

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

February 2012

Prepared by:

John Johannes (Chair)
Villanova University

John Pauly
Marquette University

ENHANCEMENT REVIEW REPORT

SOCIAL SCIENCES

FY 2011-12

Introduction

The Social Sciences Review Panel consisting of Dr. John Johannes, Villanova University, and Dr. John Pauly, Provost, Marquette University, communicated via e-mail and phone during February 2012 to evaluate twenty-eight (28) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Boards of Regents Support Fund.

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

The twenty-eight (28) Social Sciences proposals submitted in FY 2011-12 requested a total of \$2,285,789 in first-year funds. Five (5) proposals were highly recommended for funding, two (2) of them at reduced levels.

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

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

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
1	92	16SS-12	Northwestern	\$62,500	\$62,500		
2*	89	07SS-12	LSU-BR	\$71,920	\$54,000		
2*	89	27SS-12	UNO	\$155,485	\$155,485		
4	88	09SS-12	LSU-BR	\$134,308	\$86,800		
5	87	13SS-12	LaTech	\$37,600	\$37,600		
Totals				\$461,813	\$396,385	\$0	\$0

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

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
6	86	04SS-12	LSU-BR	\$33,835	\$23,000		
7	85	20SS-12	Tulane	\$80,800	\$54,360		
8	84	18SS-12	SLU	\$91,254	\$61,860		
Totals				\$205,889	\$139,220	\$0	\$0

Traditional Enhancement Table III
Not Recommended for Funding

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
9	81	06SS-12	LSU-BR	\$186,540	\$0		
9	81	08SS-12	LSU-BR	\$186,596	\$0		
9	81	15SS-12	Nicholls	\$31,547	\$0		
9	81	23SS-12	UL-L	\$127,195	\$0		
9	81	26SS-12	UL-M	\$89,938	\$0		
14	80	22SS-12	UL-L	\$43,724	\$0		
15	79	17SS-12	SLU	\$14,055	\$0		
15	79	24SS-12	UL-L	\$125,091	\$0		
17	77	05SS-12	LSU-BR	\$93,749	\$0	\$45,334	\$0
18	76	10SS-12	LSU-S	\$57,730	\$0		
18	76	11SS-12	LaTech	\$21,500	\$0		
20	75	03SS-12	LSU-A	\$59,379	\$0		
21	72	28SS-12	Xavier	\$139,209	\$0	\$37,796	\$0
22	71	19SS-12	SLU	\$10,298	\$0		
23	70	12SS-12	LaTech	\$18,900	\$0		
24	69	14SS-12	LaTech	\$46,000	\$0		
25	68	01SS-12	BPCC	\$24,586	\$0		
26	64	21SS-12	Tulane	\$183,240	\$0	\$23,540	\$0
27	56	25SS-12	UL-M	\$37,410	\$0		
28	35	02SS-12	BPCC	\$121,400	\$0		
Totals				\$1,618,087	\$0	\$106,670	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01SS-12

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Social Sciences Instruction with Global Studies Curriculum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kay Boston

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 20 (of 23 points)
B.3 19 (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 x No _____

F. Total Score:

68

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$24,586</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The goal of this project, to create a curriculum that promotes global understanding, is sound, and BPCC is to be congratulated for attempting to move in this direction. However, the projected outcome of this proposal is somewhat exaggerated, and the plan to yield the desired outcome is vague. Many of the elements of the work plan could have already been accomplished and appear to consist of "planning to plan". It should not require an outside expert or travel to a conference to design a world-diversity curriculum. Selecting or creating courses involving non-American content is not difficult to do, nor is it hard to point students to global online resources. The proposal assumes that taking several courses will make a marked difference in training a "globally aware" workforce. The institutional match is very strong, yet these funds alone, perhaps allocated differently, would get the project moving and possibly completed. Overall, this is an interesting and good project, but one that does not require Enhancement funding. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02SS-12

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Communications Training with a High Definition
Television and Film Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pat Divietro

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 0 (of 1 point)
C.3 0 (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 3 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 1 (of 5 points)
B.2 3 (of 18 points)
B.3 9 (of 20 points)
B.4 1 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

