

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

March 9-10, 2012

Prepared by:

Melissa Harrington (Chair)
Delaware State University

Greg Colores
Central Michigan University

Jeffrey Dean
University of Georgia

ENHANCEMENT REVIEW REPORT

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

FY 2011-12

Introduction

The Biological Sciences Review Panel consisting of Dr. Melissa Harrington, Delaware State University; Dr. Greg Colores, Central Michigan University; and Dr. Jeff Dean, University of Georgia, met March 9-10, 2012 via Skype conference to evaluate twenty-seven (27) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement component of the Boards of Regents Support Fund.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: (1) all proposals and appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of the proposals submitted listing titles, PIs, their institutions, and funds requested; (3) a copy of the most recent Biological Sciences report (FY 2008-09); and (4) the FY 2011-12 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals containing criteria for evaluation. After studying all proposals, the panel evaluated the proposals. During the review each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria detailed in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for those deemed worthy of funding.

The twenty-seven (27) Biological Sciences proposals submitted in FY 2011-12 requested a total of \$2,993,025 in first-year funds. Six (6) proposals were highly recommended for funding, one (1) at a reduced level.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding, together with the recommended funding levels. Table II contains a list of proposals recommended for funding should additional monies become available. Table III contains a list of proposals not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

**Traditional Enhancement Table I
Highly Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
1	90	17BS-12	Pennington	\$61,937	\$61,937		
2	89	07BS-12	LSU-BR	\$120,766	\$120,766		
3	88	13BS-12	Nicholls	\$58,454	\$58,454		
4	87	27BS-12	UL-M	\$86,661	\$86,661		
5	86	20BS-12	SU-BR	\$56,282	\$33,770	\$0	\$0
6	85	24BS-12	UL-L	\$72,262	\$72,262		
Totals				\$456,362	\$433,850	\$0	\$0

**Traditional Enhancement Table II
Recommended for Funding if Monies Become Available**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
7	84	15BS-12	Northwestern	\$109,587	\$40,000		
8	83	10BS-12	LSU-S	\$67,643	\$36,587		
9	80	23BS-12	UL-L	\$123,744	\$123,744		
Totals				\$300,974	\$200,331	\$0	\$0

**Traditional Enhancement Table III
Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
10	79	06BS-12	LSU-BR	\$138,715	\$0		
11	78	08BS-12	LSU-BR	\$80,700	\$0		
12	77	26BS-12	UL-L	\$138,343	\$0		
13	76	22BS-12	Tulane	\$113,433	\$0	\$32,717	\$0
14	75	18BS-12	SLU	\$260,000	\$0		
15	74	05BS-12	LSU-BR	\$75,976	\$0		
16	73	14BS-12	Nicholls	\$106,600	\$0		
17	72	12BS-12	Nicholls	\$118,858	\$0		
18	71	11BS-12	LaTech	\$32,088	\$0		
19	70	25BS-12	UL-L	\$249,560	\$0		
20	69	21BS-12	SU-NO	\$54,068	\$0		
21	68	19BS-12	SLU	\$94,285	\$0		
22	67	03BS-12	LSU-AG	\$115,899	\$0		
23	66	01BS-12	LSU-AG	\$86,030	\$0		
24	65	02BS-12	LSU-AG	\$132,450	\$0		
25	64	09BS-12	LSU-BR	\$74,500	\$0		
26	63	04BS-12	LSU-AG	\$132,390	\$0		
27	62	16BS-12	Nunez	\$231,794	\$0		
Totals				\$2,235,689	\$0	\$32,717	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01BS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for the Development of Molecular Markers to
Characterize a Fungus-Insect System and Enhance
Research and Training in Population Genetics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Aime

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 18 points)
B.3 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 1 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 1 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

66

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$86,030</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This is a fairly well-written proposal detailing a specific research question. However, it reads more like a research proposal than an enhancement proposal. The requested equipment, primarily for the PI's lab, would have a limited impact. It was also curious that a single undergraduate would be recruited and trained. Furthermore, no specific details on classroom incorporation are given. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02BS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for the Enhancement of Microbial and Bioactive
Filtration Research and Teaching at Louisiana State University
Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kayanush Aryana

