (or its

equivalent) to the Coordinating Board for approval.

**5. Standards for financial management systems**

Institutions shall account for the receipt and disbursement of all monies by generally accepted accounting practices and the State of Texas Uniform Grant Management Standards (UGMS), to the extent applicable. Grantee institution shall open to inspection all books and records reflecting transactions hereunder to Coordinating Board, its staff, or anyone authorized by the Coordinating Board to inspect such books and records.

**6. Payments**

The grantee institution shall receive State appropriated funds under this grant through the Office of the State Comptroller.

**7. Title to equipment**

Title to equipment purchased or fabricated with these funds shall vest in the grantee institution.

**8. Site visits**

The Coordinating Board and/or its representatives shall have the right to make site visits to review project accomplishments.

**9. Notification of absence**

The Coordinating Board shall be notified prior to a project leader's absence from campus for a period of more than six weeks.

**10. Changes in project leader**

If a project leader leaves the grantee institution or otherwise relinquishes active direction of the project, the institution must notify the Coordinating Board before the project leader leaves and submit the name of a new project leader for approval.

**11. Progress reports**

One copy of a progress report (annual report) shall be submitted to the Research Office of the Coordinating Board by July 1 of each year during which the grant is active. The progress report format is specified by the Board.

**12. Final report**

Within 30 days of the expiration of the grant, the grantee must file a final project report with the Coordinating Board in a format specified by the Board. Within 90 days of the expiration of the grant, the grantee institution must file a final financial report with the Coordinating Board that contains information on the final disbursement of funds. At the end of the grant period, unexpended funds shall be returned within 90 days of the final financial report.

**13. Suspension or termination**

This grant may be suspended or terminated if the grantee fails to comply with the terms and conditions of the grant.

**14. Conflict of Interest**

The grantee institution must notify the Coordinating Board of any potential conflicts of interest that arise prior to or during the grant period due to relationships between the project leaders or other members of the project team and any industrial collaborator(s).

**15. Nondiscrimination**

No person shall be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under this grant on grounds of race, color, national origin, religious affiliation, handicap or gender.

**16. Compliance with regulations**

The project leader must abide by all state and federal regulations related to conduct of this grant.

**17. Dissemination of project results**

The grantee is expected to publish or otherwise make publicly available the results of the work conducted under the grant. Publication in popular media as well as scholarly journals is encouraged. One reprint of any publication should be made available to the Research Office of the Coordinating Board on request.

**18. Acknowledgment of support**

An acknowledgment of Coordinating Board support must appear in any

publication of any material based on this project in terms such as the following: "This material is based in part upon work supported by the Texas Technology Workforce Development Program under Grant No. \_\_\_\_\_."

**19. Technology workforce tracking**

Grantee institution agrees to maintain accurate data on the Board's Technology Workforce Tracking System for the duration of the grant and four additional years.

**20. Retention of Formula Funding**

Grantee institution agrees to pass on to the appropriate college or department any increased formula funding that results from increased undergraduate enrollment in engineering or computer science programs.

**21. Copyright or patent rights**

The project leader shall abide by the intellectual property policy of his/her institution.

**22. Liability**

The Coordinating Board shall not be held liable for damages to people or property that may occur in the course of activities conducted as a result of this grant.

**23. Dispute resolution process**

The dispute resolution process provided for in Chapter 2260 of the Texas Government Code must be used by the Coordinating Board and the grantee institution to attempt to resolve all disputes arising under these grants.

**24. CFDA number**

The Coordinating Board shall provide the CFDA number(s) and title, award name and number, and the award year for the congressionally directed grant as provided by the federal agency overseeing this grant to all subawardees.

**25. Cash draw requirements and procedures**

The grantee shall establish and adhere to separate budgets for state, donated, and federal funds. Payment of funds occurs through:

- monetary payments for State and donated funds prior to expenditures; and
- drawn down of federal funds on reimbursement basis after expenditures occurred.

**26. Grant period**

The Coordinating Board will determine the grant period, including no-cost extensions, for the State and industry funded portion of the grant. A different grant period may be set for the federally funded portion of the grant.

**27. Federal audit**

Any institution receiving in excess of \$500,000 cumulative in federal awards per fiscal year must meet the federal audit requirements and must complete OMB circular A-133 within 9 months of year's end. The grantee institution shall permit the Coordinating Board and auditors access to records as necessary, including access through site visits.