G. Total Score:

35

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$121,400</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests equipment to enhance education in film and television production. While it is clear that this is a growing and vital aspect of the regional economy, it is unclear exactly what the proposal intends to accomplish, why it needs to be done, what the intended outcomes and evaluation measures will be, what the student or faculty benefits will be, or what linkages to the community or industry have been sought. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement to Mac Lab and Media Resources

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Min Wu

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 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 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 3 (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 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 _____ No x

G. Total Score:

75

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$59,379</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests equipment for educational enhancement in the Communication Studies program. It is, fundamentally, an experiment in the use of iPads, and represents a reasonable but not convincing proposal. The proposed use of the iPads to improve learning, collaboration, and efficiency is plausible, but the argument is often general and not entirely persuasive. What precisely does the proposed equipment provide that existing computers do not? Student surveys and "reflections" are weak tools to assess programmatic success. There is little evidence that the PI has investigated what other universities and colleges have done with iPads and built that information into the plan and curriculum. Explanation of the camcorders and tripods is minimal, but plausible. Purchase of SPSS and Dreamweaver software makes very good sense. However, should not SPSS be a University-licensed tool? Listing the existing Mac lab as institutional matching is misleading. The description of personnel costs lacks details. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Internships and Integration: Strengthening Communities
through Disaster Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rachel Dowty Beech

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 21 (of 23 points)
B.3 23 (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 N/A No _____

F. Total Score:

86

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$33,835
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$23,000

(if additional monies become available)

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

The proposal seeks to organize and promote the Disaster Science and Management internship program. The value of the program is clear, as is the appropriateness of such a university-based program in Louisiana. Expanding the number of internships seems appropriate, but the description of the actual work involved in doing so could have been more explicit. It is not clear if there are reasons to believe that 16 new internship sites could be added, and what the expansion would entail. Three months of faculty support appears excessive, and the travel expenses appear high and are poorly justified. It is unclear what the faculty support means in terms of release from teaching duties. It is also unclear why work-study funds (presumably already available) or funding from the University are not used to hire the student worker, at least during the school year. There is no institutional match. Despite these criticisms, the program is important, the project appears to be worthy overall, and the cost is modest. Partial funding is recommended if additional monies become available with budget reductions made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Health Communication Master of Arts Enhancement Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephanie Grey

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (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 7 (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 21 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (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: 77 (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>\$93,749</u>	<u>\$45,334</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 essentially an exploratory proposal designed to salvage/upgrade a small Master's program by adding a health communication focus and distance-learning strategies. The focus on health communication is sensible, and the proposal clearly demonstrates the potential importance of the initiative. However, the project seems excessively expensive to enhance three or four courses and recruit/train a small number of students. Much of the work described in the proposal should be the normal work of curriculum and enrollment planning. The importance and function of the distance-learning component is not well explained. No evidence of student demand is provided. The requested travel support appears excessive. There is no discussion of possible assistance from or cooperation with other University units for undertaking distance-learning initiatives. The requested equipment and supplies are inadequately justified and seem to be "add-ons." The need for all of the consultants is unclear. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Community Context of Social Inequality and Population
Well-Being: An Enhancement Proposal

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Matthew Lee

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. 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 21 (of 23 points)
B.3 21 (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 x No _____

F. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$186,540</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to establish a research program on inequality and social well-being is an interesting and commendable project. It is within the abilities of the faculty. The suggested linkages among inequality, health, and economic development are either obvious, already documented, or, in a few cases, slightly exaggerated. Most neighborhoods are likely already well known in terms of overall fitness for economic development. There are some questions about the utility of the one-time survey. Is there certainty that phone surveys will pick up a true sample of the target population, especially in very poor neighborhoods? The work plan is very ambitious, and it is not clear that the project can be accomplished in 13 months. It is also not clear why five new graduate students are required. The proposed budget is very high relative to available funds, and it cannot be appropriately reduced. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Origins: Chemical Identification in Archaeology Using a
Portable XRF

