

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

**REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN THE SPECIAL
MULTIDISCIPLINARY CATEGORY**

March 2012

Prepared by:

P. Jonathan Patchett (Chair)
Professor, Geochemistry
University of Arizona

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
FY 2011-12**

Introduction

Thirty-five (35) Multidisciplinary Enhancement Program proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents staff for review by the panel chair, Dr. P. Jonathan Patchett of the University of Arizona. The proposals were divided into the root disciplines eligible for this year's competition, including Biological Sciences, Computer and Information Sciences, Engineering B, Humanities, and Social Sciences, and distributed to five subject-area reviewers. Total funding requested was \$3,620,661, with \$3,460,040 of that amount requested in first-year funds.

Dr. Patchett received the following materials for review: (a) the thirty-five (35) proposals; (b) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, principal investigators, their institutions, etc.; (c) the FY 2011-12 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals (RFP); and (d) thirty-five (35) rating forms.

The subject-area reviewers submitted their evaluations of individual proposals by February 24, 2012 electronically to Dr. Patchett for further review. After careful consideration and communication with subject-area reviewers, the proposals were ranked and \$485,235 was recommended for eight (8) proposals, four (4) of them at reduced funding levels. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table II contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding should funds become available. Table III contains a rank-order list of proposals not recommended for funding.

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.

MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT, FY 2011-12

SUBJECT-AREA REVIEWERS

| | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| Dr. Melissa Harrington, Delaware State University | Biological Sciences |
| Dr. John Gorgone, Bentley University | Computer and Information Sciences |
| Dr. Allen Miller, Ohio State University | Engineering B |
| Dr. Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Iowa State University | Humanities |
| Dr. John Johannes, Villanova University | Social Sciences |

**Traditional Enhancement Multidisciplinary 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 | 97 | 15MUL-12 | Nicholls | \$62,250 | \$50,250 | | |
| 2 | 96 | 34MUL-12 | UL-L | \$38,261 | \$38,261 | | |
| 3 | 95 | 35MUL-12 | UNO | \$101,450 | \$101,450 | | |
| 4 | 94 | 22MUL-12 | SU-NO | \$96,100 | \$85,100 | | |
| 5 | 93 | 08MUL-12 | LSU-BR | \$91,347 | \$70,032 | | |
| 6 | 92 | 33MUL-12 | UL-L | \$180,155 | \$95,242 | | |
| 7 | 91 | 06MUL-12 | LSU-BR | \$29,600 | \$29,600 | \$29,600 | \$29,600 |
| 8 | 90 | 20MUL-12 | Nicholls | \$15,300 | \$15,300 | | |
| Totals | | | | \$614,463 | \$485,235 | \$29,600 | \$29,600 |

**Traditional Enhancement Multidisciplinary 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 |
|---------------|--------|----------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 9 | 89 | 19MUL-12 | Nicholls | \$117,091 | \$102,479 | | |
| 10 | 88 | 25MUL-12 | Tulane | \$227,002 | \$227,002 | | |
| 11 | 87.5 | 32MUL-12 | UL-L | \$219,128 | \$117,729 | | |
| Totals | | | | \$563,221 | \$447,210 | \$0 | \$0 |

**Traditional Enhancement Multidisciplinary 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 |
|---------------|--------|----------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 12 | 86 | 21MUL-12 | Nicholls | \$159,600 | \$0 | | |
| 13 | 85 | 18MUL-12 | Nicholls | \$259,400 | \$0 | | |
| 14 | 83 | 23MUL-12 | SU-NO | \$92,383 | \$0 | \$36,671 | \$0 |
| 15 | 82 | 13MUL-12 | LaTech | \$16,650 | \$0 | | |
| 15 | 82 | 16MUL-12 | Nicholls | \$92,510 | \$0 | | |
| 15 | 82 | 27MUL-12 | UL-L | \$82,673 | \$0 | | |
| 18 | 81 | 29MUL-12 | UL-L | \$64,435 | \$0 | | |
| 19 | 80 | 01MUL-12 | Dillard | \$121,148 | \$0 | | |
| 20 | 76 | 07MUL-12 | LSU-BR | \$103,320 | \$0 | | |
| 20 | 76 | 10MUL-12 | LaTech | \$46,502 | \$0 | | |
| 20 | 76 | 24MUL-12 | SU-NO | \$63,038 | \$0 | | |
| 20 | 76 | 26MUL-12 | UL-L | \$130,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 |
| 24 | 73 | 09MUL-12 | LSU-BR | \$75,825 | \$0 | \$44,350 | \$0 |
| 25 | 72 | 14MUL-12 | McNeese | \$70,103 | \$0 | | |
| 25 | 72 | 28MUL-12 | UL-L | \$40,867 | \$0 | | |
| 27 | 69 | 02MUL-12 | Dillard | \$175,942 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 27 | 69 | 04MUL-12 | LSU-BR | \$87,166 | \$0 | | |
| 27 | 69 | 30MUL-12 | UL-L | \$80,076 | \$0 | | |
| 30 | 68 | 05MUL-12 | LSU-BR | \$78,500 | \$0 | | |
| 31 | 66 | 17MUL-12 | Nicholls | \$44,271 | \$0 | | |
| 32 | 64 | 11MUL-12 | LaTech | \$67,035 | \$0 | | |
| 32 | 64 | 31MUL-12 | UL-L | \$159,790 | \$0 | | |
| 34 | 63 | 12MUL-12 | LaTech | \$75,400 | \$0 | | |
| 35 | 54 | 03MUL-12 | Dillard | \$95,722 | \$0 | | |
| Totals | | | | \$2,282,356 | \$0 | \$131,021 | \$0 |

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

01MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Qualitative Research and Learning Laboratory (QURALL)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charlotte Hurst

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 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 10 (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 11 (of 18 points)
B.3 13 (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 12 (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: \$121,148