**28. Federal regulations**

Grantee shall also be subject to and shall abide by all federal laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the grant project, including but not limited to:

- Sources of funds from the Department of Labor are Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Statewide Activity Funds (WIA §128 and §133; 29 U.S.C. §2853 and §2863 and 20 CFR Part 665);
- Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR): 34 CFR 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 97, and 98;
- the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1975, as amended, and the regulations effectuating its provisions contained in 34 C.F.R. Part 99.
- OMB Circular A-21, A-87, or A-122 (Cost Principles), OMB Circular A-

133 (Audits), and OMB Circular A-110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements);

- Americans with Disabilities Act, P. L. 101-336, 42 U.S.C. sec. 12101, and the regulations effectuating its provisions contained in 28 CFR Parts 35 and 36, 29 CFR Part 1630, and 47 CFR Parts 0 and 64;
- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (prohibition of discrimination by race, color, or national origin), and the regulations effectuating its provisions contained in 34 CFR Part 100;
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (prohibition of sex discrimination in educational institutions) and the regulations effectuating its provisions contained in 34 CFR Part 106;
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (nondiscrimination on the basis of handicapping condition), and the regulations effectuating its provisions contained in 34 CFR Part 104;
- Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (prohibition of discrimination on basis of age), and any regulations issued thereunder, including the provisions contained in 34 CFR Part 110;
- Section 509 of H.R. 5233 as incorporated by reference in P. L. 99-500 and P. L.99-591 (prohibition against the use of federal project funds to influence legislation pending before Congress);
- Drug Free Workplace Act [PL100-690 Title V, Subtitle D]; and
- The Texas Worker's Compensation Act.

**29. Eligible participants**

Eligible participants (target students) are restricted to high school and college students 14 to 21 years of age.

**30. Grant Amendment**

To the extent applicable laws, regulations, court orders, or official interpretations require the Coordinating Board to include additional language in its contracts,

Grantee agrees to amend this grant agreement and to cooperate in the execution of any amendment to this grant agreement necessary to effectuate such laws, regulations, court orders, or official interpretations.

**31. Availability of Funds**

This grant is subject to the availability of funds and/or grant funds appropriated by legislative act for the purposes stated and to the availability of funds under the terms of the agreement between the State of Texas and the U.S. Department of Labor. All amendments and/or extensions or subsequent grants are contingent upon the availability of funds. Notwithstanding any other provision in these grant conditions or any other document, this grant is void upon grant funds becoming unavailable.

**32. Federal Certifications**

By signing the grant conditions grantee provides certifications entitled *Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion* and *Lobbying Certification* attached hereto and incorporated herein for all purposes.

**33. Conformance with Federal and State Laws**

Nothing in the Grant Program Announcement, Grantee's proposal, or these grant conditions shall be construed to violate any provision of the laws and/or regulations of the United States of America or the State of Texas, and all acts done shall be done in such manner as may conform to those laws. If any word, phrase, clause, paragraph, sentence, part, portion, or provision of the grant agreement or the application of those provisions to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid, the remainder shall nevertheless be valid.

May 2006

## **Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion**

***This certification is required by the Department of Education regulations implementing Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension (34 CFR Part 85, 668 and 682) and by Department of Labor (29 CFR Part 98), for all lower tier transactions meeting the threshold and tier requirements stated at Section 85.11.***

1. As required under the Grant Conditions for the Technology Workforce Development Grants Program, Grantee Institution, a lower tier participant, is providing the certification set out below.
2. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was entered into. If it is later determined that the lower tier participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.
3. The lower tier participant shall provide immediate written notice to the person to whom this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective lower tier participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.
4. The terms "covered transaction," "debarred," "suspended," "ineligible," "lower tier covered transaction," "participant," "person," "primary covered transaction," "principal," "proposal," and "voluntarily excluded," as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the person to which this proposal is submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.
5. The prospective lower tier participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency with which this transaction originated.
6. The prospective lower tier participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility, and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.
7. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may but is not required to, check the Nonprocurement List.
8. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.
9. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 5 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency with which this transaction originated may pursue available remedies, including suspension and/or debarment.