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heather McKillop

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 0 (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 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$71,920</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$54,000</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 clear and reasonable proposal to acquire equipment for archaeological education and research is a worthwhile initiative. For a relatively modest cost the new equipment would significantly deepen and strengthen the work of several archaeology faculty and their students (though there is some question about the utility for a large group of students). The faculty have already tested the equipment and have a specific sense of how it will improve their work. The funding for the field trips is an "add-on" to this proposal, and such funding ought to come from other sources. One negative is the absence of any matching funds. Partial funding is recommended with no funding recommended for field trips. Other reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing and Expanding Digital Apparel Product
Development and Merchandising Using CAD System, Body
Scanner, and Virtual 3D Runway Creator Software

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lisa McRoberts

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 0 (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 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$186,596</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$0</u>
--	--

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

This request for upgraded equipment in the Computer Aided Design lab for apparel design education is a worthwhile proposal. It is reasonably well described. The requested equipment builds upon a clear departmental strength. The proposal makes a strong case for the importance of apparel education to the Louisiana economy. The budget contains a computer upgrade and some routine supply costs, which should presumably be covered by internal funding. The preliminary work with Lectra should already have been done. The benchmarks, goals, and methods of assessment could have been clearer. There is no institutional match. Though the project is sound, the cost is prohibitively high considering the limited funds available, and it is less compelling than other worthy projects. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Building Digital Resources for Research: Creating a Digitized
Collection of United States Army Corps of Engineers Publications
and Related Historical Materials for Access and Preservation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elaine Smyth

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 _____ (of 2 points)
E.2a 1 (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 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$134,308</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$86,800</u>
--	---

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

This proposal to build a digital collection of materials relating to waterways and flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley is well written and carefully argued with potential for great value for the University and the State. The proposal is straightforward and includes clear goals and benchmarks for assessing results. It is surprising that sources for purchase of hardware have not already been identified. The absence of any cost sharing or matching weakens the proposal. Due to limited funding resources, partial funding is recommended, with no funding for graduate students. Further reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10SS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSUS EMJ Program – Studio Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Jarzabek

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (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 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (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 8 (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:	<u>\$57,730</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to improve instruction for television production techniques in the Electronic Media Journalism Program is, overall, sound and worthwhile, but there are questions. Some of the claims about the importance of studio production require more support and context. To produce a polished, professional product that represents the wider campus and provides opportunities for students, some amount of controlled, high-end studio work will be necessary. However, that is not the professional world in which most communication students are going to find employment. Digital media have put most of the tools of storytelling on the desktop. How many students would be involved and take advantage of this project? What precisely are the performance and assessment measures? Paying stipends is questionable. Would the need for stipends be alleviated if some modest course credit were given? What will happen when the year's stipends are depleted? Neither of the PIs seems to have much experience in this area. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11SS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Materials Resource Lab Lecture Series

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Liane Hancock

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 11 (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 7 (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 19 (of 25 points)
B.4 1 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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 N/A No

F. Total Score:

76

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$21,500</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposed lecture series would highlight an emerging strength of the architecture program in researching and employing materials. The proposal builds upon existing strengths and would provide an interesting way to deepen relationships with a variety of stakeholders in the business, design, and government communities. The program has a strong track record of past success and the lectures should be fascinating. However, with limited resources available in this competition, this project appears to be less urgent and less likely to have a broad impact compared to competing proposals. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12SS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Preparation of Future Family Life Educators
with Technological Equipment and Media-Based Projects

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tammy Harpel

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 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 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (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 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

70

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$18,900</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to technologically enhance instruction in Family and Child Studies does not explain the purposes and uses of requested equipment with enough specificity to know what the outcomes of this initiative would be. It is not clear how the ability to produce a video will make students better family life educators, or what the nature of the videos would be. How many students will participate? What is the linkage between video production and subsequent professional competence? The proposal underestimates the amount of training and expertise needed to produce credible-looking video materials. It is not clear that students would be capable of producing high-quality videos useful for teaching in K-12 schools. The claim that this technology will facilitate faculty research is not well supported. The evaluation measures are heavily quantitative, yielding little or no information about student learning enhancement. It is not clear if the PI has experience with video production or if competing State programs use this equipment. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13SS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Touch Screen Monitors and Webcams for Enhanced Studio Critiques

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kevin Singh

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

87

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$37,600</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$37,600</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.)