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal requests funding for new computing equipment and software. It is truly interdisciplinary, involving five disciplines in several different departments across the University. The participating faculty are well qualified. Some specific examples of research projects that would be undertaken in the classes that will be affected would have strengthened this proposal. A field research capability is envisaged for the equipment, but it is not clear what "community assessments in the Gentilly area" would be done. It also is not clear how these research projects will fit into the many courses in which they are supposed to take place. How will the projects be assessed? Further, it is not clear exactly what the NVivo software does and how it would be utilized in classrooms. The lack of detail about what research will be done with the software makes it difficult to assess the potential for impact on the University and the region. Given the large number of classes to be impacted, some of the requested computers could be purchased with departmental funds rather than with BoRSF funds. In this lean funding year for the BoRSF, funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

02MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Computer/Info. Sciences

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing an Enhanced Learning Environment Using
State-of-the-Art Technologies for Upper Level Computer
Science and Related Interdisciplinary Courses with Emphasis
on Computer Graphics, Robotics and Simulation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynda Louis

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No X

G. Total Score: 69 (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>\$175,942</u> | <u>\$0</u> |
| | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

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

The proposal requests equipment and software to establish a graphics/robotics/simulation lab for Computer Science, Chemistry, and Mathematics programs. The rationale and impact on existing resources could be strengthened. The enhancement plan is weak and could be improved by defining measurable objectives or benchmarks to be accomplished and including detailed descriptions of how the five objectives will be evaluated. The enhancement plan needs a much stronger case for suitability and quality of enhancements, and how the project will directly impact and benefit Computing, Chemistry and Mathematics programs in terms of curriculum, instruction, faculty and students. The evidence for achieving eminence is weak. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

03MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Humanities

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhance Proposal for Dillard University Radio Station

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Janella Newsome

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 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 0 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2.5 (of 5 points)
B.2 4 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 2.5 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes No X

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 No X

G. Total Score:

| |
|----|
| 54 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$95,722

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

The proposed regeneration of the radio station at Dillard University is a valuable idea that could have broad impact on campus and in the community. The panel is disappointed, therefore, that this proposal is poorly written and does not make a clear and solid case for the project. Replacing a radio station tower that has been damaged and inoperable since Hurricane Katrina makes excellent sense given the station's crucial role in the professional journalism program. Current and functioning equipment and software are essential to train students to be journalism professionals. Furthermore, students would be involved in the renovation process, thereby acquiring new skills not offered in their standard program. However, the enhancement plan is not adequately detailed. Evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence is not addressed appropriately. The section regarding impact on curriculum primarily lists courses without tying them to the proposed project. The section regarding assessment is missing entirely. In the section addressing the relationship with industrial sponsors, the applicant provided information irrelevant to the question asked. Finally, the proposal overall contained repetitious information and simple lists instead of detailed and contextualized information. The panel encourages the applicant to collaborate with other colleagues on a revisions, and to seek assistance on campus for developing a successful proposal. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

04MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Instruction and Research on Human Interactions
by Employing Eye Tracking Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jan Hondzinski

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 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 8 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (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: 69 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$87,166
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal requests funds to establish eye-tracking studies. The proposal makes a convincing case that the equipment will integrate well with existing equipment and programs, and will enhance research and education. However, the proposal is weak in several areas. The claims about the number of students and courses that the equipment will impact appear inflated. The two individual systems that are proposed could not be incorporated into more than a few psychology, kinesiology and industrial engineering classes, and therefore could not impact all majors in each discipline as the proposal claims. The proposal lists a large number of courses in three areas for which the proposed equipment would be appropriate, but provides no details or examples of how the equipment would be integrated into even one class. The proposal would have been stronger if it had provided a few detailed examples of specific exercises or activities that would be introduced into a smaller number of specific courses. It was unclear from the proposal how a single eye-tracking system could be used to provide a meaningful experience to an entire class, and the proposal would also have been stronger if it had included descriptions of student outcomes beyond "gaining experience" with eye-tracking equipment. The proposal presents data showing the quality of the programs involved, but does not make clear how the instrumentation requested will enhance the programs other than the advantages of exposure to advanced technology. It would have been stronger if the objectives had been measurable and related to strengthening research and education rather than tied only to acquiring and installing equipment. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05MUL-12
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Engineering B

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Multidisciplinary Option in Healthcare
System Management

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Ikuma

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)
D.2a 10 (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 12 (of 23 points)
B.3 13 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No X

F. Total Score:

| |
|----|
| 68 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$78,500
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to establish healthcare management courses targeted to engineers. The increasingly instrumental nature of medicine makes this a valuable goal, in principle. The project has a good team from industrial engineering and business with appropriate qualifications, and support from the healthcare industry is also very good. However, all of the activities described in the work plan are associated with the development of new courses and new course materials, and should be easily accomplished as part of normal duties without external funds. The proposal indicates that the departments involved and the industry sponsors will sustain the program. The departments and sponsors could also be expected to support the modest costs of program start-up. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06MUL-12
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Humanities

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ASPIRE II: Expanding Undergraduate Research Opportunities
in the College of Humanities & Social Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Janet McDonald

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 22 (of 23 points)
B.3 23 (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: 91 (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>\$29,600</u> | <u>\$29,600</u> |
| | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$29,600</u> | <u>\$29,600</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 funding to extend the ASPIRE academic-year research program to include a summer program (ASPIRE II). This is a well-argued proposal that builds on past programmatic success. One of LSU's Flagship 2020 goals is to produce students who become intellectual and civic leaders, with successes to be measured in part by "increase[ing] more students in undergraduate research". The proposed summer program will target freshmen and sophomores. This is a logical way of developing a pipeline of experienced students eager to participate in the more rigorous academic-year experiences currently available to juniors and seniors. Ten students will be offered a summer research experience, culminating with rewarding, valuable participation in a conference. The only weaknesses in the proposal are the lack of any institutional support, along with the lack of a plan for sustaining both ASPIRE I and ASPIRE II. The PIs should develop a plan for sustaining this outstanding research opportunity beyond BoRSF funding. Full funding is recommended in both years.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

07MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Social Sciences

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mobile Media User eXperience Research Enhancement
Grant (MMUX)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lance Porter