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 1 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 13 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score:

65

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$132,450</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks equipment to enhance food research. Overall, this is a poorly written proposal. There were very few clearly stated details about how the equipment will be used. This goes for both research and teaching applications. It was unclear exactly how the equipment will impact students and in what numbers. Similarly, it is not clear how many additional researchers are impacted. This proposal would also benefit from references on the technology to be incorporated. Finally, assessment was poorly described and lacked details. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03BS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Nutritional Functional Foods Teaching and Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joan King

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 18 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

67

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$115,899</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests funds to update equipment for food analysis. One strength is that the improvements are driven by a USDA review suggesting that the equipment be updated. Unfortunately, specifically what instrumentation was suggested in the USDA Review for updating is not addressed. Presenting the detailed USDA recommendations would have made a stronger impact. Questions regarding the current equipment remain unanswered. For example, how old is the current HPLC-MS? How is it outdated? What does the new one allow users to do that cannot currently be done? References and technical information should be included throughout the proposal in support of the new analyses and new specifications. Additionally, what is a MALLS detector? Why is it needed to replace or supplement what currently exists? HPLC operation is fairly complicated, though it is not clear that the project team understands this. Finally, while mention was made of a commitment to maintain the equipment, no such supporting documentation from the Agricultural Center was provided. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04BS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Electrophysiology Techniques to Facilitate
both Teaching and Research in Multiple Departments of the
LSU AgCenter

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jolene Zheng

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

63

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$132,390</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal seeks to acquire equipment for teaching and research. The list of classes that will supposedly benefit from the equipment is very long and confusing. It is unclear, for example, how electrophysiology will be integrated into a class on food laws and standards. Given that whole-cell patch clamp experiments are technically demanding and can only be performed by one person at a time, the PI should have included some detailed examples of class exercises and how the students will progress through them in a classroom setting. Not enough detail is provided about the plans for using the patch clamp system in faculty research to assess the likely impact. It is not clear what specific goals of the research will be addressed with whole-cell patch clamp experiments, or what type of experiments will be done. The proposal does not address how large numbers of users could be trained in this demanding technique. The PI appears to have some experience with patch clamp, but the lack of information in the proposal about the use of the equipment in research, as well as the unrealistic claims for how many people may use the system, suggests unfamiliarity with the technology. The proposal would have been strengthened by objectives that focused more on improving faculty research and student learning with the purchase and integration of equipment. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05BS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Quality Measurement of Physical Activity and Body Composition

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Birgitta Baker

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

74

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$75,976</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal seeks to acquire educational equipment for kinesiology students. As written, the objectives are actually activities. The proposal would have been strengthened if the objectives had focused on increasing the quality of training of students or the quantity and quality of departmental research. The activities of purchasing equipment and integrating it into research and teaching are undertaken to achieve such educational or research objectives. Better written objectives would have allowed the PIs to create an evaluation/performance measures section that measured something more meaningful than the equipment purchase and the number of students who used it. The proposal would have been strengthened by more details on how the proposed equipment would be integrated into classes. Descriptions of example exercises should have been provided for at least some of the classes that are proposed to be enhanced by the equipment. For the Bod Pod, a sample exercise and how it would be performed by a whole class full of students using the single piece of equipment would have made it easier to assess the likely impact of the instrumentation on instruction. Similarly, more details or examples of how the proposed equipment would be used to enhance faculty research projects would have made it easier to assess the impact. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06BS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Applied Metacognition Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Melissa Brocato

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No

A.2 4 (of 5 points)

A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)

B.2 18 (of 23 points)

B.3 20 (of 25 points)

B.4 3 (of 5 points)

B.5 2 (of 2 points)

B.6 5 (of 6 points)

