REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

REVIEW OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

March 6-7, 2012

Prepared by:

Dr. Ralph L. Eckert (Social Sciences)
Chair
Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College

Dr. Lewis T. Baker (Humanities)
University of Texas at Arlington

Dr. Michael E. McGinnis (Biological Sciences)
Spelman College

Dr. Winston F. Erevelles (Engineering B & Computer and Information Sciences)
St. Mary's University (San Antonio)

FY 2011-12 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

Introduction

The Undergraduate Enhancement Subprogram proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Ralph Eckert, Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College (chair); Dr. Winston Erevelles, St. Mary's University (San Antonio), Dr. Lewis Baker, University of Texas at Arlington, and Dr. Michael "Gene" McGinnis, Spelman College met March 5-6, 2012 in Baton Rouge to evaluate forty-eight (48) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Undergraduate Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

These materials were made available to the review panel prior to the visit: a) the forty-eight (48) Undergraduate proposals to be evaluated, with their individual rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2011-12 Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2009 Undergraduate Enhancement panel final report. Prior to the meeting each member read the materials, assessed the proposals, and tentatively completed the rating forms. At its meeting the panel discussed each proposal and transformed its tentative rating into a composite rating. Reviewers then prepared comprehensive ratings and drafted this final report. Each proposal was reviewed in detail, and the panel believes that all proposals received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria in the RFP.

One proposal (039UG-12) was eliminated from the competition before the review because the institution from which it emanated is ineligible to participate in the Undergraduate Enhancement component. A second proposal (021UG-12) was withdrawn by the submitting institution.

This report contains tables that rank and categorize the proposals into two groups. Table I presents a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. First-year funds requested during this cycle totaled $3,234,942. Of the forty-seven 47 eligible proposals, thirty-two (32) were recommended for full or partial funding, which was determined only after review of the budgets and which resulted in funded amounts corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. The review panel recommended first-year funding of $1,602,216 for proposals with a composite score of 70 or higher. 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.

Two panel members have reviewed Undergraduate Enhancement proposals since the 1990s. Newer members have reviewed federal- and state-funded proposals of this type for several years. All members of this panel are generally agreed that the quality of proposals has significantly increased. Nevertheless, the panel notes that some proposals still do not follow RFP guidelines and are poorly written and edited, all of which means that it is highly unlikely they will be recommended for funding. Attention to details is important in any competition.

TABLE I
2012 UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	97	011UG-12	LSUS	$50,323	$50,323		
2	96	002UG-12	CENTENARY	$36,081	$36,081		
3	93	014UG-12	LSUS	$23,435	$19,676		
4	89	032UG-12	NORTHWESTERN	$70,939	$70,939		
5	88	029UG-12	NORTHWESTERN	$20,000	$20,000	$0	$0
6	87	013UG-12	LSUS	$45,824	$37,824	$0	$0
7	86.5	042UG-12	SUNO	$69,733	$69,733		
8	86	017UG-12	LSUS	$75,000	$65,000		
9	85	015UG-12	LSUS	$131,413	$127,223		
10	84	020UG-12	McNEESE	$49,155	$49,155		
11	83	026UG-12	NICHOLLS	$49,000	$49,000		
12	82	024UG-12	NICHOLLS	$15,000	$15,000		
13	81	031UG-12	NORTHWESTERN	$71,684	$71,684		
14	80	004UG-12	CENTENARY	$21,918	$21,918		
15	79.5	008UG-12	LSUA	$25,500	$25,500		
16	79	003UG-12	CENTENARY	$80,224	$50,000		
17	78	025UG-12	NICHOLLS	$184,894	$184,894		
18	77.5	012UG-12	LSUS	$7,099	$7,000		
19	77	046UG-12	SUNO	$90,117	$45,075		
20	76.5	010UG-12	LSUS	$33,550	$33,550		
21	76	019UG-12	McNEESE	$28,436	$28,436	$0	$0
22	75.5	016UG-12	LSUS	$122,288	$61,150		
23	75	006UG-12	DILLARD	$32,300	$17,300		
24	74.5	018UG-12	McNEESE	$72,104	$72,104		
25	74	033UG-12	NORTHWESTERN	$28,065	$22,365		
26	73.5	034UG-12	SLU	$88,197	$65,454		
27	73	047UG-12	SUNO	$45,697	$22,864		
28	72.5	043UG-12	SUNO	$99,300	$26,000		
29	72	045UG-12	SUNO	$37,803	$22,818	$558	$0
30	71.5	001UG-12	CENTENARY	$83,364	$36,160		
31	71	041UG-12	SUNO	$130,293	$130,293	$0	$0
32	70	036UG-12	SLU	$111,300	$47,697		
			TOTALS:	**$2,030,036**	**$1,602,216**	**$558**	**$0**

TABLE II
2012 UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
33	69	035UG-12	SLU	$57,031	$0		
33	69	040UG-12	SUNO	$67,070	$0		
35	68	038UG-12	SLU	$77,125	$0		
35	68	044UG-12	SUNO	$72,000	$0		
37	67	009UG-12	LSUS	$27,476	$0		
37	67	022UG-12	MCNEESE	$68,449	$0	$0	$0
37	67	027UG-12	NICHOLLS	$75,000	$0		
40	65	005UG-12	DELGADO	$123,668	$0		
41	63	048UG-12	XAVIER	$64,969	$0		
42	61	007UG-12	DILLARD	$111,093	$0		
42	61	037UG-12	SLU	$83,000	$0		
44	54	023UG-12	NICHOLLS	$122,132	$0		
45	53	030UG-12	NORTHWESTERN	$72,193	$0		
46	52	028UG-12	NICHOLLS	$51,200	$0		
			TOTALS:	**$1,072,406**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001UG-12

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Active and Interactive Learning into Action

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kenneth Aizawa

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		3	(of 5 points)	
B.2		13	(of 18 points)	
B.3		10.5	(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	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 71.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	**Requested Amount:**	$83,364
RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Recommended Amount:**	$36,160

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.)

Centenary's plan is for all Philosophy students to use iPads for active reading of e-texts, annotating, adding links, web research, etc., for some interdisciplinary courses taught at the MLK Health Clinic, for other on-campus courses, and during a trip to Haiti. The connection of iPad use to course content in regular courses is not clear. The primary advantage of the iPad is mobility, and the panel wonders why the activities described could not be done on existing computer equipment or exactly how the activities would be integrated in the existing Philosophy course content. However, mobility would be a clear advantage in the special courses at the Health Clinic and in Haiti. Funding of $36,160 is recommended for 60 iPads and covers ($32,500) and instructors' computer needs ($3,660). Classroom retrofitting should not be necessary for the courses, so that item is not recommended. AppleCare contracts are likewise not recommended. The institutional match, however, should be fully maintained. During contract negotiations Centenary must present a solid plan for tracking student use of the iPads and for their long-term care and maintenance.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002UG-12

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Enhancement to the Centenary Neurobiology Curriculum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gregory Butcher

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	18	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$36,081
	Recommended Amount:	$36,081

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.)