This proposal to acquire webcams and touch screens to review student work in the School of Architecture is sound, sensible, and imaginative. It represents a logical and creative extension of digital technology as a way of reducing costs to both students and the school. While the cash match is notable, the faculty salary match is not. This should be part of the everyday work of the two PIs. The outcomes assessment and evaluation are weakly stated. It is not clear how the PIs will know if this technology has enhanced student learning. Overall, this is a worthy proposal, and full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14SS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Speech Communication Program at
Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bryan Townsend

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 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 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (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 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

69

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$46,000</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to acquire instructional equipment for the Department of Speech makes sense, but it is poorly presented. It is vague with respect to how the equipment would be used, the value it adds to student experience, and the anticipated learning outcomes. It describes the value of training of students in research methods, but it is not clear what research is planned or what role it plays in the curriculum. It is also unclear why iPads are needed to access statistical data. Will there be any problems mixing and matching PC with Apple hardware? Do the PIs have experience with this equipment? According to the enhancement plan, faculty members have not yet been asked to consider what videos they will use in conjunction with this project. The institutional match is impressive, but funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15SS-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: New Media Technology for Next Generation Journalist and
Public Relations Professionals

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lance Arnold

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 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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 23 points)
B.3 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

F. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$31,547
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 sensible and straightforward proposal to acquire software for education in the Department of Mass Communication. Although the department is accredited by the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, the proposal does not say whether limitations in the current software have been or are likely to be an impediment to accreditation. The software improvements described are certainly desirable and, to some extent, becoming more necessary in all programs. The in-kind contribution described was for a previous equipment investment rather than new money toward this improvement. Detail is lacking on exactly how the new software will be used and what the outcome will be. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16SS-12

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Streaming Video Library of Counseling Techniques, Practices,
and Methods for Psychology Students and Faculty

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Matthews

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 11 (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 8 (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 23 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

F. Total Score:

92

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$62,500</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$62,500</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 superb proposal seeks to provide psychology programs at Northwestern and four partnering State institutions access to streaming instructional videos. It is well written and persuasive. The objectives are clear and measurable, the work plan is very descriptive, and the budget is modest. The collaborative effort is a model for other Louisiana institutions. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17SS-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Title: A Play Therapy Training Curriculum and Workshop for Graduate
Counseling Students, Students in the Helping Curricular, and
Professional Counselors to Enhance the Use of Play Therapy
Techniques, Methods, and Interventions in Practice

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Fazio-Griffith

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 18 (of 23 points)
B.3 21 (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:

79

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$14,055</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal to facilitate counseling education workshops makes a good, research-based case for the value of play therapy. The continuing repercussions of Hurricane Katrina also create a wider social need for such approaches. The proposal's objectives are clear, as is the work plan. The enhancement plan does not include benchmarks or evaluation standards, and it fails to describe in any detail how the workshop will be built and run. It is not clear how the workshop will stimulate or support faculty research. Descriptions of outcomes and evaluation measures are weak. There are multiple syntactical and grammatical errors in the writing. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 18SS-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: New Computer Labs for Communication Courses at
Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amber Narro

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 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (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 x No _____

G. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$91,254</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$61,860</u>

(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 is a straightforward equipment request to update one computer lab and create another for journalism students. It is sensible and worthy. The equipment is generally appropriate, but there is no explanation to justify the two 27-inch iMacs. The institutional match is strong. It is not clear that, as stated, adding this equipment would help to recruit or retain students. The outcome measures are soft. While the proposal is a worthy investment, due to limited funds only partial funding is recommended if additional monies become available, with all budget reductions made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 19SS-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Unleashing the Lion: Digitizing Southeastern Louisiana
University's Student Newspaper, The Lion's Roar

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lori Smith

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 11 (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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 21 (of 23 points)
B.3 17 (of 25 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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 N/A No _____

F. Total Score:

71

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount:

\$10,298

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 to create an online database for student newspapers is reasonably solid and modest. Some ambiguity surrounds the question of utility. How many users are there likely to be? What precisely is the value added? This project is sensible, but, with limited funds available, the cases for need and impact were less persuasive relative to other worthy proposals. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 20SS-12

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Certificate Program in Family Practice for Masters of Social Work
Students: Improving the Quality of Mental Health Care in Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Richard Ager