## **Certification**

- (1) The lower tier participant certifies, by signature on its Grant Proposal and by submission of the proposal, that neither it nor its principals are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.
- (2) Where the prospective lower tier participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

ED 80-0014, 9/90 (Replaces GCS-009 (REV.12/88), which is obsolete)

As amended by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

## **Lobbying Certification**

*Submission of this certification covers all federal programs in this proposal and is required by the U. S. Department of Education (34 CFR Part 82), Department of Labor (29 CFR Part 93), and Section 1352, Title 31, of the United States Code, and is a prerequisite for making or entering into a subgrant or subcontract over \$100,000 with any organization. (Read instructions for this schedule for further information.)*

The applicant certifies by signature on the Grant Conditions, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

- (1) No federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal grant or cooperative agreement.
- (2) If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form—LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.
- (3) The applicant shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact on which the U. S. Department of Education and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board relied when they made or entered into this grant or contract. Any organization that fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Dept. of Education form #ED 80-0008

As amended by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

## **Appendix B**

### **TWD TRACKING SYSTEM (ROSTER)**

#### **Texas Technology Workforce Development Grants – 2006**

The goal of the grant program is to increase the number of graduates. While some increase in graduates can be obtained in the near term through increased retention, four to six years are required generally to produce a graduate.

The Coordinating Board defines three pre-graduation and one post-graduation enrollment measures that it uses to evaluate progress (the “TWD roster”). Participating institutions will track all four measures:

ENTERING – a student with a declared major in the eligible engineering or computer science programs who is in good standing and a freshman in college.

PROGRESSING – a student with a declared major in the eligible engineering or computer science programs who has a GPA of at least 2.0 and who is a sophomore or junior in college.

ADVANCED – a student who has been admitted to an eligible engineering or computer science degree program and who is a senior in college with a GPA of at least 2.0.

GRAD – a student who was awarded a baccalaureate degree from an eligible engineering or computer science program during the previous 12-month period from the beginning of the present semester.

Institutions will use the Coordinating Board’s Technology Workforce Tracking System at <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/AAR/Research/Techworkforce/> to report progress in increasing the numbers of students at each level. The System is password protected. Contact Reinold Cornelius at [Reinold.Cornelius@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Reinold.Cornelius@thecb.state.tx.us) or 512-427-6150 to obtain access to the system.

Institutions will submit roster data on the department level. In a change to previous years, the Coordinating Board will collect TWD student rosters as aggregate numbers by major code (Texas CIP codes, <http://www.txhighereddata.org/Interactive/CIP/>), gender, and ethnicity and not on individual student-name basis.

*Proposals must include TWD roster summary data for fall 2005 and spring 2006. All applicants must have submitted full rosters for all participating departments via the website, starting with the fall 2005 roster.*

# Appendix C

## TETC TEN BEST PRACTICES

### Texas Technology Workforce Development Grants – 2006

TETC established a set of strategies as best practices at its Best Practices meeting in January 2006, which it held at the TETC host institution campus of Southern Methodist University in Dallas. The Coordinating Board posted proceeding papers and session summaries at [http://www.theccb.state.tx.us/AAR/Research/Techworkforce/TETC\\_best\\_practices.cfm](http://www.theccb.state.tx.us/AAR/Research/Techworkforce/TETC_best_practices.cfm).

Proposals for “program component 3 strategies” (recruitment, retention, and mentoring best practices, see page 3) must demonstrate the best practices nature of the project to the review team. The following TETC list of strategies as best practices is not limiting but may be referenced in support of the best practices nature of a proposed project.

1. ***Use peer teachers as a cost-effective retention and recruiting tool***  
Peer teachers (undergraduate teachers/mentors/assistants) have proved to be remarkably effective at increasing the success rate of beginning students. There is some indication that these programs are most successful when student organizations can run them or if students otherwise can view them as primarily committed to student success and independent of faculty or grading.
2. ***Expose students to their discipline early in their academic careers***  
If students are not exposed to their discipline until sometime in their second year, many of them will have moved on to other career choices. Departments should make a serious effort to expose freshman students to their discipline and integrate them into departmental programs. During first and second year courses, students still need to find motivation, perspective, and often need assistance. The department’s best professors should teach early courses and provide students with inspiration and goals for continued work in the area. The department should provide supplementary instructional support as needed.
3. ***Identify a faculty “course champion” for each core course in the curriculum***  
Core courses are exceedingly important because they provide prerequisites for difficult specialty courses that follow. However, they often suffer because course standardization and quality control is difficult if multiple faculty members co-teach the curriculum. This problem is especially severe when adjunct faculty or graduate students teach some sections of core courses. Each core course should have a “course champion” who is responsible for the course, even if this champion does not teach it in a given semester. This person should be given significant authority over the content of the course, teaching methods used, testing and laboratories, and other aspects of instruction and should be responsible for maintaining the quality of all sections of the course.
4. ***Implement an honors program if the department is large enough***  
Much of the effort to increase graduates focuses on making marginally qualified students successful or on recruiting students who might not typically pursue degrees in engineering or computer science. Programs that are large enough to justify an honors program within the regular degree program should implement activities and opportunities to ensure that highly qualified students are not lost to the discipline because they miss challenges and inspiration. An honors program can give these students the best education possible.