Supplies and equipment are requested to enhance laboratory activities in three Neuroscience courses at Centenary College. All of the proposed activites use molecular techniques to engage students in discovery or independent research. A unique and powerful aspect of this proposal is the linking of techniques between Cell Biology, a required course in the fall, and Introductory Neuroscience in the spring. The example of students being introduced to Western blots in Cell Biology, then using Western blots extensively in Neuroscience, should greatly enhance both student understanding and technical skills. The proposal is extremely well written and organized, and all of the supplies and equipment are justified. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003UG-12

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Communication Program Enhancement: High Definition Digital Filmmaking at Centenary College of Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Susan Glaros

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)	

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		2	(of 2 points)
B.6		4	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes		No	x

G. 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:**	$80,224
	Recommended Amount:	$50,000

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 (though lacking the project summary) requests state-of-the-art, high definition, file-based digital production and post-production equipment to enhance filmmaking within Centenary College's Communication program. The need for updating filmmaking technology is apparent and the benefits to students, school, and region are demonstrated; however, given BoRSF budgetary restraints, full funding is not possible. The panel's partial funding recommendation of $50,000 is based on reduction of both production and post-production equipment by 40% and 33%, respectively. Training costs are not recommended, and the institutional match should be maintained. The PI has discretion to purchase approved items that would be beneficial to the project. The panel suggests that the PI seek financial assistance from media-related industries as soon as this equipment is in place.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004UG-12

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Making Computer Science Tangible Through Physical and Mobile Devices

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Goadrich

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)	

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		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		5	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $21,918
Recommended Amount: $21,918

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 enhance the Centenary College computer science program through the acquisition of tangible computing devices such as Sifteo Cubes, Android phones and tablets, and Arduino microcontrollers. The project is framed appropriately and the argument is well presented. The tasks and timelines are reasonable, and the impact/integration concerning courses and curricula are explained in good detail. The PIs have the credentials, experience, and networking experience essential to the success of the project. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005UG-12

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Digital Media Technologies for Game Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Warren Duclos

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	6	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$123,668
	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 Delgado Community College PI wants to develop a multidisciplinary Digital Media program in Game Design through a collaboration between the Computer Information Technology program and the Division of Arts and Humanities. The proposal is collaborative in nature within the institution, with another institution, and with industry. This collaboration is its strength, as are the clearly stated needs and background information. However, the proposal has several shortcomings that need to be addressed before it can be considered for funding. The proposal is missing section 3a on Equipment, which instead appears in the proposal's budget section. The proposal provides insufficient details about program specifics. The weak work plan should be strengthened, and the roles of the PI and other faculty need to be more clearly explained. Because the concept has merit, the panel encourages the PI to resubmit an enhanced proposal at a later date either to the Undergraduate or the Two-Year Institution Enhancement Program. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006UG-12

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project to Retain and Engage First-Year Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Freddye Hill

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	3	(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	4	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	9	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$32,300
	Recommended Amount:	$17,300

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 modest, worthwhile, but not well-written proposal seeks to address serious retention problems at the University, particularly among first-generation, low-income, first-year male students. To help overcome socialization patterns that place many new students in a disadvantageous position when confronted with the demands of a college education, the PIs propose a program to encourage/ facilitate closer faculty consultation with such students. The proposed plan provides internships and volunteer service opportunities for students to become engaged with community organizations and governmental agencies. Consulting similar models employed by other disciplines and institutions would help. Non-equipment requests are reasonable. However, equipment requests—especially for faculty laptops in light of previous BoRSF grants—appear excessive and are not justified except for the PIs. Partial funding of $17,300 is recommended, with the number of computers reduced to seven (two faculty, three loaners, and two support). Matching institutional funds would have been extremely beneficial.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007UG-12

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Film and Multimedia Journalism Through the Production of Films and Multimedia Projects

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Keith Morris

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	3	(of 5 points)
B.2	9	(of 18 points)
B.3	12	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes ____ No x

G. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $111,093
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 does not conform to the RFP formatting guidelines for the Enhancement Program. Among the numerous problems are: the Project Summary is not clearly identified and portions of it are poorly written and unclear; the Enhancement Plan contains no clear segment on Goals and Objectives, which results in all parts of this section being misnumbered; the Biographical Sketch and budget pages are out of place; a mere listing of equipment requests is insufficient as is the mere listing of alumni in the Relationship with Industrial Sponsors section; there are only eight lines of narrative on Faculty Expertise; no sections regarding additional funding sources or previous BoRSF grants are provided; a fuller explanation of the precise need for the equipment requested in the narrative is necessary; and ten pages of résumé /letters of support add nothing. Quite simply, there is too much focus on the PI, and not enough on the proposal itself and RFP guidelines. The need for the equipment is sadly apparent, but the panel does not recommend funding for the project at this time. Submission of a thoroughly reworked, carefully crafted, compliant proposal is encouraged in the future.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Cryotome to Incorporate Hands-on Experiential Learning in the Biology Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zeleke Negatu

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	10.5	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 79.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$25,500
	Recommended Amount:	$25,500

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 is a request for a cryotome to enhance teaching in a Histology course. In many cases the study of histology is just a passive examination of microscope slides. This PI wants to introduce histological techniques in which students make their own slides. The traditional technique of fixing, clearing, embedding, sectioning, and deparaffinizing prior to staining is a long and tedious process that is not appropriate for a typical course. The PI proposes to replace this technique with the use of frozen sections. Using a cryotome, tissue can be frozen, sectioned, placed on slides, and ready to be stained in minutes as opposed to hours or days. The cryotome will also be useful in the PI's research and for student research. One strength of this proposal is that it builds nicely on a 2006 Enhancement award that allowed for purchase of a research microscope with a digital camera and fluorescence capabilities. With the addition of a cryotome the PI and his students (it is unclear how many students take Histology each year) can dramatically increase the range of possible research questions. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Learning Through the Development of Digital Teaching Resources

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephanie Aamodt

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	9	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$27,476
	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 LSU-S PI requests funds for an ultralow freezer to replace two that recently died, a refrigerated incubator, lab supplies, and student stipends so that she can "develop student-centered active-learning digital educational resources for education." The panel's major concern is that the exact nature of the digital resources and how they will be developed are not made clear. Presumably the PI will conduct an experiment using *C. elegans*, collect data and video, and assemble these into an interactive case study that illustrates some basic biological principle. A second objective is to increase student exposure to research. The PI will perform very directed lab activities to create the learning resources. If the students supported by this request participate in developing the resources, then their activities are not really independent research. If the students are working independently, then their inclusion in this project does not seem well integrated. Although the purchase of the incubator and freezer is justified, the development of digital educational resources seems an odd vehicle. The primary justification for providing student stipends is student financial needs, not what they would learn or contribute. Finally, the proposal lacked final editing; e.g., the second paragraph of the institutional description states that the ten biology faculty members educate 350 majors and 300 other students each year. The third sentence says the department has an average credit hour enrollment of 3,409 per semester and an average of 173 declared majors per year, and that there are 34 life science graduates each year. The PI's biographical sketch is missing. The panel does not recommended funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Black Box Theatre Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Alford

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(of 5 points)
B.2	15	(of 18 points)
B.3	15.5	(of 20 points)
B.4	3	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	3	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	9	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 76.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$33,550
	Recommended Amount:	$33,550

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.)