B.7 Yes x No

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No

F. Total Score:

79

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$138,715</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to create the Applied Metacognition Program (AMP) in the Center for Academic Success (CAS). The objectives, as written, are actually activities. The proposal would have been strengthened if the objectives were framed around improving student success. The PIs refer to the work of Carol Dweck, but the proposal does not refer to her central finding, which is the importance to learning of having a "growth mindset". This should be key to any program that teaches students and faculty about metacognition. The budget primarily requests salaries and seems inflated. The project provides salary support for many people, including graduate students, to prepare a toolkit which seems to be mostly assembled already. It is not clear what will require time of so many people. The Vice-Chancellor of Teaching and Learning should be carrying out the activities related to this project as part of her job. Similarly, the cost for evaluation seems quite high for an in-house person. This grant is very short term, so more detail should have been provided explaining how the project would be sustained after the term of the grant. Ideally the most effective components would be institutionalized rather than depending on further grant support. Given the funds requested and the involvement of the CAS, which likely has a University-wide mission, the proposal would have been stronger if it had included more detail about plans to expand the most effective parts of the project to more departments. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07BS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nanoflow Liquid Chromatography System for Biomolecular Analysis

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Huangen Ding

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 18 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$120,766</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$120,766</u>

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

This is a strong, well-written proposal to acquire a state-of-the-art piece of equipment for a core facility that is well utilized by researchers from a variety of State institutions. The few deficiencies in the proposal relate primarily to the PIs not providing fully detailed information in some sections required by the RFP. The narrative is missing a timeline for actual procurement of and training on the instrument. The section regarding eminence is only a cursory discussion of how the equipment would further elevate prominence of the center (yet this was classed as a high-value section in terms of points). Specific costs for different pieces of the equipment are not described. Few details are provided for how the new equipment would contribute to external economic development. However, the need and broad impact are very clear. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08BS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of CAMD Synchrotron Tomography Beamline
with Phase Contrast Imaging

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kyungmin Ham

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

78

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$80,700</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The authors are requesting equipment to improve imaging capability at the CAMD facility. While it is well written, the panel does not believe this proposal is appropriate for the Biological Sciences competition. It appears that this is primarily a physics or engineering application, with very limited involvement from or impact on biological sciences education and research at LSU-BR. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09BS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementing Clinical Ultrasound in Kinesiology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dennis Landin

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 1 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 1 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

64

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$74,500</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

As stated in the proposal, the goals and objectives are actually activities. The proposal would have been stronger if the goals and objectives had been framed in terms of increasing preparedness of students with some form of assessment to measure it. Though increasing student exposure to modern equipment by 50% is a quantitative objective, it does not really address the most meaningful outcomes. The proposal provides no indication of what student "exposure" to the equipment would involve. With so little detail about how the equipment will be used, it is impossible to assess the likely impact on students, faculty and the institution. The list of classes that will benefit from the equipment is very long and does not make sense. It is unclear how EMG and sonography could be integrated into cadaver prosection and dissection courses. The proposal would have been stronger if it had included examples of how the equipment would be used for specific exercises that would enhance specific courses. The proposal would have also been strengthened by some examples of faculty research projects that would be impacted. The list of student and faculty accomplishments was an unnecessary addition. The proposal would have been stronger if it had developed more meaningful benchmarks for the project, e.g., increases in the number of papers and presentations authored by students. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10BS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Critical Thinking and Analytical Skills in
Environmental and Ecological Studies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amy Erickson

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 20 (of 23 points)
B.3 22 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

F. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTS: Requested Amount: \$67,643
Recommended Amount: \$36,587

(if additional monies become available)

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

The PIs seek to purchase HP tablets to enhance inquiry-based instruction. This is an interesting approach, but this proposal would have been greatly enhanced by the inclusion of data or studies from references showing the benefit of an inquiry-based approach. The proposal was submitted as non-equipment, yet the budget primarily requests equipment. Partial funding is recommended to support half of the tablets and software licenses if additional monies become available. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11BS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Resources for Enhancing Student's Knowledge and Skills in
Nutrition Assessment and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yeonsoo Kim

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 18 points)
B.3 13 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