5. ***Provide on-campus jobs rather than scholarships, at least to some students***  
Many students don't seriously commit to their academic program because they also hold off-campus jobs that do not support their academic goals. On-campus jobs provide opportunities to learn about the student's discipline and get to know professors, staff, and other students. They bond the student-employees with the program, whether they involve working in a research lab or providing office support. The families of many low-income students expect them to have jobs and those students are willing to risk their academic careers by working off-campus, even if they have scholarships. On-campus jobs avoid this problem.
6. ***Use specialized "camps" as a tool for both recruiting and retention***  
Specialized camps for girls, for high achievers, or for minority students can be effective recruiting tools for computer science and engineering disciplines. "Redshirt" camps, i.e., camps for students between the freshman and sophomore years, have had good records as effective retention tools.
7. ***Use summer camps for high school students to fill the pipeline***  
The experience of a summer camp can be extremely empowering to high school students by giving them the confidence that they have the ability to succeed in engineering or computer science and helping them prepare for a college culture. Involvement by industry representatives can introduce role models and ideas for future job opportunities. The program should use the resulting close-knit group experience to facilitate continuing contact between participants through web-based communication tools after the camp.
8. ***Increase enrollments by providing degree programs to non-traditional students***  
In some areas of the state, there are large numbers of technology company workers who do not have degrees but would like to obtain them. Departments can in some cases significantly increase enrollments by tailoring programs specifically to their needs, e.g., by offering courses in the evenings, on-site, on-line, etc. Graduate engineers and computer scientists from these same companies may supplement the department's faculty, often at low cost.
9. ***Reach out to high school counselors at least as aggressively as to mathematics and science teachers***  
High school students are more likely to get guidance regarding higher education institutions and majors from counselors than from teachers. There is some indication that high school counselors often do not understand the benefits of degrees in engineering and computer science and recommend that good students pursue degrees in other areas. It is important that high school counselors have accurate and meaningful information.
10. ***Customize best practices to address the specific needs of your program***  
Based on TETC's experience with statewide implementation of the Infinity program, it is difficult to pick up an idea from one campus and duplicate it exactly at a number of other campuses. It is often the case that ideas will need to be "tweaked" to accommodate differences in students, faculty, curriculum, facilities, or schedules.

# **Appendix D**

## **INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEWERS**

### **Texas Technology Workforce Development Grants – 2006**

The Technology Workforce Development grants program constitutes an effort by the State of Texas together with Texas industry (Texas Engineering and Technical Consortium – TETC) to increase both the quantity and quality of baccalaureate-level engineers and computer scientists educated in Texas. Every computer science program at public colleges and universities in the state, every ABET accredited engineering program at public institutions, and every ABET accredited electrical engineering program at independent (private) institutions are eligible to compete for grants.

The quality of the review process is absolutely critical to the eventual success or failure of this program. Consideration of proposals by a panel of reviewers provides the first and most critical step in determining what strategies the State of Texas can fund.

It is our desire that we fund the best projects with prime consideration of feasibility of the proposed strategies for achieving the goals of the Texas Youth in Technology Demonstration Project: support an increase in the number of engineering and computer science graduates from Texas institutions of higher education; and increase collaborative efforts between universities, engineering and computer science departments, and private companies in Texas. *Our advisory committee deliberately provides the review panels with maximum flexibility in identifying quality proposals.*

#### **GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS**

PLEASE DO NOT COPY, QUOTE, OR OTHERWISE USE MATERIAL FROM A PROPOSAL, AND AVOID DISCUSSING, AFTER THE FACT, CONFIDENTIAL OPINION PRESENTED DURING THE REVIEW PROCEEDINGS.

The names and affiliations of the reviewers will be available to the public following the public announcement of awards.