Professional theater and video equipment as well as a wide variety of supplies and tools are requested in this well-written proposal. The materials will both enhance the institution's black box theater capabilities and improve students' educational opportunities and experiences. Equipment requests build nicely from an earlier BoRSF grant. The PIs have aggressively sought additional grants and have been quite successful. Also noteworthy are the institutional matching funds in addition to private sector support. This modest project should help improve theater collaboration between LSUS and BPCC, and will permit significantly increased performing arts productions in the region. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of a Dual Enrollment Biology (BIOS 120L) Teaching Laboratory at Parkway High School

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Banks

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(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	6	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 97 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$50,323
	Recommended Amount:	$50,323

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 from the Department of Biological Sciences at LSUS wants to acquire eight student stations consisting of laptop computers, data acquisition systems, a variety of transducers, and spectrometers for active lab investigations. The equipment will be housed at Parkway High School in dedicated lab space to support a dual-enrollment offering of LSUS's BIOS 120 course at Parkway. The proposal is very well written and supports what appears to be a successful dual-enrollment program between LSUS and surrounding high schools. What appears to be a very similar proposal was funded through the BoRSF in 2009 to establish a similar lab at Haughton High School. In both cases courses offered at the high schools duplicate successful courses offered on the LSUS campus. Building these laboratory-based courses around the same versatile and cost-effective equipment used on campus is well thought out and justified. Significant in-kind matching is offered in the form of installation, training, and maintenance of the off-campus equipment. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

012UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSUS Machining Capability Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Boucher

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(of 5 points)
B.2	14	(of 18 points)
B.3	15.5	(of 20 points)
B.4	3	(of 5 points)
B.5	1	(of 2 points)
B.6	5	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	9	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 77.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$7,099
	Recommended Amount:	$7,000

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 LSUS PI seeks to acquire some metal forming equipment, finishing equipment, workholding devices, and tooling to augment existing basic machining facilities. This is a modest investment that will extend the work that is being done at the institution to support its programs through courses and projects. The PI appears to be well qualified and experienced to conduct and manage the project. Some items included on the budget page appear to be "starter items." The panel recommends slightly reduced funding of $7,000 for items to be determined at the PI's discretion. Matching funds should be maintained since departmental funds are critical and essential to replace inserts, end mills, and other such consumables.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Analytical Skills in Chemical Ecology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amy Erickson

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)

B.1		5	(of 5 points)	
B.2		19	(of 23 points)	
B.3		22	(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	

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

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1	Yes	x	No	

F. Total Score: 87 (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:**	$45,824	$0
	Recommended Amount:	$37,824	$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.)

Funds are requested for equipment for a new Chemical Ecology Lab course. Two rotary evaporators will be used in faculty research labs for sample preparation. $8,000 for supplies is also requested. The final request is $10,000 for sample analyses contracted from the LSU Ag Center (625 samples at $15 each). There are only 24 students in the Environmental Science concentration in the Department of Biological Sciences. The Chemical Ecology lab course is expected to be taught on a 2- or 3-year rotational basis. If the Chemical Ecology lab course is a priority of the department, the requested equipment would be critical to its success. The supply budget and the funds for contracted analyses seem excessive for the small number of students. The team recommends $10,000 for the supplies and contracted analyses in the partial funding recommendation of $37,824 in year 1 only, with full maintenance of institutional match.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Multimedia Technology in Biology, Biochemistry, and Bioinformatics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: M. Cran Lucas

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)	

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		5	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		5	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$23,435
	Recommended Amount:	$19,676

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 proposal for a projection system for a 250-seat auditorium used for seminars and large lecture classes. The proposal is generally well written. However, although logically arranged, the numbering of the headings in the proposal do not match the RFP format. Also, some text from a different proposal about computers is part of the narrative. The team advises the PI to follow the format and edit proposals more carefully. Requested and well justified are 1) a dual projection system in which the images from two 5,000 lumen projectors are combined to create a single 10,000 lumen image bright enough for use with ambient light in this large space, and 2) a new computer. However, an expensive rugged laptop that is also requested is not well justified. A much cheaper laptop can serve the purpose of a backup machine. An impressive institutional match for installation, faculty time, training, and maintenance should be maintained. Partial funding of $19,676 is recommended, with the exclusion of the rugged laptop and port replicator ($3,758.79).

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Education and Outreach Opportunities Through the Handbook of Northwest Louisiana Online

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura McLemore

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)	

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		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		4	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$131,413
	Recommended Amount:	$127,223

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 overarching purpose of this well-crafted proposal from LSUS Archives is twofold: to digitize rare books and primary sources to preserve the material and provide broader access to it, and to involve students and faculty of several Louisiana institutions in researching and writing articles for *The Handbook of Northwest Louisiana*. The digitization process and *The Handbook* are designed to improve educational experiences and opportunities for the region's students, teachers, and residents. Funds requested are primarily for the purchase of a costly, large-format, planetary scanner which will make possible the digitization of oversized volumes, bound and fragile books, manuscripts, newspapers, documents, and maps. *The Handbook* does offer great potential benefit to this region and all of Louisiana. Funds for installation, training, and other expenses are not recommended. The panel recommends an award of $127,223 to purchase the XL7000-600 dpi scanner and the accompanying workstation. The significant institutional match should be maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: SmartRoom Enhancement for Mass Communication Studies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Linda Webster

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(of 5 points)
B.2	14	(of 18 points)
B.3	16.5	(of 20 points)
B.4	3	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	4	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 75.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$122,288
	Recommended Amount:	$61,150

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.)

In an effort to enhance instruction, learning and technological skills for the students and faculty in the Communications Department, this proposal seeks a large amount of equipment to upgrade six outmoded classrooms. The need to replace old classroom accoutrements and modernize electronic resources is clearly demonstrated. However, budgetary restrictions prevent the BoRSF's fully funding such a large and costly undertaking. Nevertheless, with the benefits of these improvements well justified and with significant institutional matching funds (which should be maintained), the team recommends $61,150 for the electronics, wiring, and accoutrements necessary for the acquisition and installation of equipment in three Smart classrooms.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Genetic Studies at LSUS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tara Williams-Hart

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	17	(of 18 points)
B.3	16	(of 20 points)
B.4	5	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	5	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	4	(of 6 points)
C.2	0	(of 1 point)
C.3	2	(of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$75,000
	Recommended Amount:	$65,000

The purchase of two major equipment items and an array of smaller items and supplies to enhance the Molecular Biology capabilities of teaching and research labs is requested. Neither the capabilities nor limitations of these sytems is described in detail. The ChemiDoc MP system has the ability to use chemiluminescense to replace ethydium bromide and UV-induced fluorescence labeling of proteins to replace Coomassie blue staining. The narrative could have mentioned that savings of time, student exposure to toxic chemicals, and waste disposal fees would accrue. Although the system would greatly enhance the core capabilities of the Molecular Biology lab, its use in the teaching lab is more difficult to assess. For the Principles of Genetics lab, the PI indicates that all of the equipment "**will** be utilized to expand the current laboratory exercises." For the other two courses, the statement is that the equipment "**may** be utilized..." No specific exercises that would be enabled by this technology are described. It is reasonable to expect that gel rigs would need to be replaced. However, the request is for two pre-packaged kits from BioRad that each contain a power supply and a set of 4 micropippetors. Since power supplies from the old electrophoresis rigs are probably still usable and $5,000 is requested for high-quality pipettors, it may be more cost effective to just buy the rigs "á la carte" rather than the BioRad kits. The National Geographic (NG) Genographic project is a nice resource; however, the need to spend $10,000 for 100 students to donate their own DNA samples does not seem justified. The team's concern is that the Public Participation Kits are single use and the data--and presumably the teaching materials--are the property of the individual students who would provide their DNA. The NG project is winding down and although the kits are still available, it seems unlikely that direct public participation will continue much longer. The robustness of the LSUS molecular biology activities argues for continued support, but it is unclear whether this funding would be transformative and enabling, or just "nice to have." The panel recommends partial funding of $65,000 by eliminating the Genographic kits. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally with the recommended BoRSF reduction.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018UG-12

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Robotics Laboratory and Developing Multidisciplinary Course Contents

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Seyed Aghili

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(of 5 points)
B.2	14	(of 18 points)
B.3	14.5	(of 20 points)
B.4	3	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	4	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes x	No