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 11 (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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 19 (of 23 points)
B.3 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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:

85

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$80,800
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$54,360

(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 to create a Certificate Program in Family Practice for Master's students is worthy and contains strong support letters, but is vague with respect to details. Can the Porter Cason Institute sustain this effort past the life of the grant? It is assumed that preliminary work has been done, e.g., surveying faculty, checking existing syllabi, surveying potential clinicians who might supervise students, and making connections with agencies. What if the School of Social Work cannot recruit sufficient numbers for the program? The need for three outside speakers is not made clear. The cost matching arrangements are strong. The proposal is poorly written in places, lacking clarity and focus. It is difficult to find answers to straightforward questions. For example, how much of what sort of work does the certificate require? The budget description is confusing. The comparison of what the potential award would fund and what the program is willing to continue to fund later is confusing. Partial funding is recommended if additional monies become available. Budget reductions can be made at the discretion of the PI, and the institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 21SS-12

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Lower Mississippi Valley Landscape Archaeology Project:
Enhancement, Equipment, Instrumentation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christopher Rodning

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 0 (of 1 point)
C.3 0 (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 8 (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 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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 N/A 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:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$183,240</u>	<u>\$23,540</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 proposal for a long-term study of regional Native American sites makes a decent case for the historic and intellectual significance of the area the researchers wish to study. More details could be provided describing what the researchers intend to do and how the work depends upon the requested resources. A significant amount of equipment is requested with explanations of what each instrument does, but without much overall context about how the pieces fit together or why they are all necessary at once. It was not clear how much equipment the program already has, or why all of the new equipment is needed. There is little explanation of what sorts of work would occur in each year. It is an interesting and probably worthwhile project, but the cost is prohibitive given the limited funds available and other, more competitive proposals.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 22SS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preserving Acadiana Cultural History: Creating Access to the
Oral History Collection at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: April Grey

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 11 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 0 (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 21 (of 23 points)
B.3 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$43,724
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 to digitize and promote an oral history collection has a clear and understandable focus. The Acadiana collection has great value both for the University and the region. It is not clear how many students and scholars now access these data. Has the possibility of outsourcing the digitization project been examined? The institution's willingness to contribute heavily to the project is impressive. This is a worthwhile undertaking. However, with limited funds available and no clear sense of the project's potential impact, no funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 23SS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Fabrication Teaching Laboratory: Essential Upgrades

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Corey Saft

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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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:	<u>\$127,195</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to enhance digital fabrication infrastructure in the School of Architecture and Design makes a good case for the importance of continuing to improve the facilities of a highly regarded program whose graduates are doing well in top graduate schools. The proposal builds on a steady series of improvements in the past. It is not clear how the new equipment will be incorporated into the curriculum. The proposal did not adequately describe what the new equipment will do that the current equipment does not, and how that will make a difference in students' experiences. Which other architecture programs in the State and nearby have this technology? The equipment cost listed in the narrative does not match the cost listed in the budget justification. The institutional match is for time and indirect costs only. Due to the limited amount of funds available and the relatively high cost of the proposal, funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 24SS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Gaming the Systems: STEM Integrated Building Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Corey Saft

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 1 (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 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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:

79

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$125,091</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal to create an educational iPad application is an imaginative approach to teaching architectural design and offers a clear timeline for development. The school does have expertise in game development, although this is not made apparent until late in the narrative. The hiring of a programmer to develop the game is treated too briefly and casually. The budget is relatively costly compared to available funds. Given how much of the request is for salaries, it is hard to imagine how costs could be reduced and still make the project viable. The proposal could have argued more assertively why this project is absolutely necessary to develop this application. It is rife with technical jargon and certain parts are hard to follow. It is not clear that this approach is the best way to achieve the project's ultimate goals. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 25SS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ULM Criminal Justice Media Library Licensing Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bernard Lanham

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 23 points)
B.3 14 (of 25 points)
B.4 1 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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 5 (For NS/NE)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes N/A No