If a reviewer has an affiliation or financial connection with an institution or a person submitting a proposal that might be construed as creating a conflict of interest, the reviewer should consult Reinold Cornelius at [Reinold.Cornelius@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Reinold.Cornelius@thecb.state.tx.us) or 512-427-6150.

The Coordinating Board intends that the quality of the proposals funded be comparable to those supported by national funding agencies.

Independent institutions must match grant funds provided by the state for the proposed activity. Public and independent institutions may include fringe benefit costs in their budgets.

#### **GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW PANEL CONSULTATIONS**

Project leaders will divide their proposals into strategies. The review panel can delete strategies from a proposal and recommend others for funding. If an otherwise meritorious project has what the review panel believes is an unrealistically high budget, the panel may recommend that it be reduced. We would prefer that this not be done routinely, and that each proposal normally

be allowed to stand or fall based on the budget proposed. The panel may also decide to increase a particular budget up to the cap set by the TWD Advisory Committee, if it demonstrates significant cause. The Committee capped the award amounts for the Phase I of the grants at \$95,000. Grant amounts should correlate with the potential payoff. Feasibility, in terms of number of participants, should be related to project cost.

The State is considering awarding funds for a second grant period (Phase II) in fiscal year 2007 with double the funds available for Phase I. Proposals should include a separate budget page for this phase of the awards. A budget for Phase II may not exceed \$190,000.

Project leaders, who currently hold a TWD grant from an earlier competition, should neither be penalized nor given a priority for funding in this round of grants. This competition for the first time includes all of engineering as eligible grantees for this competition.

Selection of projects should follow these general guidelines:

- Predominant goal of the program is the eventual increase in number of graduates.
- Ensure adherence to the program components of the Texas Youth in Technology Demonstration Project.
- How well formulated are the proposal's criteria for measuring success? (E.g., are benchmark and goals set for cohort-retention data for retention strategies?)
- Proposals using "best practices" strategies should contain argumentation supporting the assertion either through the TETC Ten Best Practices list (Appendix C) or based on other experiences.
- Make sure the Phase I and Phase II strategies form a coherent unit, while funding is secured only for Phase I at the time of Program Announcement publication.

## **GUIDELINES FOR INDIVIDUAL REVIEWERS**

Each reviewer should review all of the proposals sent prior to the scheduled panel review meeting. The following are some suggestions related to this task:

Before reading the proposals, the reviewers should read over the *Program Announcement* for the 2006 TWD grants program. The review materials include:

- An evaluation form for each proposal received. Each reviewer produces a preliminary score for each proposal before the panel meeting. There are places on each evaluation form for comments. Comments are very desirable and helpful for the project leaders. The reviewers should ensure that each proposal receives three to five comments that will form the basis for presentation of the proposal to the panel.
- Each proposal should receive a preliminary score from at least two reviewers before the meeting.
- During the deliberations, each reviewer will have to lead a brief discussion of each of the received proposals. At that time, the panel might revise the preliminary scoring of a proposal as well as the comments.
- The Coordinating Board will return the evaluations to the project leaders without any scores. Scores are meant as tools for the reviewers to initially categorize proposals. The review panel usually does not use scores to arrive at its final ranked list of proposals.

# Appendix E

## SELECTION CRITERIA

### Texas Technology Workforce Development Grants – 2006

**Institutional Quality (20 percent)** – an assessment of the quality of the instructional program provided to students in the undergraduate program as the basis for the planned expansion in enrollment and quality.

*Evidence that institutions could provide:*

- Qualifications of faculty teaching in the undergraduate program, historic student to faculty ratio, and accreditation status
- Information regarding adequacy of laboratories and other facilities
- Placement record for recent graduates
- Other information

**Project Emphasis (30 percent)** – how does the project address the three program components of the TETC Texas Youth in Technology (TYT) Demonstration Project?

*Questions the proposal should address:*

- How clearly is the project structured around the three program components of TYT?
- Do the project's strategies specifically target minorities and/or female students?
- Does the project involve appropriate collaboration with community colleges, independent school districts, and/or local workforce development boards?
- Does the proposal ensure that eligible participants (target students) are high school and college students 14 to 21 years of age?
- Other quality indicators.

**Feasibility of Proposed Strategies (30 percent)** – an assessment of the likelihood that the proposed strategies will successfully achieve the proposed enrollment and graduation increases. The feasibility argument should include comparisons with historic implementations of equivalent strategies as well as nationwide comparisons of feasibility and success.