71

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$32,088</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal seeks to enhance nutrition education through the acquisition of education materials. The goals are poorly presented and the objectives, as stated, are actually activities. The proposal would have been stronger if it had presented measurable goals and objectives related to improving student learning, practicum, and research experiences. The listed objectives beginning "to obtain" and "to provide" would then become activities to accomplish thoughtful, realistic goals and objectives. A more detailed description relating the project activities with the Senior Citizens Fitness Center, Life Choice Center and Lincoln Council on Aging to student learning outcomes and experiences would have also strengthened the proposal. More details on the planned uses for the equipment should have been provided. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12BS-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Ecology Education at Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raj Boopathy

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

72

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$118,858</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The authors seek several key pieces of equipment to improve ecology-based courses within the Department of Biological Sciences. This proposal is hampered by a vague work plan. It is unclear how analytical capacity will be enhanced. What will be possible with the requested equipment that the older equipment cannot do? Many courses are listed, yet no specifics are provided on how each course will be impacted. Student comments are not appropriate assessment tools. Finally, some pieces of equipment were better justified than others. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13BS-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer Technology for Biological Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Doucet

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$58,454</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$58,454</u>

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

This proposal seeks to replace eight-year-old computers in a heavily utilized student computer lab. It is, overall, a very strong proposal. The rationale provides excellent quantitative data from student users on increasing equipment failures and issues related to outdated software. Because the request is to upgrade/fix a student computer lab shared by many different classes, the new equipment will impact a large and diverse group of students and truly enhance their education. The proposal provides details about the exact equipment being requested and the timeline for its procurement and installation, and describes very clearly the courses and curricula that would be impacted. It provides a lucid and persuasive set of performance measures that would make a nice model for others to follow. Given the scoring rubric set forth in the RFP, suggestions for improving the proposal would be to reduce the amount of information provided for performance measures and provide more information with specific examples regarding economic development. The section on faculty development could also be improved. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14BS-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Genetics & Cell Biology Laboratory Experiences
for Biology Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rajkumar Nathaniel

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

73

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$106,600</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal seeks to acquire technology for cell and molecular biology laboratory exercises. The objectives, as written, are actually activities. The proposal would be strengthened by rewriting the objectives to focus on increasing student learning or increasing the number of students who take upper-level biology courses. The written objectives of adding molecular biology equipment to the classes would become activities proposed to achieve the objectives. With more appropriate objectives, the performance measures, which focus on assessing the satisfaction of students who take the courses and the quality of their learning, make more sense. The proposal could be strengthened by the inclusion of more information about the classes the PIs plan to target, some examples of laboratory exercises the new equipment will make possible, and how those exercises will support the learning goals for the courses. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15BS-12

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Biological Chemistry Labs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zafer Hatahet

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 5 (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 18 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$109,587
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$40,000

(if additional monies become available)

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

This proposal seeks laboratory equipment and supplies for biological chemistry education. It represents a major enhancement for the department. The narrative would have been improved by inclusion of a timeline and description covering procurement, installation and training related to the requested equipment, as well as a management plan for how equipment would be accessed or utilized for anything outside the coursework described. The proposal needs more detail on specific maintenance for individual items. Only one PI is listed on a project that will clearly affect multiple faculty members. The addition of more would have improved the score for faculty expertise. The section on economic development was very weak. Some of the requested items will be much easier to integrate into teaching lab exercises than others, and the Panel has a concern about whether certain items will actually be used by students. A reduced budget would allow the PI to prioritize the equipment request based on educational impact. Partial funding of \$40,000 is recommended if additional monies become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. If further monies become available, funding is recommended at the level of \$70,000. The institutional match is to be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16BS-12

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing a Partnership in Biology in the Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 18 points)
B.3 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

62

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$231,794</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks equipment and support to accomplish what appears to be a very ambitious project. However, there is far too little detail throughout the entire proposal. For example, the project rationale is very poorly developed and provides no information on what will actually be accomplished by the project. It was unclear how the requested material will complement existing resources. Further, it was not clear how the materials will be integrated into specific courses. In addition, the goals, objectives, and work plan are all extremely vague. All participating faculty and staff, along with their qualifications, are not listed. This is unfortunate, since the proposal describes a novel idea that would involve a unique collaboration between Nunez and the Tulane School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17BS-12