G. Total Score: 74.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$72,104
	Recommended Amount:	$72,104

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 project proposes enhancement of a robotics laboratory and the development of a multi-disciplinary course sequence using popular academic robotics platform equipment (CoroBot) and software development kits (Microsoft) to revise an existing course and create a new one. The project is well explained and the team appears to be well qualified and experienced, which insures the success of a project that should favorably impact STEM education at McNeese. The PIs are encouraged to seek projects from industrial sponsors to provide students with problems from real-life situations. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019UG-12

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Arduino Laboratory Hardware for Computer Science Courses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Bender

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		4	(of 5 points)	
B.2		13	(of 18 points)	
B.3		15	(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	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$28,436	$0
	Recommended Amount:	$28,436	$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 rectify an identified weakness of McNeese's computer science graduates by giving them the tools to develop software that is capable of directly interacting with hardware devices. This is to be addressed by introducing the Arduino platform to upper-division courses. Although the project is explained in adequate detail for the most part, additional information regarding its impact would have further enhanced the proposal. Parts of the work plan and discussion of the attainment of eminence could have been stronger. The goals and objectives are well presented and the PIs are well qualified to execute the project. The project is a small but credible one with good grounding in the needs of industry. The team recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020UG-12

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Language Resource Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Diane Bowman

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	17	(of 18 points)
B.3	13	(of 20 points)
B.4	5	(of 5 points)
B.5	1	(of 2 points)
B.6	5	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$49,155
	Recommended Amount:	$49,155

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, well-thought-out proposal that identifies and directly addresses a genuine need. McNeese has not yet fully recovered from the 2005 hurricanes and the Foreign Language department has little usable computer equipment. Within the humanities, Foreign Languages is the only area where computers have become essential in current teaching practice. In fact, the only real weakness of the proposal is that it is somewhat "remedial" in the sense that the University should be supplying much of it as a matter of course. Given the financial strains facing the higher education institutions that suffered from the recent hurricanes and the downturn in State funding, this may well be impossible. The team recommends fully funding this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021UG-12

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Equipment for Nutrition and Wellness Laboratory at McNeese State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Debbie Hollingsworth

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes _____ No _____
A.2 _____ (of 5 points)
A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 _____ (of 5 points)
B.2 _____ (of 18 points)
B.3 _____ (of 20 points)
B.4 _____ (of 5 points)
B.5 _____ (of 2 points)
B.6 _____ (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No _____

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 _____ (of 6 points)
C.2 _____ (of 1 point)
C.3 _____ (of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 _____ (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score: N/A (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $17,500
Recommended Amount: _____

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 was withdrawn by the institution.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022UG-12

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instruction of Corrosion Engineering

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Julie Mendez

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		3	(of 5 points)	
B.2		13	(of 18 points)	
B.3		13	(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	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	7	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 67 (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:**	$68,449	$0
	Recommended Amount:	$0	$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.)

McNeese PIs seek to acquire equipment and simulation software to develop hands-on learning in a proposed new elective course to deepen engineering students' understanding of corrosion. The work plan needs to be strengthened beyond the detailed listing of the proposed experiments and simulations. While the stated goal of the project appears to be focused on corrosion, the greatest cost in the budget is the tension/compression tester that appears to focus on a range of courses that are worthy but unrelated directly to corrosion. This lack of detail is also seen in the proposed experiments, half of which are focused on standard testing methods. It is conceivable that the PIs intend to enhance the overall materials and testing component of the program and introduce CAE tools in a scope broader than that proposed. The PIs are encouraged to review this feedback and resubmit a revised proposal in a future cycle. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023UG-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Achievement and Community Outreach via the Department of Languages and Literature at Nicholls State University Through Computer Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Scott Banville

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		2	(of 5 points)	
B.2		11	(of 18 points)	
B.3		8	(of 20 points)	
B.4		3	(of 5 points)	
B.5		1	(of 2 points)	
B.6		4	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$122,132
	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.)

Aside from repeated references to the "literacy of the screen," this proposal offers little in the way of pedagogical objectives. The plan is to equip two carts of notebook Macs, which would be moved from one class to another as necessary. There is little discussion of what types of activities this process would allow faculty and students to do that they cannot do now. Without specific goals, there is and can be no justification of why using carts of notebooks might be better than PCs in a lab. There is also no discussion of enrollment figures that would justify the number of computers requested. This is a vague proposal that fails to demonstrate need and lacks any innovative ideas. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024UG-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Core Facilties in Biological Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Angela Corbin

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	16	(of 18 points)
B.3	15	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$15,000
	Recommended Amount:	$15,000

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.)

Two water purification systems to support teaching labs and research activities in the Biology Department are requested. The availability of Reagent Grade I Ultrapure water is important for producing media and solutions to be used in many biological procedures. The need and justification for such a system are well presented. However, the need for two systems is not addressed. The proposed systems would reside in rooms 204 and 208 of a hall, one a teaching lab and one a research lab. Each of these units is able to provide 1.5 liters per minute of high-grade water. The narrative makes repeated and impassioned explanations of the general need for a source of high-grade water, but no indication is stated about the volume of water needed, the nature of the storage to be used, or why the specific model was chosen. For example, the proposal specifies the Siemens UltraPure Classic UV model that is designed for HPLC, ICP-MS, ion chromatography and electrochemistry, though the Classic UF model is designed for cell culture and molecular biology. There is even a UV/UF model that combines UV sterilization with ultra filtration to produce a more versatile water grade. Nevertheless, recommended funding of $15,000 would greatly enhance the department's capabilities. The justification based on the relationship between Nicholls, the LDEQ, the FDA, and local industry was especially compelling.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025UG-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Petroleum Services Laboratory Enhancement Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Gautreaux

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $184,894

Recommended Amount: $184,894 **(*see funding stipulation)**

Nicholls PIs seek funds for critical laboratory equipment to support course lectures in Drilling Fluids, Reservoir Fluids and Environmental Technologies to supplement theoretical learning. The project fills a definite need and appears to have been developed in response to articulated regional needs and to enjoy strong industry support. However, the budget needs to be carefully considered because, to accommodate the entire cost of the lab ($376,894), the BoRSF request of $184,894, plus the institutional and private matches ($39,000 and $153,000, respectively), were calculated into a single, consolidated budget. Of major concern is the following question: What will happen to the work plan if the entire match of $192,000, much of which is to be generated through industry donations, is not achieved? The letter of support from the AADE indicates that commitment to the laboratory is contingent on fundraising, and Nicholls does not have a guarantee that $153,000 will be raised. What would happen to the work plan if, for example, only $50,000 was received? For this reason the panel stipulates that Nicholls must provide BoR staff with appropriate documentation of receipt of the AADE's $153,000 donation before the BoR releases the recommended full funding of $184,894. If $153,000 is not received, Nicholls must guarantee to the BoR's satisfaction that the entire work plan presented in the proposal, including the acquisition of all of the items listed in the budget, will be carried out as presented. Although the panel agrees that this project should be funded, **full funding must be contingent on Nicholls' success in securing the entire $153,000 match from the AADE. If the full match is not available, and Nicholls cannot guarantee the work plan will be completed with available resources, the panel recommends rescinding funding for the project.**

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026UG-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Anatomy Laboratory Experiences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Susan Robichaux

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	15	(of 18 points)
B.3	15	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

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:**	$49,000
	Recommended Amount:	$49,000

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 wishes to purchase a set of anatomical models to be used in introductory biology and anatomy courses in the Biology Department. Overall the proposal is well written and the cost of these models seems appropriate for the large number of Allied Health and Nursing students who take these introductory courses. The proposal could have been strenthened by providing more information about the quantity and quality of models on hand. Reviewers should not need to rely on the simple statement that the current models are of insufficient quantity or quality to meet the needs. Nonetheless, this does not obviate the fact that such models are necessary to courses in human anatomy at the undergraduate level. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027UG-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Modern Gas Chromotography/Mass Spectrometer System to Enhance Biological Instruction