*Evidence that institutions could provide:*

- Data, including enrollment data, indicating historical demand for the program and feasibility of planned expansion.
- Previous experience using the proposed strategy at that institution or at other institutions.
- Description of criteria for measuring success for all strategies of the project.
- Project assessment process, including self or third-party assessment mechanisms.
- Integration of Phases I and II of the project, considering the tight time frame for Phase I.
- Other information

**Cost-Effectiveness of Proposed Strategies (20 percent)** – Cost effectiveness weighs number of expected participants versus cost. The proposal also should spell out the effect of the new proposed project on the existing program quality (curriculum and facilities, etc.).

*Evidence that institutions could provide:*

- Costs for recruitment, participation, and enrollment per student
- Mechanisms for achieving self-sustainability
- Commitment to the project by the department and support by the institution
- Other information

**Appendix F**  
**2006 PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM**  
**Texas Technology Workforce Development Grants – 2006**

- Eligible to compete based on program guidelines
- Not eligible to compete

➤ Rank after review team deliberation

Revised Budget

\$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Institution:**  
**Department:**  
**Project Leader:**  
**Proposal Title:**

**Institutional Quality (20 percent)**

An assessment of the quality of the instructional program provided to students in the undergraduate program(s) as the basis for the planned expansion in enrollment and quality at this institution.

**Reviewer Comments:**

**Project Emphasis (30 percent)**

How does the proposal address the three program components of the TETC Texas Youth in Technology (TYT) Demonstration Project? Components: 1) internship program, 2) scholarship or work study program, and 3) recruitment, retention and mentoring best practices.

**Reviewer Comments:**

**Feasibility of Proposed Strategies (30 percent)**

An assessment of the likelihood that the proposed strategies will successfully achieve the proposed enrollment and graduation increases.

**Reviewer Comments:**

**Cost-Effectiveness of Proposed Strategies (20 percent)**

Cost effectiveness weighs number of expected participants versus cost.

**Reviewer Comments:**

**Additional Comments:**

**Comments on Proposal Quality:**

Adherence to guidelines for developing proposals and suggestions for improving future submissions.

Reviewer comments are very much appreciated by the submitters. Comments addressing deficiencies or strengths are especially helpful. Please don't write anything you wouldn't say to the submitter, if you had an opportunity to speak with him or her directly. Under additional comments, please include arguments summarizing the panel's opinion of this proposal.

Texas Technology Workforce Development Grants Program – 2006

**Proposal Cover Page – TETC-TYT**

Name and address of submitting institution to which award should be made (include branch/campus/other components)	
Name(s) of participating departments for this proposal	Name(s) of non-academic partners for this proposal
Title of Proposed Project (maximum of 100 characters)	Total Amount Requested for Project Phase I: \$ Phase II: \$
<p>By signing below, the institution certifies that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) it is committed to enlarging its engineering and/or computer science program and achieving the enrollment and graduation goals included in this proposal;</li> <li>(2) it will pass on to the appropriate college and department in subsequent biennia any increased formula funding that results from these increased enrollments (Grant Condition Number 20);</li> <li>(3) the institution has a written Organizational Accountability System in place as described in Grant Condition Number 2; and</li> <li>(4) this grant would not supplant funds that would otherwise accrue to the program.</li> </ol>	
<p>Project Leader's Name: (type or print)</p> <p>Title:</p> <p>Phone Number:</p> <p>E-mail Address:</p> <p>Mailing Address:</p> <p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>Co-Leader's Name: (from same institution)</p> <p>Title:</p> <p>Phone Number:</p> <p>E-mail Address:</p> <p>Mailing Address:</p> <p>Signature: _____</p>
<p>Authorized Institutional Representative's Name: (type or print)</p> <p>Title:</p> <p>Phone Number:</p> <p>E-mail Address:</p> <p>Mailing Address:</p> <p>Signature: _____</p>	<p>University President or Dean (type or print)</p> <p>Title:</p> <p>Phone Number:</p> <p>E-mail Address:</p> <p>Mailing Address:</p> <p>Signature: _____</p>

Technology Workforce Development Grants Program – 2006  
**Project Summary – TETC-TYT**

Project Leader:  Title: Department:	Project Co-Leader:  Title: Department:
----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

Mark all TYT program components for this project: <input type="checkbox"/> 1) internship program <input type="checkbox"/> 2) scholarship or work study program <input type="radio"/> scholarship <input type="radio"/> work study	<input type="checkbox"/> 3) best practices program <input type="radio"/> recruitment <input type="radio"/> retention <input type="radio"/> mentoring
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Title of Proposal