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 7 (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 15 (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 12 (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.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$103,320
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The PI requests funding to enhance mobile computing capabilities in the Manship School and CCT units at LSU-BR. By purchasing mobile units of different types and eye-tracking equipment, the PIs wish to raise their national profile in mobile device development and usage, and to train students in this rapidly changing domain. However, the proposal is presented on a rather broad level. Becoming better at digital/mobile is a good general goal, but funding specific equipment requires more detailed explanations. No benchmarks or criteria are provided. It is not clear what exactly will constitute success, whether it is a certain number of new students, applications, or business partnerships. It is also not clear how the equipment will be used in courses, or what the eye-tracking equipment, which is 40% of the budget, will be used for, and how and where. While the equipment will strengthen LSU-BR's standing in digital/mobile undergraduate education, it is not clear what the specific results will be. The evaluation criteria emphasize the number of students involved rather than student learning and achievement. Some firm evidence or indication that the equipment will, in fact, attract or retain more students would have helped. The above questions may well be a reflection of the style of presentation of the project, rather than the real worth of the proposed enhancement. Nevertheless, funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

08MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Social Sciences

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preparing Students for Next Generation Visual Research and
Design: A System for 3D Scanning and Digital Fabrication

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thomas Sofranko

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 _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 9 (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 19 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes N/A No _____

G. Total Score:

| |
|----|
| 93 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$91,347
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,032

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 PI seeks funds for purchase and installation of a 3D scanner and CNC mill for investigation and fabrication of objects and models in the College of Design. The proposal clearly describes the need for the equipment to serve multiple disciplines, including architecture, interior design, archeology and art. Although the work plan is not very detailed, the interdisciplinary use of the equipment, demonstrated by the PIs involved and all the support letters, is impressive. The description of the impact on curriculum could be more specific, particularly in reference to the numbers of students, but inclusion of an example does help. Evaluation and assessment are also somewhat unclear in the proposal. No clear standards or criteria for success are provided. In this overall strong proposal, the lack of an institutional match is disappointing. Reduced funding is recommended with no funding recommended for installation and personnel training. Other reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09MUL-12
Humanities

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Campus Internationalization through the Global Connections Residential College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Meredith Veldman

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 23 points)
B.3 18 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (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: 73 (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>\$75,825</u> | <u>\$44,350</u> |
| | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

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

This is a novel approach to enhancing campus internationalization at LSU-BR through the residential college format. National data have proven that learning communities increase student retention. The development of global competencies is increasingly seen as a required component of a 21st century undergraduate education. The proposal suggests that the residential college is in hiatus; it would have been valuable to know the actual reason for this and what has been done to improve the chance for future success. A coherent and focused case is not made for how all of the project pieces will be integrated to "recruit and retain both American and international students." While the idea to use LSU students abroad to enhance student learning on campus is highly attractive, the proposal does not provide details regarding implementation (type of assignments, asynchronous/synchronous, integration, etc.). It may be more difficult to accomplish than presented in the proposal. It was not made clear what benefits, if any, international students would receive from this project. The proposed "domestic study abroad" for international students to learn about important sites of U.S. history is creative, but not fully developed in the proposal. A compelling and detailed rationale for the purchase of 50 iPads was not presented. The speaker series is a good idea, though harder to justify with such limited available funds. The proposal would have been stronger if it had focused on fewer, more defined areas of activity. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

10MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Social Sciences

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: GIS Laboratory Enhancement Grant: Positioning and Mobile Technologies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Irene Casas

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 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 6 (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 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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 N/A No _____

G. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$46,502
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This relatively modest proposal requests funds to augment GPS capability to support instruction and other work in a combined GIS program between social sciences and forestry at Louisiana Tech. The proposal seems intuitively sensible, and a small institutional match is commendable, but the case for need is not well made. Although the program is growing, it has so far produced only 20 graduates, raising questions of relative costs and benefits. The evaluation section is rather vague. It does not reference numbers of current or expected students, and no hard criteria for measuring success were described. Some examples of class field projects using the equipment or descriptions of how students would conduct the exercises would have solidified the proposal. It is also not clear how the equipment will be productively shared between the units. Impact on recruitment and retention is offered more as a hope than as a certainty. It seems as though the goal of the project is to attract students, which is a means but not an end of higher education programs. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

11MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering B

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer Upgrade for College-wide Nanotechnology Teaching Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Daniela Mainardi

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 0 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (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 9 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (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:

| |
|----|
| 64 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: \$67,035
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal requests funding to replace computer workstations used by the Nanosystems program at Louisiana Tech, principally for a nanosystems modeling course that draws students from several engineering disciplines. The enhancement plan addresses only equipment acquisition and installation, which is perhaps reasonable given the type of request, but the proposed equipment update does not appear to significantly increase existing multidisciplinary activities or significantly change the curriculum. The proposal honestly identifies other computing resources that are available, including some that were scheduled to be updated by the end of 2011 through another Enhancement grant. Eliminating "minor irritations" is not a strong argument for enhanced faculty development. The impacts that are described are important, but the case that available resources are not sufficient to achieve them is less than compelling. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

12MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering B

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multidisciplinary Auditory Research Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sheryl Shoemaker

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 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 2 (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 9 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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: 63 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$75,400

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks funds to develop an Auditory Research Laboratory at Louisiana Tech. While the title and project summary describe a collaboration between speech and biomedical engineering programs, this is not made clear in the narrative. The rationale for the project and impact on current resources have extensive information about the Department of Speech but very little about Biomedical Engineering. The work plan addresses only acquisition and installation of equipment. There is no discussion about how multidisciplinary collaboration will be facilitated or enabled. The evidence of potential to achieve eminence section considers only speech. All of the curricular enhancements are in speech. Similarly, Biomedical Engineering is not mentioned under economic development and impact. In summary, this is essentially a proposal from a single non-engineering discipline. It is not a truly multidisciplinary proposal. The benefits accrue to the Department of Speech with relatively minor potential benefits to the Biomedical Engineering program and the project should not be funded under this program. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13MUL-12
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Humanities

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana@200: An Interdisciplinary Exploration of Two
Hundred Years of Louisiana History and Life

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Virginia Thompson

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 18 (of 23 points)
B.3 20 (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 _____ No X

F. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$16,650
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to fund a series of outside speakers to celebrate 200 years of statehood in 2012. Celebration of Louisiana history is the right kind of project for Louisiana Tech given its institutional commitment to engagement and outreach. The PI is a public historian who clearly understand the importance of community engagement. The outreach to other campuses and public libraries in the region is a strategic and valuable component of this proposal. The College of Liberal Arts promotes annual "themes of inquiry" and this year's theme is "Louisiana @200". This plan to recruit outside speakers is aligned with this year's theme and a series of targeted courses offered in fall 2012. The speakers will visit the targeted classes in addition to providing public lectures for the campus and outside community. The PI plans to bring in a speaker every other week throughout the fall quarter. From the perspective of both faculty and students, as well as from the community point of view, this may be too much activity to compress into a short period of time. A better idea might be hosting fewer speakers or spreading activities out over two quarters, so that the events are not rushed or perceived as a burden instead of the education enhancement that the PI envisions. The budget narrative is the weakest component of this proposal. In-kind and matching contributions are not easily distinguished from the funds being requested. This is further complicated by inconsistencies in the tabular and narrative budget segments (e.g., the budget lists \$16,650 while the narrative includes \$19,000 for speaking fees). Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

14MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Humanities

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: 21st Century Information Literacy

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jessica Hutchings

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$70,103

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal requests new computing equipment for the McNeese library. It has potential for institution-wide impact. Updating the library's technology involves securing tools and equipment necessary for teaching, learning, and information gathering. The PI includes three components: an information commons, a refurbished library instruction classroom, and equipment for mobile librarianship. The proposal adequately addresses ADA compliance in the spaces described. Most university libraries have an "instruction commons" hub where students can gather to carry out research and/or collaborate with peers, and in this and other ways the proposal is in alignment with the evolving role of academic libraries. The enhanced technology classroom is planned for use not only by students, but also by faculty and staff for a variety of professional development activities. While the merits of investing in library access and services for the campus are clear, the work plan provided by the PI is minimal with little or no description of the activities to be undertaken, no indication of which individuals are responsible for which tasks, little detail on timing of activities, and no benchmarking of accomplishments. Without this detailed information, it is not possible to assess the ability of the PIs to accomplish the work plan. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15MUL-12
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Humanities

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Bayou Studies Resource Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Alexander

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 22 (of 23 points)
B.3 25 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (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:

| |
|----|
| 97 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$62,250
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,250

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 well-written and carefully planned proposal to establish a Bayou Studies Resource Center (BSRC) at Nicholls. Led by faculty in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, the project team seeks to enhance bayou research opportunities, student learning, and outreach. The region is distinct from the rest of southern Louisiana, linguistically, ethnically, culturally, ecologically, and geologically. A minor degree already exists in Bayou Studies. This proposal envisions strengthening the minor and developing research and outreach opportunities. A major strength of the proposal is the participation of, and potential impact on, other disciplines in the social sciences, sciences, business, and culinary arts. The PI has secured a commitment of space where books/artifacts, computer equipment, and display cases will be housed to showcase BSRC materials and to serve as a research hub for students, faculty, and community members. The proposed BSRC will raise public visibility of the University. This is a strategic project that an institution like Nicholls should be developing because of its unique location in the heart of the bayou region and the ability to build on established areas of strength like ecology, geography, and culinary arts. The plan to appoint an advisory board is absolutely critical to the success of the PI's plan for the BSRC to serve as a regional public resource. In this lean funding year for BoRSF, the panel recommends funding at a reduced level of \$50,250 with funding for two graduate students, rather than three, to begin development work on the BSRC.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

16MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading Autoclaves for Microbiology Education

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 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 7 (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 15 (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: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$92,510

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal requests replacement of two aging autoclaves in the Department of Biological Sciences at Nicholls. The proposal did not clearly justify the need for two new autoclaves, and described housing for only a single autoclave. Most important, it is not clear how this proposal is interdisciplinary since it seemed that the equipment to be replaced is housed in the Department of Biological Sciences, the replacements likewise, and only that department will benefit. Because the proposed enhancement is not interdisciplinary, it should not be funded under the Multidisciplinary program. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

17MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Fostering Undergraduate Research in the Humanities and
Sciences at Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Deborah Cibelli

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 3 (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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (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 12 (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: \$44,271
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to foster undergraduate participation in interdisciplinary research, including conference presentations, which is a worthy goal. The proposal was submitted as primarily for equipment, yet equipment makes up less than half of the budget. It would have been strengthened by some examples of the type of interdisciplinary projects that would foster undergraduate research. The proposal states that the project "will encourage faculty mentoring of students in General Education courses for the promotion of undergraduate research based upon critical thinking and reflection", but there are no details presented to show how this will happen, what courses or faculty will be involved or how the projects will be initiated among students. The current expectation is that posters will be printed on glossy paper by large format printers, and this has resulted in significant costs for poster presentations. The proposal would have been stronger had it focused on preparation, printing and travel needs for students currently engaged in undergraduate research through existing programs. The weakness of the plan raises questions about the number of students who would be involved and whether the quality of the research would justify an investment in poster-making and travel. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

18MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Undergraduate Curricula with Nanotechnology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Glenn Lo

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 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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (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: 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$259,400
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks funding for a complete teaching package ("NanoProfessor") including instruments for nanotechnology at Nicholls. The overall cost includes a desktop fabrication system, atomic force microscope, fluorescence microscope, PowerPoint lectures and e-tutorials, 20 sets of textbooks and lab guides, two years of consumable supplies, and training. The proposal is interdisciplinary, involving several different departments across the University. The participating faculty are generally well qualified, though there is little discussion of experience in nanotechnology. The proposal includes sample experiments that show how the system could be integrated into many different courses and could be used for K-12 outreach activities. Investment in this equipment has the potential to be transformative for the institution, both in how it educates its own students and the quality of its outreach activities. However, there are concerns associated with purchasing a ready-assembled package at this cost. The proposal would have been strengthened by more information about the kind and expense of the maintenance required for this instrumentation. Purchasing such an extensive package is a somewhat extraordinary step for a university, where the PIs would normally be expected to develop their own lecture materials, the students would buy textbooks, and any equipment would be separately proposed. Given the large investment requested, the institution should provide a larger match. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

19MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collaborative Instrumentation for Undergraduate Instruction
and Research in Marine Biology and Chemistry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Earl Melancon

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 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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (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: 89 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$117,091