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Darcey Wayment

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	9	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$75,000
	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 purchase of a GC/MS for the Department of Physical Sciences is proposed. The PI suggests that since biology majors make up a large percentage of the students taught in various chemistry courses, they will be the direct beneficiaries of the instrument. However, no data are presented about the number of biology majors to be affected or the extent to which instruction would be enhanced. Eleven chemistry courses are to be impacted by this acquisition, but no data are presented regarding how many courses are taken by biology majors or how the courses would be impacted. The panel is concerned about how the GC/MS would be used in Organic Chemistry labs. Chemistry 226 has 72 students per year and the PI claims that they need the GC/MS to conduct multistep synthesis labs with GC/MS readings taken at various points in the synthesis. This is a lot of use of a delicate apparatus by many inexperienced users. A major part of the justification for this instrument is that it is a basic tool to which all chemists need access. This claim makes it difficult to argue credibly that Nicholls would be in a unique position if it acquired a GC/MS. The proposal was not well edited, although it is generally well written. This proposal might be more appropriate for the Health & Medical Sciences competition. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028UG-12

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Physiology Education at Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Enmin Zou

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(of 5 points)
B.2	6	(of 18 points)
B.3	5	(of 20 points)
B.4	2	(of 5 points)
B.5	0	(of 2 points)
B.6	3	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 52 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	**Requested Amount:**	$51,200
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.)

Funds are requested for two BioPac physiological recording systems and a RT-PCR instrument for use in two physiology courses, General Physiology (G.Phys.) and Human Anatomy & Physiology (A&P). The BioPac systems are intended to complement an existing LabData2000 system that is limited only to muscle contraction, not EKG, recordings. Justification for the BioPac systems is that in muscle contraction labs in G.Phys. the students will be able to share three sets of data instead of the current single set. In both G.Phys. and A&P students will be able to record their EKGs sharing the BioPac units. Little thought seems to have been given to further incorporating the BioPac units into the courses. BioPacs are usually configured in sets with a variety of transducers that can be used as the basis for a lab-based course. The PI gives no hint as to which tranducers will be purchased beyond EKG electrodes and an implied force transducer. A solution to recording EKGs is to buy a set of electrodes for the existing LabData 2000, which has 16 channels for data acquisition. Simply increasing the number of data sets is not transformative. Using less expensive equipment such as the Vernier LabQuest2 Deluxe Physiology package at $1,309, the PI could purchase 12 stations instead of two, and engage students in multiple ways. The portability of such systems would allow them to be used in field activities in the aquatic and environmental courses. The RT-PCR system is uniquely unjustified for use in low-tech labs since the PCR thermocycler acquired through another BoRSF award could be used for the single proposed experiment. It seems clear that the RT-PCR is intended for use by students in the Master's program and the PI's lab. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029UG-12

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing a Distinguised Speakers Series at Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Crank

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)

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

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)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1	Yes	x	No

F. Total Score: 88 (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:**	$20,000	$0
	Recommended Amount:	$20,000	$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 straightforward proposal for a guest speaker series at Northwestern State University. While such programs might seem extravagant at a time when there is widespread need for equipment at Louisiana's universities, the quality of education remains more a function of the people in the classroom than the number of computers. This proposal has two strengths that recommend it: 1) the concentration of speakers in the media/communications industry will appeal to students in a wide variety of disciplines across campus, and 2) the speaker series fits well with the University's proximity to the growing media industry in north Louisiana. The two individuals who are choosing the speakers and organizing the events around their visits appear to be exceptionally well qualified to select speakers who will be both scholarly and entertaining. The panel recommends full funding for this elegantly simple approach to education.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030UG-12

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mobile Applications Development Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Eric Fountain

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	2	(of 5 points)
B.2	11	(of 18 points)
B.3	9	(of 20 points)
B.4	2	(of 5 points)
B.5	1	(of 2 points)
B.6	3	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

E.1	1	(of 2 points)
E.2a	3	(For S/E)
or		(of 10 points)
E.2b		(For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 53 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$72,193
	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 project seeks to develop a mobile lab for courses that teach students about applications development in the Apple iOS platform for use on iPads and iPhones. The proposal needs to be significantly strengthened by providing sufficient detail in the enhancement plan section. The impact of the project was not clearly explained. While the enhancement plan does highlight the quality of the program and its valuable connections to industry, the connections have not been developed and presented in a meaningful or compelling way to benefit the overall project. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031UG-12

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of Histology Laboratory in the Department of Biological Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wanda Goleman

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		5	(of 5 points)	
B.2		10	(of 18 points)	
B.3		16	(of 20 points)	
B.4		4	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		4	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

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:**	$71,684
	Recommended Amount:	$71,684

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

This is a very well-written proposal that requests $71,684 for equipment to develop a Histology Lab course. The PI points out that the Department of Biological Sciences at Northwestern has concentrations in Biomedical Science, Natural Science, Bioinformatics, Forensic Science, Clinical Laboratory Sciences, and Veterinary Technology. Practical experience with tissue processing and histological stains would be valuable for students in the Forensic Science, Clinical Laboratory Science, and Veterinary Technology concentrations. The enhancement plan section of the proposal is minimal and does not address the exact nature of the proposed lab exercises, the anticipated enrollment, or the practicality of scheduling such equipment for multiple users. Nevertheless, the PI has significant experience with histological processing and so no issues are anticipated. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032UG-12

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Introductory Biology Labs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zafer Hatahet

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	16	(of 18 points)
B.3	15	(of 20 points)
B.4	5	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	5	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$70,939
	Recommended Amount:	$70,939

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 requests funds to enhance general biology teaching labs. Due to budget cuts each lab section now has 36-38 students. To ensure small group size, the PI requests ten Vernier Physiological workstations for each of two lab rooms that are in almost constant use. The need and argument are convincing and the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033UG-12

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening the Clinical Psychological Assessment Training Program Through a Greater Number and Range of Assessment Materials

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathryn Kelly

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)	

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		4	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		4	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	9	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	**Requested Amount:**	$28,065
RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Recommended Amount:**	$22,365

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.)

Although this proposal is geared primarily toward graduate students, the materials requested should benefit faculty and students by expanding the quantity and the breadth of standardized psychological assessment tools. This project will both increase the number of assessment resources currently available to the program and widen the range of materials by providing three new assessment measures studied now only theoretically and procedurally. Despite the fact that the rationale for the project is not well written and contains troubling errors, the need for the requested materials is clear. It would have been nice if the project had some institutional match. Nevertheless, funding for all the assessment resources enumerated is recommended, except that the number of WAIS kits with hardware should be reduced from 15 to ten, a reduction of $5,700. The total recommended funding for this project is $22,365.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Software/Hardware: A Lab for Extremes & Everything in Between

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ghassan Alkadi

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(of 5 points)
B.2	11	(of 18 points)
B.3	14.5	(of 20 points)
B.4	3	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	4	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 73.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$88,197
	Recommended Amount:	$65,454

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 a software/hardware laboratory to stimulate student research and increase their software and hardware development skills. The PIs are well qualified and experienced and the proposal is well thought out and presented. The range of projects that could be supported will provide students with the breadth and depth of real-life experiences. The connection with and focus on industry clients are valuable assets for students. However, the work plan would have benefited from additional details; the plan detracts from an otherwise strong proposal. The budget request does not provide adequate justification for the reviewers to recommend 50% faculty summer support. The reviewers recommend partial funding of $65,454 for equipment and urge the institution to provide at least one month of summer salary support for the PIs. It is important that institutional matching funds be maintained as pledged in the proposal to ensure the success of this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition and Integration of a Scalable Semiconductor-based Third Generation DNA Sequencing Instrument (Ion Torrent Personal Genome Machine) into Academics and Research at SELU