INSTITUTION: Pennington Biomedical Research Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Confocal Imaging Capabilities at
Pennington Biomedical Research Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Burk

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 1 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

G. Total Score:

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$61,937</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$61,937</u>

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

The proposal seeks to enhance the Cell Biology and Bioimaging Core research infrastructure at PBRC. The case made for funding is very strong. The proposal clearly describes the confocal imaging support provided by the institution for a large number of users, along with the high level of grant support and publications of those users that included data obtained at the imaging facility. The specific equipment proposed is clearly described and well justified, and the potential for increasing the prominence of PBRC is clear. The proposal would have been even stronger if the stated goal had been to increase the number of users of the confocal and the quality of the data that is produced, rather than to enhance the facility by buying equipment. This would have linked the goal better with the performance measures, which are focused on measuring exactly those outcomes. Since PBRC does not educate students, there will be little impact on pedagogy. However, the potential impact on the biomedical research and development community in Baton Rouge compensates for this. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 18BS-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a High Resolution Transmission Electron Microscope
for the Enhancement of Several Academic Programs and the
Support of Undergraduate and Graduate Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Norton

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

75

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$260,000</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This is a very well-written proposal. The plan for enhancement of research and courses is good and well supported with detailed examples. The instrumentation will primarily support faculty research with little impact on instruction. The objectives are good. The performance measures, however, emphasize long-term outcomes that cannot be measured by the end of the project. Given the large size of this request, especially in a lean funding year, and the major emphasis on research applications, this would be more appropriately submitted as a shared instrumentation proposal to a federal funding source. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 19BS-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Modernization and Improvements to the Vertebrate
Collections at Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kyle Piller

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

68

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$94,285</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to enhance specimen collections is generally well written and well referenced, and includes a wealth of information about the department and the faculty research related to the project. Crucial information regarding the case for funding, however, is left out. More details are needed on how the archived specimens are used to advance science, along with some quantification of the number of users. The impact of the project on the number of users and the quality of the information that they would acquire is not explicitly stated. The goals and objectives should have focused on increasing the accessibility and scientific and academic usefulness of the collection rather than increasing research capabilities of the institution and acquiring a freezer (which is an activity, not an objective). This would have linked the objectives with the performance measures proposed, which are perfect to measure progress toward achieving the objective of increasing use of the collection. The proposal indicates that images from the collection made using the new equipment would be incorporated into introductory biology classes, but there is no indication of who would be taking these images and making them available to the instructors. Similarly, the proposal should have linked DNA extraction from specimens with courses in genetics, and cell and molecular biology, which commonly have DNA extraction as a laboratory exercise. It would have also been helpful to add faculty as PIs who teach courses that could be enhanced by access to a more modern, available vertebrates collection. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 20BS-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Instructional Infrastructure in Biology by
Implementing Multimedia Technologies at Southern University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Caroline Telles

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$56,282</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$33,770</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to outfit biology classrooms with modern audio-visual educational technology includes good, measureable goals and objectives and a strong plan for evaluating success. Having the department chair, dean and an information technology expert as PIs on the proposal shows that the project has the administrative support to succeed. The proposal would have been strengthened if it had included more details, along with specific examples, about how the new infrastructure would be used in instruction. If properly utilized, the equipment will have immediate impact. There is no institutional match. Partial funding is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 21BS-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Biology Curriculum and Instruction at
Southern University at New Orleans with Interactive
White-Board Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lisa Mims-Devezin

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

69

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$54,068</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests funds to improve instruction by adding interactive white boards to classrooms. It falls short in a few key areas. No references are provided to support how this new technology will improve student learning. Additionally, the measurable objectives are too short and confusing. Finally, it was not clearly described how this project would help the department achieve or maintain eminence. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 22BS-12

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Next-Generation DNA Sequencer for
Research, Training and Education at Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Blum