**NOTE: This summary should be suitable for public release. (11-point minimum font size.)**

GOALS AND COSTS	High School Students	Entering Students	Progressing Students	Advanced Students	Graduated Students
Fall 2005 Headcount according to Coordinating Board TWD Roster	N/A				
Spring 2006 Headcount according to Coordinating Board TWD Roster	N/A				
<i>Goal for Phase I:</i> Number of eligible participants (target students) involved					
Cost for Phase I per enrollment measure.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Dollars per participant for Phase I:	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<i>Goal for Phase II:</i> Number of eligible participants (target students) involved					
Cost for Phase II per enrollment measure.	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Dollars per participant for Phase II:	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

**Notes:**

- 1 For definitions of “Entering,” “Progressing,” “Advanced,” and “Graduated” students see Program Announcement.
- 2 Eligible Participants (target students) are *high school and college students 14 to 21 years of age*.
- 3 Sum of dollars per enrollment measure must equal requested amount (on Proposal Cover Page).
- 4 Each cell of the table must contain one and only one number.

**Strategies for achieving goals** (indicate the dollar cost and the number of anticipated students involved for each strategy):

(continued on next page)

Strategies for achieving goals (continued):

Technology Workforce Development Grants Program – 2006

**Proposal Budget – TETC-TYT**

Project Leader:  Title: Department:	Project Number: (to be filled if awarded)  Award Phase: <input type="checkbox"/> Phase I (August 1, 2006 – March 14, 2007) <input type="checkbox"/> Phase II (12 months – award period to be announced)
----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Title of Proposal:

**Budget**

	TWD Request	Independent Inst.: Matching Funds Budget
<b>A. Personnel</b> (show number of people in brackets)		
1. ( ) Project Leader/Co-Project Leader		
2. ( ) Other tenure-track faculty		
3. ( ) Other Professionals (technician, programmer, etc.)		
4. ( ) Non-tenure – track faculty		
5. ( ) Graduate Students/Post-Doctoral		
6. ( ) Undergraduate Students		
7. ( ) Secretarial – Clerical		
8. ( ) Other		
Sub – Total Salaries and Wages		
Fringe Benefits		
<b>Total – Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits</b>		
<b>B. Capital Equipment:</b> All capital equipment included in project costs must be specifically listed and justified on page Proposal-4. No capital equipment may be purchased after December 15, 2006 without prior Coordinating Board approval.		
<b>Total – Capital Equipment</b>		
<b>C. Travel</b>		
1. Domestic		
2. Foreign (not allowable)		
<b>Total – Travel</b>		
<b>D. Other Direct Cost</b>		
1. Materials and Supplies		
2. Scholarships		
3. Conference Registration Fees/Publication Costs		
4. Computer (ADPE) Services		
5. Subcontracts/Consultant Services		
6. Subcontracts: Community Colleges (list separately)		
7. Other (specify):		
<b>Total – Other Direct Costs</b>		
<b>Total Direct Costs:</b>		
<b>Total In-Kind (Specify):</b>		
<b>Total Requested Amount</b> (must agree with amount on Proposal Cover Page)		

Project Leader's Typed Name and Signature (required only prior to funding)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Institutional Representative's Typed Name, Title and Signature (required only prior to funding): I hereby certify that I have read and agree to comply with all grant conditions of this grant and agree to return to the Coordinating Board any funds not expended in compliance with those conditions.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Texas Technology Workforce Development Grants Program – 2006  
**Capital Equipment List – TETC-TYT**

Capital equipment included in project costs must be specifically listed and justified.  
 Only capital equipment specifically listed in the approved equipment list may be purchased with grant funds.

**Capital equipment is defined by the grantee institution.**

Project Leader:	Project Number: (to be filled if awarded)
Title: Department:	Award Phase: <input type="checkbox"/> Phase I (August 1, 2006 – March 14, 2007) <input type="checkbox"/> Phase II (12 months – award period to be announced)
Title of Proposal:	

Description and Justification	Cost
	\$
<b>Total Cost of Requested Capital Equipment</b>	<b>\$</b>

Technology Workforce Development Grants Program – 2006  
**Expenditure Report - Federal Funds - TETC-TYT**

Project Number:	
Project Leader(s):	
Institution:	
Project Leader's Mailing Address (include department)	
Proposal Title (maximum of 100 characters)	
Time Period for Expenditure Report	from - to

Federal Funds Only!