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Childers

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

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: $57,031
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 well written and articulate request for an $81,473 Ion Torrent Personal Genome Machine. A substantial institutional cash match of $24,442 reduces the request for BoRSF to $57,031. The PI justifies the purchase of such an instrument on several grounds. The first is that current research faculty are spending $2,000-$10,000 for an outsourced analysis that would only cost $500 on an in-house PGM. Another justification is that third-generation sequencing is an enabling technology that provides a broad range of new research possibilities. Purchase of a PGM seems like a strategic move on the part of Southeastern from a research and graduate education perspective. However, its integration into the undergraduate curriculum is less certain. One benchmark is that by the end of the first year there will be at least a 30% use directly for faculty research. It seems unlikely that large numbers of undergraduates with class projects would be using the instrument, especially when each run costs several hundred dollars. Few course budgets could accomodate much use at that rate. While this is a meritorius proposal, it seems to be primarily focused on graduate and faculty research productivity, and is unlikely to have a significant impact on undergraduate pedagogy or instruction. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collaborating on Common Core Standards

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Hanson

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes x	No

G. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$111,300
	Recommended Amount:	$47,697

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 complex proposal that seeks to integrate some of the activities of four different programs, all of which are clustered around the Department of English. The proposal is a marvel of administrative coordination but fails to show any real advantage to tying all of the programs together. The changes to the Early Start (ES) classes would be the addition of the Common Read texts and a session or two on Publishing Studies. The proposal fails to clearly describe the specific benefits of the parts and how each part would be enhanced. The panel sees common interests among the programs. The real driver of future cooperation appears to be the Publishing Studies program, which has the web and communication expertise to encourage and facilitate a less formal, guided interaction, including interaction between the University and high school faculties and, in the future, high school students. The panel recommends partial funding of $47,697 for the laptops and software for the Publishing Studies program (without AppleCare), which can be used to expand campus offerings and for the sort of outreach to high schools described in the proposal. The computers could also be used for web publication of ES writings, should the department wish to implement that part without BoRSF support for the seminars. The institutional match for equipment may be reduced proportionally with the BoRSF reduction in that line item.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of an Energy Laboratory for Engineering Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Junkun Ma

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	2	(of 5 points)
B.2	7	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes x	No

G. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount:	$83,000
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 describes the development of a new undergraduate energy laboratory that will host technologies relevant to both traditional and alternative energy sources for the undergraduate Engineering Technology program. The proposal would have been significantly strengthened by reworking the weak work plan, which provides only very limited information. The rationale for the project needs to be strengthened and more clearly stated. Because the idea has merit, the PIs are encouraged to address these shortcomings and resubmit the proposal in a future competition. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Multifunctional Mechanical Testing Instrument for Enhancing the Teaching and Research Capabilities of the Science and Technology Programs at Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rana Mitra

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	4	(of 5 points)
B.2	13	(of 18 points)
B.3	14	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes x	No

G. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $77,125
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 multifunctional mechanical properties tester capable of providing measurements at the macro, micro and nano scales. The proposed instrument is compact, modular, and less expensive than traditional machines. The PI and the co-PI appear to be well qualified to run the project. However, the role of these two individuals appears to focus more on research than on the courses cited in the proposal--no significant mention is made of other faculty support to implement this project and their role in it. The proposal would be significantly strengthened by adding detail to the section on impact. There is little institutional support for the project. The PIs are encouraged to work and grow this match. Because the idea has merit, the project should be revised and resubmitted at a future date. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039UG-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Robotics Lab for Hands-on Student Training

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ebrahim Khosravi

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score: N/A (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:**	$115,000	$0
	Recommended Amount:		

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, which was not reviewed by the panel, was submitted by an institution that is ineligible to participate in the Undergraduate Enhancement Subprogram.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Using High Performance Liquid Chromotography (HPLC) to Enhance Biology Curricula, Faculty Pedagogy and Student Learning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bashir Atteia

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	5	(of 6 points)
C.2	1	(of 1 point)
C.3	0	(of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

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:**	$67,070
RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Recommended Amount:**	$0

An HPLC sytem is requested to "enhance curricula, faculty pedagogy and student learning in Introduction to Biology, General Biology, Cell Biology, Pharmacology, and Chemistry courses." The PI convinced the panel that an HPLC unit would enhance laboratory research. It is also clear that the use of an HPLC in lab courses would open new possibilities for student labs. Less clear is whether an HPLC will enhance faculty pedagogy or student learning. Several interesting lab activities are described in which use of an HPLC would allow students to perform more sophisticated chemical analyses in the labs. However, no arguments are presented indicating how a more sophisticated measurement would enhance student learning. It could be argued that replacing the current hands-on colorimetric assays with a complex, technically difficult and difficult-to-interpret HPLC assay is heading in the wrong direction. The PI states that the HPLC will impact 350 students per semester. How will the students use the instrument? How many samples could be run in the course of a lab? Will students just observe a demonstration of the instrument? It is not clear how 350 students per semester will get enough hands-on use of an HPLC to make a difference in their learning outcome. If the PI has a way to handle that much student use, how will the department deal with the solvent waste stream that would be generated? With this many unanswered questions, the panel does not recommend funding the proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Computer Laboratory Facilities for Health Information Management Systems (HIMS) Instruction at Southern University at New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Andrea Mignott

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes		No x

G. Total Score: 71 (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:**	$130,293	$0
	Recommended Amount:	$130,293	$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 wishes to enhance the HIMS program by developing a computer laboratory, documents area, and appropriate audio and visual equipment to be used to support courses, projects, library needs, and certification. The integration of the plan with accreditation standards is a strength of the proposal. The project appears to fill a growing need in information systems related to health care, and the PIs appear to be suitably qualified to direct and implement the project. The proposal would have been further strengthened by the integration of individuals from the health care community in the implementation of this project. The PIs are strongly encouraged to incorporate some health care expertise in the project plan. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of General Biology, Microbiology, Cell and Molecular Biology, and Genetics Teaching and Research Instruction Infrastructure at Southern University at New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lisa Mims-Devezin

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		4	(of 5 points)	
B.2		16	(of 18 points)	
B.3		14.5	(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	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 86.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$69,733
	Recommended Amount:	$69,733

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 purchase an autoclave and a water purification system for the SUNO Biology Department. The equipment is justified and adequate details have been provided. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Utilizing Research and Literacy to Advance Students Through the Pipeline

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shatiqua Mosby-Wilson

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	3	(of 5 points)
B.2	13	(of 18 points)
B.3	14.5	(of 20 points)
B.4	4	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	5	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes	No x

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	7	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	No	x

G. Total Score: 72.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $99,300
Recommended Amount: $26,000

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.)