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$113,433</u>	<u>\$32,717</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests a state-of-the-art DNA sequencer. The argument that this acquisition could help put this facility in a leading regional position initially appears reasonable. However, no information is provided to indicate whether or not current capacity on recently purchased sequencers is already being exceeded, or why the current instruments are not appropriate for the work being envisioned. Getting out in front of the technology curve too early can often be costly for departments. It is not clear that the PIs have fully investigated and considered competing technologies, particularly since most of the rationale for requesting the Ion Torrent instrument seems to be drawn from a single review article. Based on the proposal, it appears that the metagenomic analyses will be a significant component of the proposed work, yet the Ion Torrent is not particularly suited for this type of work. It would have been preferable to see specific feedback to questions put to multiple users in the currently installed Ion Torrent user base concerning the specific applications intended by the PIs. It is also extremely problematic that almost no mention was made of the bioinformatic resources or lack thereof available for support of this instrumentation. Most institutions quickly find that upon obtaining a next-generation instrument, they are immediately faced with bottlenecks in computational processing and bioinformatics support. Also, the request for faculty support split over two years was not strongly justified. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 23BS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Facilitation of Biological Structure/Function Studies: Purchase of an Ultramicrotome with Cryo Capability for Implementation in Research and Teaching

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Caryl Chlan

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$123,744
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$123,744

(if additional monies become available)

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

The proposal to acquire a cryo-ultramicrotome includes a lengthy list of potential users for the requested equipment. However, considering the described research pursued by individual investigators, it was not always easy to understand whether there was truly a direct link to this particular piece of equipment. For example, it was not clear why a cryo-ultramicrotome would be particularly useful to someone working with AFM. While the section on potential to achieve eminence was very strong, it appeared overdone with regard to research specifics for each co-PI. It might have helped if some of that material had been moved to the sections on faculty improvement or faculty expertise, the latter of which was underdeveloped. The section on economic development was also very weak. Full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 24BS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading Instrumentation for Metal Analysis in Biological
Research and Education at UL Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Klerks

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

85

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$72,262</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$72,262</u>

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

The proposal requests funds to upgrade a 25-year-old unit for research and education. The proposal is well reasoned and the need is clearly stated. The objectives, as written, are actually activities. The proposal would have been stronger if the objectives and performance measures had focused on training students and improving faculty research competitiveness, rather than on the purchase of equipment. The evaluation plan would have been better if it included a clearer plan to measure changes in research agendas and student satisfaction. It is not enough to state that an increase in student satisfaction is anticipated. The proposal would have been improved by inclusion of more details on how faculty research would be impacted. Examples, such as data generated by the old equipment with a legend pointing out how the data could be collected better with the new instrumentation, would have also been helpful. Likewise, notations in the biographical sketch of which papers included data gathered with the old equipment would have strengthened the case. A strength of the proposal is the specific examples of classes and exercises that would benefit from the new equipment. The impact and need are clear. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 25BS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Greater Throughput and Sensitivity at Lower Costs: Enhancing
Biological Research and Training at UL Lafayette with
Microfluidics Real-Time PCR

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joseph Neigel

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 4 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

70

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$249,560</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$0</u>
--	--

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

Overall, this is a well-written proposal, but suffers from insufficient justification for adding such a high-throughput machine. The work plan lacks specific examples about how this instrument would play a significant role in curriculum development, as well as student recruitment and faculty enhancement. The discussion on the impact this instrument might have on economic development is significantly underdeveloped. The proposal would have been strengthened by more details on how this instrument is expected to enhance the path to prominence for this group. Finally, equivocation regarding the instrument requested and a lower-capacity instrument manufactured by the same vendor was not helpful in understanding the drawbacks to purchase of the instrument that was not requested. Even given the reduced capacity of the less expensive instrument, it was difficult to judge whether the researchers have sufficient need for capacity to keep the requested instrument running at a reasonable load. Given the limited funding available in this competition and more pressing needs elsewhere, this request was not deemed to be competitive. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 26BS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Next Generation DNA Sequencer to Enhance
the Research and Training Program in Environmental and
Evolutionary Biology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mauricio Rodriguez-Lanetty