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$102,479

(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 requests funding for an ion chromatography system at Nicholls. The proposal is truly interdisciplinary, involving several different departments across the University. The participating faculty are generally well qualified. Teaching and research applications are well described. The proposal includes examples that show how the ion chromatography system would be integrated into many different courses, although some of the examples are more convincing than others. There is no institutional match, and given the large investment requested, the institution should be expected to provide a share, perhaps contributing the cost of the glassware and supplies. Partial funding is recommended for the equipment if additional monies become available, with reductions in the equipment budget to be made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

20MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing E-Learning Technology for Students of Biology
and Social Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rajkumar Nathaniel

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 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 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (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:

| |
|----|
| 90 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

| | |
|--|--|
| SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: | Requested Amount: <u>\$15,300</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$15,300</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 requests funds to replace old video equipment and upgrade computer video in multimedia teaching areas at Nicholls. The need is significant, given the age of the existing equipment. Generally, the proposal is well argued. Presenting more details of courses that use the multimedia facilities would have helped, though the course delivered through video from 50 miles away at LUMCON is a good use of the facility, as are lectures recorded for student viewing later. The proposal would have been strengthened by greater detail about class or educational activities that could only occur using the proposed equipment. This a modest investment in a situation where need exists. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

21MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Paradigm Shift in Coastal Monitoring from Boats to
Unmanned Aerial Vehicles

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Balaji Ramachandran

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

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 Requested Amount: \$159,600
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a proposal to acquire an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) to enhance coastal monitoring in south Louisiana. The PIs have drawn on expertise in the community, and have secured matching funds from partner organizations to offset the cost of the equipment. The partnership with the community college is a strength of the proposal and the included letter of commitment suggests that the partnership will be productive. The proposal is generally very well written, making a persuasive case for the UAV acquisition. However, the RFP specifically prohibits requesting funds for the "purchase of motorized vehicles such as cars, vans, boats, etc. (Section V.F.4.)". The panel suggests reworking the proposal for submission to another grant funding source. Concerns included a lack of details about how the community college students will participate. The proposal would have also been strengthened by a clearer explanation of what the proposed UAV can do that the currently used UAV cannot do. The evaluation plan is weak. The PIs propose several initiatives and predict a significant impact on the quality of the students and faculty development, but little is provided to indicate how the impact will be assessed. Retaining accreditation does not seem like a good performance measure for the success of this project or the degree to which it has achieved its goals. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

22MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Humanities

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Faculty and Undergraduate Student Readiness for
Online Learning in the Disciplines of English,
Communications and Biology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Ralph

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 _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 9 (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 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (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: 94 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$96,100

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$85,100

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 well-written and detailed proposal to improve online learning in English, Communications and Biology. A University-wide study concluded that difficulties in navigating virtual learning continue to be an impediment to student and faculty success in online courses, and identified the need for enhanced training for both students and faculty. The student audience in the greater New Orleans area is largely non-traditional and seeks out online delivery of instruction. The panel views the investment of time and resources in this project as highly strategic, recognizing that quality of online course delivery and student readiness for virtual learning is a challenge for most institutions. The PIs present a careful plan for assessing student readiness for the online environment, redesigning current training for faculty who teach online and more careful monitoring on course evaluations. There is enormous potential for a positive impact on student learning. All budget items seem reasonable with the exception of two consultants for training and evaluation. According to the Quality Matters website, a paid subscription includes free training for two. The PIs could attend and then train the other participants. The lead PI, given his expertise in academic program management, should be able to assess the effectiveness of the enhancement as the project proceeds. The panel therefore recommends funding at a reduced level with no funding for the consultants. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:
ROOT DISCIPLINE:

23MUL-12
Humanities

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Arts-based Program Enhancement: Creating New
Pedagogical Tools for Multidisciplinary Programs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Riep

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

G. Total Score: 83 (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>\$92,383</u> | <u>\$36,671</u> |
| | Recommended Amount: | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

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 to prepare existing African art collections for display and education. The University offers the only Museum Studies Program in Louisiana. The two PIs possess impressive academic credentials and experience, contribute a broad range of expertise, and are uniquely positioned to bring to fruition the proposed enhancement. The African collection is a unique resource. The artifacts in the collection have never been researched and information on their origin/value has never been published. Some of the artifacts were damaged in the Hurricane Katrina aftermath, so their preservation and documentation are urgent. However, the co-PIs submitted a BoRSF proposal to the Humanities competition that greatly overlapped with this proposal, including duplicate requests for summer support, student assistants, funding for speakers, and equipment. Neither PI disclosed the dual BoRSF requests in either proposal as required. Without full disclosure, explanation and justification within the rules and criteria set forth in the RFP, it is impossible for the panel to know if the requests for time and equipment are, in fact, necessary or are simply duplicated. In the future, the PIs should adhere to all proposal requirements, especially for disclosure. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

24MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Computer/Info. Sciences

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Build a 3D Graphic Programming Lab at SUNO for
Enhancing Student's Learning and Facilitating Faculty
Members Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yanjun Yu

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 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 12 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (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 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.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$63,038
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal requests equipment and software to create a 3D graphic simulation lab to teach 3D programming and modeling to Management Information Systems, Mathematics, and Biology students. The rationale and impact on existing resources sections are strong. The goals and objectives are appropriate. The enhancement plan seems appropriate, but is very general. A stronger case could have been made for how each objective will be evaluated in detail, and for how this project will raise the department to a higher level of eminence, or maintain a current high level of eminence. The economic and/or cultural development and impact sections could be stronger. As presented, and in a lean funding year, the Panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

25MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Social Sciences

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Center for Designing, Composing and Recording Digital Audio
for Film, Video and Multimedia

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Blue

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 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (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 12 (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
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: \$227,002
Recommended Amount: \$227,002

(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 requests funding to acquire new audio equipment for film, video and multimedia at Tulane. It would modernize and qualitatively improve sound production in the PI's teaching, research and production. The work plan is feasible, and the scope of the enhancements is clear. A number of support letters testify to the PI's stature in the field. Although there is an informative description of Tulane's many achievements and attributes in this area, it is less than clear precisely whether and how this equipment will catapult the departments involved into eminence. This technology will certainly constitute an improvement, but it is not quite so evident that it will dramatically improve the curriculum, attract additional students, or enhance faculty, as claimed. Performance measures are a strong aspect of the proposal. Tulane's institutional match is a positive, suggesting a commitment to the project. The cost of the AVID Pro Tools system is nearly half of the budget, and the majority of the other requested items are necessary to utilize it. This is a problem in a lean funding year because the budget cannot be reduced significantly. Full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 26MUL-12
Humanities