Although the stated goals of this project--improving literacy along with research and writing skills--are laudable, it is difficult to favorably view a proposal, particularly the project summary, as poorly written and presented as this. Failure to use paragraphs effectively, omitted words, grammatical errors and nonsentences are among the glaring errors. Moreover, some of the requested software, subscriptions, supplies, and library equipment are not well explained or specifically justified. Still, the need to help students attain basic, minimum skill levels in this library-oriented research and writing endeavor is apparent. The team recommends an award of $26,000 for the purchase of one Keios Envision Ware ($15,000), four student assistantships ($6,000), and the acquisition of other supplies to be determined by the PI ($5,000). Pledged institutional funds may be reduced proportionally, but the University should cover additional supplies.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 044UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Student Learning in Biological Sciences Laboratory Courses Through Undergraduate Laboratory Teaching Assistant Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tonye Numbere

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1		5	(of 5 points)	
B.2		10	(of 23 points)	
B.3		15	(of 25 points)	
B.4		4	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		5	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

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

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:**	$72,000
	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 $72,000 to support 24 undergraduates per semester to serve as Teaching Assistants who will work in pairs in departmental labs, each receiving a stipend of $1,500 per semester. Many advantages and benefits would accrue from the development of a successful TA program at SUNO. The panel, however, is concerned about the practicality of implementing such a large program in a single year, with no pilot program and no source of continuing funding. Although the goals and objectives are well thought out, it does not seem reasonable that a quality TA program could be initiated in the time allocated. The proposal states that there are 18 lab courses that teach 852 students per year. However, it is unclear how many course sections are offered in a year. The average of 24 students per section implies there are 35 lab sections per year, or 17 per semester. It is unclear if only selected courses will have TAs or if each TA assists in more than one section. Rather than a large, one-time program with no guarantee of continuing funds for future years, the PI might want to consider a smaller, pilot implementation with only a few TAs in one or two courses. This would be more manageable, provide evidence of success to justify continued funding requests, and perhaps permit a more "controlled" trial that could be published in the educational literature. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 045UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Education in English Programs Through Integration of Classroom Technologies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jennifer Nunes

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	16	(of 18 points)
B.3	9	(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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 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)

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:**	$37,803	$558
	Recommended Amount:	$22,818	$0

SUNO is in dire need of basic, essential equipment. Furthermore, its lack prevents English Department faculty from accessing many available resources such as digital texts and other materials. The proposal is strategic in the sense that a few well-considered items will go a long way toward improving undergraduate education at the University. The panel notes that despite the need, the proposal exhibits redundancy of function: the faculty notebooks and iPads overlap. Similarly, there is no need for a small projector for each faculty member, since three larger projectors are requested. The requests for extra cables in case of eventual wear and tear violates the Enhancement Program's rule of not funding maintenance. Purchasing DVDs is not recommended, given digital accessibility. The panel recommends partial funding of $22,818 as described below, with full maintenance of the match. If departmental faculty prefer notebooks to iPads, they may substitute them, either in whole or in part, and use remaining funds for any other recommended items. The panel recommends funding for these approved items: 12 iPads with 12 sets of accessories, $14,085.60; 6 pocket projectors with carrying cases, $3,744; 3 Epson projectors, $2,160; 3 VGA cables, $66; Insignia speakers, $80; 12 power strips, $432; and 3 locking storage units, $2,160. Remaining funds may be used for approved items at the PI's discretion.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 046UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Undergraduate Biology Laboratory Courses Through Integration of New Instrumentation into Active Teaching and Learning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joseph Olubadewo

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes x	No

G. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $90,117
Recommended Amount: $45,075

This proposal requests 12 physiological (iWorx) workstations and laptops for two labs used by Biology and Anatomy & Physiology faculty. The goal is to change the nature of the lab courses so that students will "engage more effectively in inquiry-based learning ... and mastery of biological concepts through construction of their own learning." Throughout the proposal specific experiments from the iWorx lab manuals are given. A significant danger is that trying to get away from "cookbook" style labs by adopting the iWorx system is like hopping from the frying pan into the fire because iWorx and other packaged systems are often used by students who simply follow the steps outlined in the lab manuals and accept any data that result. Developing true inquiry-based labs in which students understand and can make use of the transducers and data acquisition system to record physiological signals is not trivial. The proposal was difficult to read, needed editing, and had large blocks of bold and underlined text. All of the numbers and text in the figures were replaced by question marks that made no sense to the panel. In a time of limited resources, $90,000 for 12 workstations is not justifiable. The laptops do not need to be $2,000 business workhorses. A quoted passage from the iWorx literature states: "...other systems for physiology experimentation limit access to licensed computers (Vernier Systems)." **This statement is incorrect.** Vernier allows all faculty and students to install its software on home and/or school machines. The panel recommends partial funding of $45,075 (50% of the request) for the project and urges the PI to look into purchasing more appropriate and cost-effective technology for introductory courses, such as the Vernier or Pasco systems. Eighteen or more student stations could be purchased with judicious choices of sensors and computers.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 047UG-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Biology Unit Curriculum at Southern University in New Orleans with Cellular and Molecular Biology Equipment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Quincy Quick

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		3	(of 5 points)	
B.2		13	(of 18 points)	
B.3		14	(of 20 points)	
B.4		1	(of 5 points)	
B.5		1	(of 2 points)	
B.6		4	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$45,697
	Recommended Amount:	$22,864

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 purchase of a fluorescence microscope ($22,800) and a gel imager ($22,800) to enhance the teaching of a course related to Cellular and Molecular Biology. The instruments will also be used to support faculty and student research. The need for these pieces of equipment in a modern Biology program is apparent and the justification for the equipment to support independent student and faculty research is obvious. However, it is unclear how these instruments could be used effectively in lab courses. The proposal narrative lists ten labs that enroll 490 students a year as potential users of this equipment. The fluorescence microscope is not portable and, ideally, will be housed in a room that can be darkened. The practicalities of efficient and effective use of a single instrument by large classes is not addressed. No specific lab exercises or activities are described in detail. It appears that course instruction is a secondary use for the equipment and the primary use will be the PI's research. Nevertheless, partial funding of $22,864 is recommended, with full maintenance of the match. The PI may use discretion as to how to best use recommended funds for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 048UG-12

INSTITUTION: Xavier University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Virtualization: A High-Yield, Low-Cost Alternative for Outfitting Computer Science Teaching Labs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raymond Lang

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 63 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $64,969
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 address the high cost of ownership and poor use of funds associated with traditional computing laboratories through virtualization. Virtualization, it is argued, will provide higher flexibility, more adaptability and greater expandability at a lower overall cost of ownership. The proposal's primary objective is to replace an obsolete physical computer laboratory with a virtual one. Although the PIs have accomplished some initial work relative to the proof of concept, they did not convince the panel that the plan is workable. An important component was missing: the proposal lacked specific and detailed information regarding the application and integration of the new facility within the curriculum. No funding is recommended.