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

77

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$138,343</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal is to obtain a next-generation sequencing system for the core facility at UL-L. Few details were provided concerning use of current sequencing capacity, and the long-term plans to keep the new instrument running were vague. The PIs did a good job of presenting arguments in favor of a particular platform, but it would have been helpful to see data from pilot studies (from the same platform at another core) to show how the instrument will specifically address current needs. A weakness of the proposal is the lack of substantive discussion of the bioinformatics and computational load that will be incurred if this instrument is run anywhere near full capacity. Some discussion of this was warranted, both with respect to the requested computer and software (how many licenses will be required?) as well as with respect to the potential load on campus networks for moving data around. Such instruments at other comparable institutions have been faced with severe infrastructure bottlenecks due to lack of planning. Also, the economic development section was not very well developed. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 27BS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Center for Biometeorology: Instrumentation for Long-Term
CO2 and H2O Flux Monitoring in a Bottomland Hardwood
Forest

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joydeep Bhattacharjee

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

87

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$86,661</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$86,661</u>
--	--

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

This is a proposal that seeks to establish an Ameriflux site in an unrepresented ecosystem (there is not one in the Mississippi delta region). Clearly, the successful implementation of this tower would fill a currently existing gap. The proposal clearly supports the claim of growing student interest in this area. However, the proposed establishment of a Center for Biometeorology seems premature, as only one class is proposed that is not currently in the curriculum. Further, the proposal lacks specific detail on how this equipment will benefit existing classes. In spite of these criticisms, this is certainly a meritorious proposal. Full funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Biological Sciences
for the FY 2011-12 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/No n Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001BS-12	Aime,Mary	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1	E	N	Equipment for the development of molecular markers to characterize a fungus-insect system and enhance research and training in population genetics	\$86,030.00	\$0.00	\$86,030.00
002BS-12	Aryana,Kayanush	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1	E	N	Equipment for the enhancement of microbial and bioactive filtration research and teaching at Louisiana State University Agricultural Center.	\$132,450.00	\$0.00	\$132,450.00
003BS-12	King,Joan	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1	E	N	Enhancing Nutritional Functional Foods Teaching and Research	\$115,899.00	\$0.00	\$115,899.00
004BS-12	Zheng,Jolene	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1	E	N	Enhancement of electrophysiology techniques to facilitate both teaching and research in multiple departments of the LSU AgCenter	\$132,390.00	\$0.00	\$132,390.00
005BS-12	Baker,Birgitta	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	High Quality Measurement of Physical Activity and Body Composition	\$75,976.00	\$0.00	\$75,976.00
006BS-12	Brocato,Melissa	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	NE	N	The Applied Metacognition Program	\$138,715.00	\$0.00	\$138,715.00
007BS-12	Ding,Huangen	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Nanoflow Liquid Chromatography System for Biomolecular Analysis	\$120,766.00	\$0.00	\$120,766.00
008BS-12	Ham,Kyungmin	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Enhancement of CAMD Synchrotron Tomography Beamline with Phase Contrast Imaging	\$80,700.00	\$0.00	\$80,700.00
009BS-12	Landin,Dennis	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Implementing Clinical Ultrasound in Kinesiology	\$74,500.00	\$0.00	\$74,500.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/No n Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
010BS-12	Erickson,Amy	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	NE	N	Enhancing Critical Thinking and Analytical Skills in Environmental and Ecological Studies	\$67,643.00	\$0.00	\$67,643.00
011BS-12	Kim,Yeonsoo	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Resources for Enhancing Student's Knowledge and Skills in Nutrition Assessment and Education	\$32,088.00	\$0.00	\$32,088.00
012BS-12	Boopathy,Raj	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Ecology Education at Nicholls State University	\$118,858.00	\$0.00	\$118,858.00
013BS-12	Doucet,John	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Computer Technology for Biological Sciences	\$58,454.00	\$0.00	\$58,454.00
014BS-12	Nathaniel, Rajkumar	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancing Genetics & Cell Biology Laboratory Experiences for Biology Students	\$106,600.00	\$0.00	\$106,600.00
015BS-12	Hatahet,Zafer	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of biological chemistry labs	\$109,587.00	\$0.00	\$109,587.00
016BS-12	Waddell,Stephen	Nunez Community College	1	E	N	Enhancing a Partnership in Biology in the Community College	\$231,794.00	\$0.00	\$231,794.00
017BS-12	Burk,David	Pennington Biomedical Research Center	1	E	N	Enhancement of the Confocal Imaging Capabilities at Pennington Biomedical Research Center	\$61,937.00	\$0.00	\$61,937.00