F. Total Score:

56

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$37,410</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to enhance educational resources in the Department of Criminal Justice needs a stronger explanation of the intellectual and pedagogical value of the materials to be purchased. These online journals should be available through the library as standard practice, so requesting purchase in this proposal is puzzling. There should be a statewide plan for these resources. It is not clear if there is a plan to renew the three-year agreements. It is impossible to judge the impact of the project without more information. Which journals are needed for undergraduate instruction? Which of them are available online and in hard copy now? How many students would be affected? The assessment and evaluation plans are weak. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 26SS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: BOR Enhancement Grant

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Rodriguez

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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (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 11 (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:	<u>\$89,938</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This well-written proposal for various departmental enhancements to improve recruiting and retention argues for improved educational spaces such as labs and Smart classrooms that are standard in most communication and media programs. It is a solid project, but its expectations and proposed results appear to be somewhat exaggerated. The emphasis on recruitment rather than pedagogy and student learning weakens the proposal. The speakers and workshops appear to be less crucial and might be funded through internal or private sources. Details about connections to industry lack specifics. A portion of the work plan should already have been undertaken and even finished prior to proposal submission (e.g., assessing inventories, planning for speakers, developing assessment tools for this project). Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 27SS-12

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Image Acquisition, Color Grading, and Collaboration for 4K
Digital Cinema Production Pipeline

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Racine

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$155,485</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$155,485</u>

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

The proposal requests funds to acquire equipment that will complete a series of major enhancements to high-tech film production education at UNO. It represents a significant investment in a highly successful program that has had economic benefits for the New Orleans region. The faculty expertise is clearly documented, and strong rationales for the technology improvements are offered. The project enables an ambitious transition from only being able to show 4K films to enabling students to make them. The institutional match is impressive. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 28SS-12

INSTITUTION: Xavier University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Communication Studies through Intercultural
Exchange and Civic Engagement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ross Louis