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Hispanic World Sources for the Twenty-First Century

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leslie Bary

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 19 (of 23 points)
B.3 19 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 76 (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 |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| | | Recommended Amount: | |
| | | <u>\$130,000</u> | <u>\$50,000</u> |
| | | <u>\$0</u> | <u>\$0</u> |

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

This is an ambitious proposal that builds on previous BoRSF support, and seeks to expand resources in Hispanic Studies at the Edith Garland Dupre Library. The University already has impressive collections of resources related to the Hispanic World, including the Louisiana Colonial Records Collections, the Center for Louisiana Studies, the Center for Cultural and Eco-Tourism and the University Art Museum. Enhancing the collection of materials for students and faculty carrying out research in the Hispanic World is a valuable undertaking. However, the significant budget request over two years is not very realistic given the limited funds available for this competition and the somewhat narrow focus of this proposal. Furthermore, the PIs do not address the institution's financial commitment to enhancing this collection over time. The section on evaluation measures does not adequately address how the proposed work will be evaluated. Given the level of funding requested, there does need to be a rigorous assessment plan to determine the impact of this investment. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 27MUL-12
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Computer/Info. Sciences

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: 3D Visualization for Curriculum Enhancement in Computer Science, Civil Engineering, and Earth Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christoph Borst

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 9 (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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 20 (of 23 points)
B.3 18 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (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:

| |
|----|
| 82 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$82,673
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$0

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

This proposal requests funds to develop software and applications specific to visualization problems and to education of Computer Science, Earth Sciences, and Civil Engineering students. The project has access to a wide range of 3D visualization hardware. Pls have established a solid research record. While faculty expertise is excellent, it is difficult to estimate the competence of future staff (research associate & graduate students) on which the project depends for success. The project has limited impact on existing resources and does not strengthen the computing infrastructure. The economic and cultural development and impact section could be stronger. The goals and objectives are general, though clearly stated. The project could be strengthened with more detailed objectives. The enhancement plan provides a schedule of activities and seems appropriate, but is very general and could use a clearer, stronger case for how the project will evaluate each objective in detail. The evidence for achieving eminence is weak. In this lean funding year, funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

28MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Social Sciences

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Interdisciplinary Field Recording Techniques Course

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark DeWitt

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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 N/A 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:

\$40,867

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks funds for equipment and faculty salary to develop a course in field recording techniques. The argument for need is not convincing. The new course does not appear to have been approved, or perhaps even considered for approval. The course and the equipment seem to be modest additions that would enhance the program marginally, but they do not appear to have the potential for catapulting the program to eminence in any regard. If a multidisciplinary course is needed, it is not clear why the course could not be developed without an Enhancement Program award. Existing equipment presumably could be used to test the course's impact and attractiveness. If those outcomes were positive, an equipment grant could then follow. The assessment and performance measures are legitimate, but they do not speak forcefully to the final educational effect of the course or equipment. In short, the proposal is not compelling. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

29MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering B

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Adsorption Analyzer for Developing High
Capacity Oil Adsorption Materials for Oil Spills Cleanup

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Daniel Gang

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 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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (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: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$64,435

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal requests funding for an Adsorption Analyzer for testing materials used in oil-spill cleanup. The technical rationale for the project is clear, but it is not clear that the project extends beyond the boundaries of environmental engineering even though the listed PIs are from several engineering disciplines. The work plan describes only equipment acquisition aspects but does not provide any insights into the types of projects that will be carried out other than one existing project of the lead PI. The proposal would be stronger with more information about the range of projects and activities that will be supported across the disciplines. The relationships with industry and sponsors may be good, but the presentation lacks any specific information. In a lean funding year, funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

30MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering B

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Tracking Oil Spill Fate Materials in Seawater with Computer Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Boyun Guo

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 5 (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
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: \$80,076
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a proposal to acquire equipment to measure diffusion of components from degrading oil spills through seawater. The title of the proposal emphasizes computer technology yet the actual goal is to acquire an instrument that will provide diffusion data that can be used, in part, to assess the adequacy of computer models already developed by the PI's group. The work plan describes only the acquisition of the equipment and, beyond the implied aspect of evaluating the computer models, does not describe the actual experiments that will be conducted and their role in evaluating oil spill dispersal. In addition, there are few to no details of any other applications of the equipment. Similarly, the description of potential to achieve eminence is quite general and does not demonstrate that the proposed equipment acquisition is essential or even important to achieving this goal. Four faculty members are listed as participating in the proposal but the information about their substantive role in the project is very limited. The economic and cultural impact section seems to address impacts from research that will result from the acquisition of the equipment, but this link to research projects is not clearly defined anywhere in the proposal. In summary, this proposal requests equipment designed to address the needs of one existing research project, and the case that it will find other uses is not made. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

31MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering B

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Equipment for Enhancing Piezoelectric and
Sensor Array Fabrication

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mohammad Madani

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 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 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (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 10 (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
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: \$159,790
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to acquire a carbon nanotube deposition system and apply it to sensor array fabrication. The case for this enhancement has shortcomings. The arguments are very general. The relationship between the proposed equipment and existing facilities is not clear and somewhat contradictory. Is the proposed acquisition to be used with smart structures only or are additional applications envisioned? The objectives are very general and the plan addresses the equipment acquisition only. There is little information about the types of projects that will be undertaken. Similarly, the discussion of potential basically states that the proposed acquisition integrates well with the current situation, but it does not make the case that it is necessary or that it will significantly improve capabilities. The issues discussed in the faculty development section apply equally well with or without this equipment. The faculty is well qualified, but given the weak development of the proposed uses of the equipment, it is not clear that these individuals are best suited to obtain value from the enhancement. The discussion of impact is very generic and mainly involves other issues and programs, not the proposed enhancement. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

32MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering B

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Raman and FTIR Microscopes for Materials Science and
Biological Research and Teaching

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thomas Pesacreta

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 2.5 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 87.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$219,128