018BS-12	Norton,William	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Acquisition of a High Resolution Transmission Electron Microscope for the Enhancement of Several Academic Programs and the Support of Undergraduate and Graduate Research	\$260,000.00	\$0.00	\$260,000.00
019BS-12	Piller,Kyle	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Modernization and Improvements to the Vertebrate Collections at Southeastern Louisiana University	\$94,285.00	\$0.00	\$94,285.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/No n Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
020BS-12	Telles, Caroline	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	2	E	N	ENHANCING THE INSTRUCTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE IN BIOLOGY BY IMPLEMENTING MULTIMEDIA TECHNOLOGIES AT SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	\$56,282.00	\$0.00	\$56,282.00
021BS-12	Mims-Devezin, Lisa	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	E	N	Enhancement of the Biology Curriculum and Instruction at Southern University at New Orleans with Interactive White-Board Technology	\$54,068.00	\$0.00	\$54,068.00
022BS-12	Blum, Michael	Tulane University	2	E	N	Acquisition of a next-generation DNA sequencer for research, training and education at Tulane University	\$113,433.00	\$32,717.00	\$146,150.00
023BS-12	Chlan, Caryl	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Facilitation of Biological Structure/Function Studies: Purchase of an Ultramicrotome with Cryo Capability for Implementation in Research and Teaching	\$123,744.00	\$0.00	\$123,744.00
024BS-12	Klerks, Paul	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Upgrading instrumentation for metal analysis in biological research and education at UL Lafayette	\$72,262.00	\$0.00	\$72,262.00
025BS-12	Neigel, Joseph	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Greater Throughput and Sensitivity at Lower Costs: Enhancing Biological Research and Training at UL Lafayette with Microfluidics Real-Time PCR	\$249,560.00	\$0.00	\$249,560.00
026BS-12	Rodriguez-Lanetty, Mauricio	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Acquisition of a Next Generation DNA Sequencer to Enhance the Research and Training Program in Environmental and Evolutionary Biology	\$138,343.00	\$0.00	\$138,343.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/No n Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
027BS-12	Bhattacharjee, Joydeep	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1	E	N	Center for Biometerology: Instrumentation for Long-term CO2 and H2O Flux Monitoring in a Bottomland Hardwood Forest	\$86,661.00	\$0.00	\$86,661.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	27
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,993,025.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$32,717.00
Total Money Requested	\$3,025,742.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 1 of 3

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

YES _____ NO _____

_____ of 5 pts.

_____ of 5 pts.

A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?

A.2 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?

A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 66 points

_____ of 5 pts.

_____ of 23 pts.

_____ of 25 pts.

_____ of 5 pts.

_____ of 2 pts.

_____ of 6 pts.

B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?

B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?

B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?

B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?

B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?

B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?

C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE--Total of 12 points

_____ of 12 pts

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 2 of 3

COMMENTS:

D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT--Total of 12 points

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

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Depending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either D.2a OR D.2b:

_____ of 10 pts. D.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?

D.2b For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

E. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 3 of 3

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____ Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Form 6.12, rev.2010)

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 1 of 3

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

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

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 56 points

- ____ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- ____ of 18 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- ____ of 20 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- ____ of 2 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- ____ of 6 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 2 of 3

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE--Total of 12 points

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

COMMENTS:

E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT--Total of 12 points

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

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Depending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either E.2a OR E.2b:

- | | | |
|------------------|------|--|
| _____ of 10 pts. | E.2a | <u>For science/engineering proposals only:</u> To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana? |
| | E.2b | <u>For non-science/non-engineering proposals only:</u> To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana? |

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 3 of 3

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____ Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Form 6.11, rev 2010)