This report is for budget of CFDA # from Federal Fiscal Year	Budget	Cumulative Expenditures (including current)	Current Expenditures
A. Personnel [show number of people in brackets]			
1 Project Leader/Co-Project Leader [ ]	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2 Other tenure-track faculty [ ]	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3 Other Professionals (technician, programmer, etc.) [ ]	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4 Non-tenure – track faculty [ ]	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5 Graduate Students/Post-Doctoral [ ]	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6 Undergraduate Students [ ]	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7 Secretarial – Clerical [ ]	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
8 Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total – Salaries, Wages and Fringe Benefits	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
B. Capital Equipment: All capital equipment included as expenditures must be specifically listed.			
1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total – Capital Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
C. Travel			
1 Domestic	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2 Foreign (not allowable)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total – Travel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
D. Other Direct Cost			
1 Materials and Supplies	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2 Scholarships	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3 Conference Registration Fees/Publication Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
4 Computer (ADPE) Services	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5 Subcontracts/Consultant Services	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6 Subcontracts: Community Colleges (list separately)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
7 Other (specify):	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total – Other Direct Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

**Institutional Representative:** I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that this report is true in all respects and that all expenditures have been made for the purpose and conditions of the grant or agreement.

Date:  
Phone:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name:  
Title:

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
**Technology Workforce Development Grants Program**  
**Advisory Committee**

Ms. Judy B. Shaw, Chair (2007)\*  
 Process Engineering Manager  
 Texas Instruments  
 Dallas, TX 75243  
 (972) 995-1255

Dr. Ravi Marawar (2008)\*  
 Academic Program Manager  
 National Instruments  
 Austin, TX 78759  
 (512) 683-5505

Mr. Brad Beavers (2008)\*  
 Austin Site Director  
 Intel Corporation  
 Austin, TX 78746  
 (512) 314-0024

Dr. Alvin H. Meyer, P.E. (2006)\*  
 Associate Dean for Student Affairs  
 The University of Texas at Austin  
 Austin, TX 78712  
 (512) 471-1166

Mr. Monte Cely (2007)\*  
 Vice President (ret.)  
 AT&T Labs  
 Round Rock, TX 78681  
 (512) 310-9777

Mr. Lawrence W. Stephens (2006)\*  
 Director of Systems Engineering  
 Lockheed Martin Missiles and Fire  
 Control  
 Mail Stop EM-92  
 P.O. Box 650003  
 Dallas, Texas 75265

Dr. Agnes L. DeFranco (2007)\*  
 Interim Assistant Vice President for  
 Undergraduate Studies  
 University of Houston  
 Houston, TX 77204  
 (713) 743-2422

Dr. Valerie E. Taylor (2008)\*  
 Department Head and Stewart &  
 Stevenson Professor  
 Department of Computer Science  
 Texas A&M University  
 College Station, TX 77843  
 (979) 845-5820

Dr. Hesham El-Rewini (2007)\*  
 Chairman and Professor of Computer  
 Science and Engineering  
 Southern Methodist University  
 Dallas, TX 75275-0122  
 (214) 768-3278

Open (2008)\*

Ms. Cheryl R. Hewett (2006)\*  
 Higher Education Marketing Manager  
 Hewlett Packard Company  
 Spring, TX 77379  
 (281) 927-7564

\*(year) indicates term expires  
 in December that year

**Coordinating Board Support Staff:**

Dr. Reinold R. Cornelius  
 Program Director in Research  
 THECB  
 P.O. Box 12788  
 Austin, TX 78711  
 (512) 427-6156  
 Reinold.Cornelius@theccb.state.tx.us

Dr. Linda N. Domelsmith  
 Director of Research  
 THECB  
 P. O. Box 12788  
 Austin, TX 78711  
 (512) 427-6150  
 Linda.Domelsmith@theccb.state.tx.us

## **Need More Information?**

For more information about the program, contact:

Dr. Reinold R. Cornelius  
Program Director  
Academic Excellent and Research  
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board  
P.O. Box 12788  
Austin, TX 78711-2788  
Phone: (512) 427-6150  
FAX: (512) 427-6168  
e-mail: [Reinold.Cornelius@thehb.state.tx.us](mailto:Reinold.Cornelius@thehb.state.tx.us)

<http://www.thehb.state.tx.us/AAR/Research/Techworkforce/>