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$117,729

(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 requests funding for Raman and FTIR instruments in the Microscopy Center. The new instrumentation would benefit research in biology and, to a lesser extent, in various types of materials science. Instructional use is of lesser importance, but the facilities would be used for graduate training, in graduate courses, and in some undergraduate settings. The goals primarily address equipment acquisition and do not address multidisciplinary enhancements that will be enabled. The work plan and evidence of potential sections make the case convincingly that the equipment will benefit several researchers in biology, and it appears to be useful, but not as essential, to the engineering programs involved (chemical, civil, industrial technology). All impact on curriculum is in biology. The discussion of impact on faculty development and student quality could apply to the acquisition of just about any piece of sophisticated equipment in any institution. Of the two instruments, the Raman microscope appears to have the most applications. There is no institutional match. Funding is recommended for the Raman microscope if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

33MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Social Sciences

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Cinema-grade Production Equipment for the Departments of
Communication and Moving Image Arts at UL Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charles Richard

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$180,155
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$95,242

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 requests funds for film production equipment in the Departments of Communication and Moving Image Arts. The request is in response to a new major in Moving Image Arts established in 2010. After a single year the program had an enrollment of 58 students, likely due to the high level of film production in Louisiana and the related employment opportunities for graduates. This request is for additional and improved equipment for the growing body of students enrolled in these programs, with the argument that employment in today's movie production industry will require the students to have had exposure to state-of-the-art equipment and procedures. The core request is for the purchase of 20 cinema-grade cameras for approximately \$90,000. The ancillary equipment nearly doubles the total request. The performance measures are weak, but the proposal is strong overall. It should be a priority for BoRSF to support training for an activity that has become important in Louisiana. The lack of hard institutional match is very disappointing. Funding is recommended at a reduced level for a scaled-back project that will still have significant educational impact. Reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

34MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Biological Sciences

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Spectroscopy and Macromolecule
Characterization Techniques in Undergraduate Laboratories
for Chemistry, Biology and Engineering Majors

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wu Xu

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 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 18 (of 18 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (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:

| |
|----|
| 96 |
|----|

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$38,261

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$38,261

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 to acquire a UVVisible spectrophotometer and needed low-temperature freezer. The equipment adds UVVisible capability and replaces an older freezer that does not attain sufficiently low temperatures. The facility is truly interdisciplinary and will benefit instruction and research in biology, chemistry, and chemical engineering. The operation and significance of the equipment is very clearly explained, as is its use in laboratory courses. A minor defect in presentation is that the performance measures section is primarily a description of activities that will be undertaken rather than a description of how the impact of the activities will be assessed. The enhancement appears to achieve significant impact for a modest investment. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

35MUL-12

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering B

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of 3-D Optical Profiler for Research and Education
in Materials Science

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leszek Malkinski

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 9 (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 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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$101,450
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$101,450

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 proposal to acquire a 3D optical profiler. The team is a good mix of senior and junior faculty from several disciplines. The requested equipment will be utilized in an existing multi-disciplinary institute and significantly extends the capabilities of the institute and the University. It will benefit several units. The acquisition also supports the University's plans to develop a materials science program, a significant impact on curriculum. At the moment, however, the impact on instruction is not detailed. The discussion of economic development and impact is not as strong as it could be and is conventional. These deficiencies are minor detractors from an otherwise well-written proposal. The budget consists entirely of the optical profiler plus a modest cost for installation and training, so reducing of the budget is impossible. Full funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

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

| Proposal Number | PI Name | Institution | Duration | Equipment/ Non | New/ Continuation | Project Title | Amount Requested | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|----------|-------------------|----------------------|--|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total |
| 001MUL-12 | Hurst,Charlotte | Dillard University | 1 | E | N | Qualitative Research and Learning Laboratory (QURALL) | \$121,148.00 | \$0.00 | \$121,148.00 |
| 002MUL-12 | Louis,Lynda | Dillard University | 2 | E | N | Establishing an Enhanced Learning Environment Using State-of-the-Art Technologies for Upper Level Computer Science and Related Interdisciplinary Courses with Emphasis on Computer Graphics, Robotics and Simulation | \$175,942.00 | \$0.00 | \$175,942.00 |
| 003MUL-12 | Newsome,Janella | Dillard University | 1 | E | N | Enhance Proposal for Dillard University Radio Station | \$95,722.00 | \$0.00 | \$95,722.00 |
| 004MUL-12 | Hondzinski,Jan | Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge | 1 | E | N | Enhancing Instruction and Research on Human Interactions by Employing Eye Tracking Technology | \$87,166.00 | \$0.00 | \$87,166.00 |
| 005MUL-12 | Ikuma,Laura | Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge | 1 | NE | N | Development of a Multidisciplinary Option in Healthcare System Management | \$78,500.00 | \$0.00 | \$78,500.00 |
| 006MUL-12 | McDonald,Janet | Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge | 2 | NE | N | ASPIRE II: Expanding undergraduate research opportunities in the College of Humanities & Social Sciences | \$29,600.00 | \$29,600.00 | \$59,200.00 |
| 007MUL-12 | Porter,Lance | Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge | 1 | E | N | Mobile Media User eXperience Research Enhancement Grant (MMUX) | \$103,320.00 | \$0.00 | \$103,320.00 |
| 008MUL-12 | Sofranko,Thomas | Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge | 1 | E | N | Preparing Students for Next Generation Visual Research and Design: A System for 3D Scanning and Digital Fabrication | \$91,347.00 | \$0.00 | \$91,347.00 |
| 009MUL-12 | Veldman,Meredith | Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge | 2 | NE | N | Enhancing Campus Internationalization through the Global Connections Residential College | \$75,825.00 | \$44,350.00 | \$120,175.00 |