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 72 (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>\$139,209</u>	<u>\$37,796</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 an ambitious proposal to bolster the launch of a new Communications Studies major with various enhancements, including the acquisition of educational technology, curricular development, and an international exchange program. The new major is a noble and potentially exciting initiative, but the link between the pedagogical goals and the list of requested equipment is tenuous. Many of the goals can be met with minimal or no equipment. The project components do not fit together in a convincing fashion, especially at this level of requested funding. Strong aspects include the mission-related goals of the project, the proposed Community Advisory Board to create a civic engagement strategy, and the faculty-student collaboration. The need for some equipment is apparent, but the connection of that need to the proposal rationale is not. The number of students to be served is small. The service learning in Haiti is notable, but does not seem essential at this early stage. The proposal might have been stronger if it focused on support for the pedagogical enhancements rather than equipment. It is not clear why all three Communications programs cannot share lab resources and equipment. It is also not clear whether the proposed lab will be open and properly staffed during non-class hours, which would greatly add to its utility. It is surprising that a new major would be launched without adequate equipment and supporting services. Funding is not recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Social Sciences
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
001SS-12	Boston, Kay	Bossier Parish Community College	1	NE	N	Enhancing Social Sciences Instruction with Global Studies Curriculum	\$24,586.00	\$0.00	\$24,586.00
002SS-12	Divietro, Pat	Bossier Parish Community College	1	E	N	Enhancing Communications Training with a High Definition Television and Film Studio	\$121,400.00	\$0.00	\$121,400.00
003SS-12	Wu, Min	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria	1	E	N	Enhancement to Mac Lab and Media Resources	\$59,379.00	\$0.00	\$59,379.00
004SS-12	Dowty Beech, Rachel	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	NE	N	Internships and Integration: Strengthening Communities through Disaster Education	\$33,835.00	\$0.00	\$33,835.00
005SS-12	Grey, Stephanie	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	2	NE	N	Health Communication Master of Arts Enhancement Project	\$93,749.00	\$45,334.00	\$139,083.00
006SS-12	Lee, Matthew	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	NE	N	The Community Context of Social Inequality and Population Well-Being: An Enhancement Proposal	\$186,540.00	\$0.00	\$186,540.00
007SS-12	McKillop, Heather	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Origins: Chemical Identification in Archaeology Using a Portable XRF	\$71,920.00	\$0.00	\$71,920.00
008SS-12	McRoberts, Lisa	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Enhancing and Expanding Digital Apparel Product Development and Merchandising Using CAD system, Body Scanner, and virtual 3D Runway Creator software	\$186,596.00	\$0.00	\$186,596.00
009SS-12	Smyth, Elaine	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Building Digital Resources for Research: Creating a Digitized Collection of United States Army Corps of Engineers Publications and Related Historical Materials for Access and Preservation	\$134,308.00	\$0.00	\$134,308.00
010SS-12	Jarzabek, Mary	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	LSUS EMJ Program - Studio Enhancement	\$57,730.00	\$0.00	\$57,730.00
011SS-12	Hancock, Liane	Louisiana Tech University	1	NE	N	Materials Resource Lab Lecture Series	\$21,500.00	\$0.00	\$21,500.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
012SS-12	Harpel, Tammy	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Enhancing the Preparation of Future Family Life Educators with Technological Equipment and Media-Based Projects	\$18,900.00	\$0.00	\$18,900.00
013SS-12	Singh, Kevin	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Touch Screen Monitors and Webcams for Enhanced Studio Critiques	\$37,600.00	\$0.00	\$37,600.00
014SS-12	Townsend, Bryan	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Speech Communication Program at Louisiana Tech University	\$46,000.00	\$0.00	\$46,000.00
015SS-12	Arnold, Lance	Nicholls State University	1	NE	N	New media technology for next generation journalist and public relations professionals.	\$31,547.00	\$0.00	\$31,547.00
016SS-12	Matthews, Michael	Northwestern State University	1	NE	N	Streaming Video Library of Counseling Techniques, Practices, and Methods for Psychology Students and Faculty	\$62,500.00	\$0.00	\$62,500.00
017SS-12	Fazio-Griffith, Laura	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	NE	N	Title: A Play Therapy Training Curriculum and Workshop for Graduate Counseling Students, Students in the Helping Curricular, and Professional Counselors to Enhance the use of Play Therapy Techniques, Methods, and Interventions in Practice.	\$14,055.00	\$0.00	\$14,055.00
018SS-12	Narro, Amber	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	New Computer Labs for Communication Courses at Southeastern Louisiana University	\$91,254.00	\$0.00	\$91,254.00
019SS-12	Smith, Lori	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	NE	N	Unleashing the Lion: Digitizing Southeastern Louisiana University's Student Newspaper, The Lion's Roar	\$10,298.00	\$0.00	\$10,298.00
020SS-12	Ager, Richard	Tulane University	1	NE	N	A CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN FAMILY PRACTICE FOR MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS: IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF MENTAL HEALTH CARE IN LOUISIANA	\$80,800.00	\$0.00	\$80,800.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
021SS-12	Rodning, Christopher	Tulane University		E	N	Lower Mississippi Valley Landscape Archaeology Project: Enhancement, Equipment, Instrumentation	\$183,240.00	\$23,540.00	\$206,780.00
022SS-12	Grey, April	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	NE	N	Preserving Acadiana Cultural History: Creating Access to the Oral History Collection at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette	\$43,724.00	\$0.00	\$43,724.00
023SS-12	Saft, Corey	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Digital Fabrication Teaching Laboratory: Essential Upgrades	\$127,195.00	\$0.00	\$127,195.00
024SS-12	Saft, Corey	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	NE	N	Gaming the Systems: STEM Integrated Building Design	\$125,091.00	\$0.00	\$125,091.00
025SS-12	Lanham, Bernard	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1	NE	N	ULM CRIMINAL JUSTICE MEDIA LIBRARY LICENSING PROJECT	\$37,410.00	\$0.00	\$37,410.00
026SS-12	Rodriguez, John	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1	E	N	BOR Enhancement Grant	\$89,938.00	\$0.00	\$89,938.00
027SS-12	Racine, Robert	University of New Orleans	1	E	N	Image Acquisition, Color Grading, and Collaboration for 4K Digital Cinema Production Pipeline	\$155,485.00	\$0.00	\$155,485.00
028SS-12	Louis, Ross	Xavier University	2	E	N	Enhancing Communication Studies through Intercultural Exchange and Civic Engagement	\$139,209.00	\$37,796.00	\$177,005.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	28
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,285,789.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$106,670.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,392,459.00

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: _____

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)