APPENDIX A

Summary of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Undergraduate Enhancement
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
001UG-12	Aizawa,Kenneth	Centenary College	1	E	N	Active and Interactive Learning into Action	$83,364.00	$0.00	$83,364.00
002UG-12	Butcher,Gregory	Centenary College	1	E	N	An Enhancement to the Centenary Neurobiology Curriculum	$36,081.00	$0.00	$36,081.00
003UG-12	Glaros,Susan	Centenary College	1	E	N	Communication Program Enhancement: High Definition Digital Filmmaking at Centenary College of Louisiana	$80,224.00	$0.00	$80,224.00
004UG-12	Goadrich,Mark	Centenary College	1	E	N	Making Computer Science Tangible Through Physical and Mobile Devices	$21,918.00	$0.00	$21,918.00
005UG-12	Duclos,Warren	Delgado Community College	1	E	N	Enhancing Digital Media Technologies for Game Design	$123,668.00	$0.00	$123,668.00
006UG-12	Hill,Freddye	Dillard University	1	E	N	Project to Retain and Engage First-Year Students	$32,300.00	$0.00	$32,300.00
007UG-12	Morris,Keith	Dillard University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Film and Multimedia Journalism through the production of Films and Multimedia Projects	$111,093.00	$0.00	$111,093.00
008UG-12	Negatu,Zeleke	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria	1	E	N	Acquisition of cryotome to incorporate hands-on experiential learning in the Biology Program	$25,500.00	$0.00	$25,500.00
009UG-12	Aamodt, Stephanie	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Enhancement of Learning through the Development of Digital Teaching Resources	$27,476.00	$0.00	$27,476.00
010UG-12	Alford,Robert	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Black Box Theatre Enhancement	$33,550.00	$0.00	$33,550.00
011UG-12	Banks,Stephen	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Establishment of a Dual Enrollment Biology (BIOS 120L) Teaching Laboratory at Parkway High School.	$50,323.00	$0.00	$50,323.00
012UG-12	Boucher,Gary	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	LSUS MACHINING CAPABILITY ENHANCEMENT	$7,099.00	$0.00	$7,099.00
013UG-12	Erickson,Amy	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	2	NE	N	Enhancement of Analytical Skills in Chemical Ecology	$45,824.00	$0.00	$45,824.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
014UG-12	Lucas,M. Cran	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Enhancement of Multimedia Technology in Biology, Biochemistry, and Bioinformatics	$23,435.00	$0.00	$23,435.00
015UG-12	McLemore,Laura	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Enhancing Education and Outreach Opportunities through the Handbook of Northwest Louisiana Online.	$131,413.00	$0.00	$131,413.00
016UG-12	Webster,Linda	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	SmartRoom Enhancement for Mass Communication Studies	$122,288.00	$0.00	$122,288.00
017UG-12	Williams-Hart, Tara	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Enhancement of Genetic Studies at LSUS	$75,000.00	$0.00	$75,000.00
018UG-12	Aghili,Seyed	McNeese State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Robotics Laboratory and Developing Multidisciplinary Course Contents	$72,104.00	$0.00	$72,104.00
019UG-12	Bender,Paul	McNeese State University	2	E	N	Arduino Laboratory Hardware for Computer Science Courses	$28,436.00	$0.00	$28,436.00
020UG-12	Bowman,Diane	McNeese State University	1	E	N	A Language Resource Center	$49,155.00	$0.00	$49,155.00
Proposal withdrawn by Institution 021UG-12	Hollingsworth, Debbie	McNeese State University	1	E	N	Acquisition of Equipment for Nutrition and Wellness Laboratory at McNeese State University	$17,500.00	$0.00	$17,500.00
022UG-12	Mendez,Julie	McNeese State University	2	E	N	Enhancement of Instruction of Corrosion Engineering	$68,449.00	$0.00	$68,449.00
023UG-12	Banville,Scott	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancing Student Achievement and Community Outreach via the Department of Languages & Literature at Nicholls State University through Computer Technology	$122,132.00	$0.00	$122,132.00
024UG-12	Corbin,Angela	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancing Core Facilities in Biological Sciences	$15,000.00	$0.00	$15,000.00
025UG-12	Gautreaux, Michael	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Petroleum Services Laboratory Enhancement Project	$184,894.00	$0.00	$184,894.00
026UG-12	Robichaux,Susan	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancing Anatomy Laboratory Experiences	$49,000.00	$0.00	$49,000.00
027UG-12	Wayment,Darcey	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Acquisition of a Modern Gas Chromatography/ Mass Spectrometer system to enhance Biological Instruction	$75,000.00	$0.00	$75,000.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
028UG-12	Zou,Enmin	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancing physiology education at Nicholls State University	$51,200.00	$0.00	$51,200.00
029UG-12	Crank,James	Northwestern State University	2	NE	N	Establishing a Distinguished Speakers Series at Northwestern State University	$20,000.00	$0.00	$20,000.00
030UG-12	Fountain,Eric	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Mobile Applications Development Lab	$72,193.00	$0.00	$72,193.00
031UG-12	Goleman,Wanda	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Development of Histology Laboratory in the Department of Biological Sciences	$71,684.00	$0.00	$71,684.00
032UG-12	Hatahet,Zafer	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of introductory biology labs	$70,939.00	$0.00	$70,939.00
033UG-12	Kelly,Kathryn	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	STRENGTHENING THE CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT TRAINING PROGRAM THROUGH A GREATER NUMBER AND RANGE OF ASSESSMENT MATERIALS.	$28,065.00	$0.00	$28,065.00
034UG-12	Alkadi,Ghassan	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Software/Hardware: A Lab for Extremes and Everything in Between	$88,197.00	$0.00	$88,197.00
035UG-12	Childers,Gary	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Acquisition and integration of a scalable semiconductor based third generation DNA sequencing instrument (Ion Torrent Personal Genome Machine) into academics and research at SELU	$57,031.00	$0.00	$57,031.00
036UG-12	Hanson,David	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Collaborating on Common Core Standards	$111,300.00	$0.00	$111,300.00
037UG-12	Ma,Junkun	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Development of an Energy Laboratory for Engineering Technology	$83,000.00	$0.00	$83,000.00
038UG-12	Mitra,Rana	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Acquisition of a Multifunctional Mechanical Testing Instrument for Enhancing the Teaching and Research Capabilities of the Science and Technology Programs at Southeastern Louisiana University	$77,125.00	$0.00	$77,125.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
039UG-12	Khosravi,Ebrahim	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	2	E	N	A Robotics Lab for Hands-on Student Training	$115,000.00	$0.00	$115,000.00
040UG-12	Atteia,Bashir	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	E	N	Using High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) to Enhance Biology Curricula, Faculty Pedagogy and Student Learning	$67,070.00	$0.00	$67,070.00
041UG-12	Mignott,Andrea	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	2	E	N	Enhancement of Computer Laboratory Facilities for Health Information Management Systems (HIMS) Instruction at Southern University of New Orleans	$130,293.00	$0.00	$130,293.00
042UG-12	Mims-Devezin, Lisa	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	E	N	Enhancement of General Biology, Microbiology, Cell and Molecular Biology, and Genetics Teaching and Research Instruction and Infrastructure at Southern University at New Orleans	$69,733.00	$0.00	$69,733.00
043UG-12	Mosby-Wilson, Shatiqua	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	E	N	Utilizing Research and Literacy to Advance Students Through the Pipeline	$99,300.00	$0.00	$99,300.00
044UG-12	Numbere, Tonye	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	NE	N	Enhancement of Student Learning in Biological Science Laboratory Courses through Undergraduate Laboratory Teaching Assistant Program.	$72,000.00	$0.00	$72,000.00
045UG-12	Nunes, Jennifer	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	2	E	N	Improving Education in English Programs Through Integration of Classroom Technologies	$37,803.00	$558.00	$38,361.00
046UG-12	Olubadewo, Joseph	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	E	N	Enhancement of Undergraduate Biology Laboratory Courses Through Integration of New Instrumentation Into Active Teaching and Learning	$90,117.00	$0.00	$90,117.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
047UG-12	QUICK, QUINCY	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	E	N	Enhancing the Biology unit curriculum at Southern University in New Orleans with Cellular and Molecular Biology equipment	$45,697.00	$0.00	$45,697.00
048UG-12	Lang, Raymond	Xavier University	1	E	N	Virtualization: A High-Yield, Low-Cost Alternative for Outfitting Computer Science Teaching Labs	$64,969.00	$0.00	$64,969.00

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

Total Number of Proposals submitted	48
Total Money Requested for First Year	$3,234,942.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	$558.00
Total Money Requested	$3,235,500.00

APPENDIX B

Enhancement Program Rating Forms:

1. Equipment

2. Non-equipment

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

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?

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:

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:_____

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

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_____	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 66 points

_____ of 5 pts.	B.1	Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?
_____ of 23 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 25 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?

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?

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:

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:_____