| Proposal Number | PI Name | Institution | Duration | Equipment/ Non | New/ Continuation | Project Title | Amount Requested | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|----------|----------------|-------------------|--|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total |
| 010MUL-12 | Casas,Irene | Louisiana Tech University | | 1 E | N | GIS Laboratory Enhancement Grant: Positioning and Mobile Technologies | \$46,502.00 | \$0.00 | \$46,502.00 |
| 011MUL-12 | Mainardi,Daniela | Louisiana Tech University | | 1 E | N | Computer Upgrade for College-wide Nanotechnology Teaching Laboratory | \$67,035.00 | \$0.00 | \$67,035.00 |
| 012MUL-12 | Shoemaker,Sheryl | Louisiana Tech University | | 1 E | N | Multidisciplinary Auditory Research Laboratory | \$75,400.00 | \$0.00 | \$75,400.00 |
| 013MUL-12 | Thompson,Virginia | Louisiana Tech University | | 1 NE | N | Louisiana@200: An Interdisciplinary Exploration of Two Hundred Years of Louisiana History and Life | \$16,650.00 | \$0.00 | \$16,650.00 |
| 014MUL-12 | Hutchings,Jessica | McNeese State University | | 1 E | N | 21st Century Information Literacy | \$70,103.00 | \$0.00 | \$70,103.00 |
| 015MUL-12 | Alexander,Robert | Nicholls State University | | 1 NE | N | Bayou Studies Resource Center | \$62,250.00 | \$0.00 | \$62,250.00 |
| 016MUL-12 | Boopathy,Raj | Nicholls State University | | 1 E | N | Upgrading Autoclaves for Microbiology Education | \$92,510.00 | \$0.00 | \$92,510.00 |
| 017MUL-12 | Cibelli,Deborah | Nicholls State University | | 1 E | N | Fostering Undergraduate Research in the Humanities and Sciences at Nicholls State University | \$44,271.00 | \$0.00 | \$44,271.00 |
| 018MUL-12 | Lo,Glenn | Nicholls State University | | 1 E | N | Enhancing Undergraduate Curricula with Nanotechnology | \$259,400.00 | \$0.00 | \$259,400.00 |
| 019MUL-12 | Melancon,Earl | Nicholls State University | | 1 E | N | Collaborative Instrumentation for Undergraduate Instruction and Research in Marine Biology and Chemistry | \$117,091.00 | \$0.00 | \$117,091.00 |
| 020MUL-12 | Nathaniel,Rajkumar | Nicholls State University | | 1 E | N | Enhancing E-Learning Technology for Students of Biology and Social Sciences | \$15,300.00 | \$0.00 | \$15,300.00 |
| 021MUL-12 | Ramachandran,Balaji | Nicholls State University | | 1 E | N | A Paradigm Shift in Coastal Monitoring from Boats to Unmanned Aerial Vehicles | \$159,600.00 | \$0.00 | \$159,600.00 |
| 022MUL-12 | Ralph,Michael | Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans | | 1 E | N | Enhancing faculty and Undergraduate student readiness for online learning in the disciplines of English, Communications and Biology. | \$96,100.00 | \$0.00 | \$96,100.00 |
| 023MUL-12 | Riep,David | Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans | | 2 E | N | Arts-based Program Enhancement: Creating New Pedagogical Tools for Multidisciplinary Programs | \$92,383.00 | \$36,671.00 | \$129,054.00 |

| Proposal Number | PI Name | Institution | Duration | Equipment/ Non | New/ Continuation | Project Title | Amount Requested | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|----------|----------------|-------------------|---|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total |
| 024MUL-12 | Yu,Yanjun | Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans | | 1 E | N | Build a 3D Graphic Programming Lab at SUNO for Enhancing Student's Learning and Facilitating Faculty Members Research | \$63,038.00 | \$0.00 | \$63,038.00 |
| 025MUL-12 | Blue,Mary | Tulane University | | 1 E | N | Center for Designing, Composing and Recording Digital Audio for Film, Video and Multimedia | \$227,002.00 | \$0.00 | \$227,002.00 |
| 026MUL-12 | Bary,Leslie | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 2 NE | N | Hispanic World Sources for the Twenty-First Century | \$130,000.00 | \$50,000.00 | \$180,000.00 |
| 027MUL-12 | Borst,Christoph | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 NE | N | 3D Visualization for Curriculum Enhancement in Computer Science, Civil Engineering, and Earth Sciences | \$82,673.00 | \$0.00 | \$82,673.00 |
| 028MUL-12 | DeWitt,Mark | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 E | N | Interdisciplinary Field Recording Techniques Course | \$40,867.00 | \$0.00 | \$40,867.00 |
| 029MUL-12 | Gang,Daniel | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 E | N | Acquisition of Adsorption Analyzer for Developing High Capacity Oil Adsorption Materials for Oil Spills Cleanup | \$64,435.00 | \$0.00 | \$64,435.00 |
| 030MUL-12 | Guo,Boyun | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 E | N | Tracking Oil Spill Fate Materials in Seawater with Computer Technology | \$80,076.00 | \$0.00 | \$80,076.00 |
| 031MUL-12 | Madani, Mohammad | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 E | N | Acquisition of Equipment for Enhancing Piezoelectric and Sensor Array Fabrication | \$159,790.00 | \$0.00 | \$159,790.00 |
| 032MUL-12 | Pesacreta,Thomas | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 E | N | Raman and FTIR microscopes for materials science and biological research and teaching | \$219,128.00 | \$0.00 | \$219,128.00 |
| 033MUL-12 | Richard,Charles | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 E | N | Cinema-grade Production Equipment for the Departments of Communication and Moving Image Arts at UL Lafayette | \$180,155.00 | \$0.00 | \$180,155.00 |
| 034MUL-12 | Xu,Wu | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | | 1 E | N | Enhancement of Spectroscopy and Macromolecule Characterization Techniques in Undergraduate Laboratories for Chemistry, Biology and Engineering Majors | \$38,261.00 | \$0.00 | \$38,261.00 |

| Proposal Number | PI Name | Institution | Duration | Equipment/Non | New/Continuation | Project Title | Amount Requested | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------|---------------|------------------|---|------------------|--------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | Year 1 | Year 2 | Total |
| 035MUL-12 | Malkinski, Leszek | University of New Orleans | 1 | E | N | Acquisition of 3-D Optical Profiler for Research and Education in Materials Science | \$101,450.00 | \$0.00 | \$101,450.00 |

***The RFP restricts second year funding requests to no more than \$50,000.**

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Total Number of Proposals submitted | 35 |
| Total Money Requested for First Year | \$3,460,040.00 |
| Total Money Requested for Second Year | \$160,621.00 |
| Total Money Requested | \$3,620,661.00 |

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)