

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN THE SPECIAL
MULTIDISCIPLINARY CATEGORY

March 2010

Prepared by:

Winston Erevelles (Chair)
Dean, School of Science, Engineering and Technology
St. Mary's University

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
FY 2009-10**

Introduction

Thirty-one (31) Multidisciplinary Enhancement Program proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents staff for review by the panel chair, Dr. Winston Erevelles of St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas. The proposals were divided into the root disciplines eligible for competition, including Agriculture, Arts, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Engineering A, and Health and Medical Sciences, and distributed to five subject-area reviewers. Total funding requested was \$4,444,899, with \$4,344,899 of that amount requested in first-year funds.

Dr. Erevelles received the following materials for review: (a) the thirty-one (31) proposals; (b) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, principal investigators, their institutions, etc.; (c) the FY 2009-10 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals (RFP); and (d) thirty-one (31) rating forms.

The subject-area reviewers submitted their evaluations of individual proposals to Dr. Erevelles electronically for further review and funding recommendations. After careful consideration and communication with subject-area reviewers, the proposals were ranked and \$706,109 was recommended for seven (7) proposals, two (2) of them at reduced funding levels. A reduced level of funding was made available to the special multidisciplinary category this year and the submission level was relatively high. Therefore a number of proposals that were reviewed very favorably by the panel were unable to be funded. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table II contains a rank-order list of proposals not recommended for funding.

A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

SUBJECT-AREA REVIEWERS

Area	Review
Engineering A	Dr. John W. Steadman, University of South Alabama
Earth and Environmental	Dr. Jonathan Patchett University of Arizona
Arts	Dr. Patricia Wasserboehr University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Agriculture	Dr. David B. Beasley Arkansas State University
Health & Medical Sciences	Dr. John Kendall Oregon Health & Science University

**TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	96	014MUL-10	LaTech	\$57,085	\$57,085		
2	95	029MUL-10	UL-M	\$147,734	\$147,734		
3	94.5	008MUL-10	LaTech	\$64,965	\$64,965		
4	94	027MUL-10	UL-L	\$49,281	\$49,281		
5	92.5	016MUL-10	McNeese	\$143,811	\$78,923		
6	92	005MUL-10	LSU-BR	\$148,121	\$148,121		
7	91	031MUL-10	UNO	\$199,386	\$160,000		
TOTALS:				\$810,383	\$706,109	\$0	\$0

**TABLE II
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
8	90	007MUL-10	LSU-S	\$109,771	\$0		
8	90	012MUL-10	LaTech	\$71,098	\$0		
10	89	013MUL-10	LaTech	\$124,167	\$0		
11	88.5	004MUL-10	LSU-BR	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000*	\$0
11	88.5	018MUL-10	Northwestern	\$52,619	\$0		
13	88	006MUL-10	LSU-S	\$152,692	\$0		
14	87	022MUL-10	TUHSC	\$108,893	\$0		
15	86	023MUL-10	UL-L	\$75,586	\$0		
16	84	002MUL-10	LSU-BR	\$318,896	\$0		
16	84	026MUL-10	UL-L	\$287,070	\$0		
18	80	017MUL-10	Nicholls	\$26,898	\$0		
18	80	024MUL-10	UL-L	\$91,265	\$0		
20	79	003MUL-10	LSU-BR	\$250,375	\$0	\$0	\$0
20	79	011MUL-10	LaTech	\$94,271	\$0		
22	78	019MUL-10	SU-BR	\$436,352	\$0	\$0	\$0
23	77	025MUL-10	UL-L	\$77,506	\$0		
24	76	030MUL-10	UL-M	\$323,540	\$0		
25	75	009MUL-10	LaTech	\$79,220	\$0		
26	73	021MUL-10	SU-BR	\$130,895	\$0		
27	72	028MUL-10	UL-M	\$161,011	\$0		
28	70	001MUL-10	LSU-BR	\$198,243	\$0		
28	70	020MUL-10	SU-BR	\$91,575	\$0	\$0	\$0
30	57	015MUL-10	McNeese	\$75,250	\$0		
31	49	010MUL-10	LaTech	\$97,323	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$3,534,516	\$0	\$100,000	\$0

*The RFP restricts Second Year Requests to \$50,000.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing an Advanced Sustainable Materials Laboratory to
Enhance Sustainable Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marwa Hassan

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$198,243
 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.)

While this proposal was submitted as multidisciplinary and Engineering A, it is for equipment to establish an advanced sustainable materials laboratory which will be utilized by disciplines such as industrial engineering, materials engineering and materials science that are specifically identified in the RFP as Engineering B. Thus the eligibility is questionable. In addition, the intellectual focus is on characterization of nano-particles and nano-materials. The connection between this science and engineering interest and materials suitable for sustainable construction is weak. It is evident that the Principal Investigators could benefit from having this suite of equipment. However, it is questionable that having this laboratory "exclusively dedicated to construction applications" would make them nationally competitive or is even the right approach to achieving the listed goals. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Students' Communication Skills Through Advanced Multimodal Projects

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sarah Liggett

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$318,896
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.)

Communication across the curriculum to enhance the traditional modes of writing and speaking with new proficiencies in visual and technological education is a worthy goal. Clearly, many undergraduates will benefit. The proposal is well written and several elements such as a table of contents and a glossary of terms make it easy to comprehend. In addition, goals are clearly articulated and linked directly to funding requests. The proposal provides evidence of full administrative support for the initiative and demonstrates how personnel have been good stewards of past financial support. The proposal would be strengthened by a rationale for how the four modes would be used in a music or theater class just as it gives a good example for the sports medicine class. In section B.5 the proposal states that LSU's in-state and national recruiting power will be increased. If so, it is important to report how current initiatives have already improved recruitment efforts. The budget is relatively large for this competition. While the panel is very supportive of this competitive proposal, funding is not recommended due to limited funds available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: X-Ray Absorption Spectroscopy at CAMD: Version 2.0

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Spivey

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$250,375</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal is to add equipment to the synchrotron at LSU-BR, which is primarily a basic science facility used in physics and chemistry, disciplines which are not eligible in this competition. However, the RFP clearly states that the topic of the proposal is to determine eligibility, not the discipline of the Principal Investigators. A second weakness of the proposal is that its primary impact is to allow for the creation of two independent and simultaneously available beam lines, the need for which is not established. In fact, the assertion that there is a lack of available beam time at this and the many other Department of Energy (DOE) operated x-ray beam lines is not justified. While the requested amount is large for this competition, it is very small compared to the National Science Foundation and DOE investments in the Center for Advanced Materials and Devices (CAMD). Thus the impact of this project on national prominence or faculty development is not likely to be significant. The major strengths of the proposal include the very capable PIs and the clear description of exactly what equipment would be purchased and how it enhances the CAMD capabilities. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Hierarchical Mentoring - Transforming Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Isiah Warner

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17.5 (of 20 points)
B.3 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 88.5 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$100,000*</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This is a well-designed proposal to augment a Howard Hughes Medical Institutes-supported program developed to provide opportunities for students to acquire skills for careers in the sciences. It is built on a background of previous efforts to increase the population of scientists, especially those from diverse backgrounds. Section D was minimally described but actually constitutes a major element of the argument and should have been expanded. The budget for each year is exactly \$100,000, which seems a bit artificial and justified on the basis of it being the amount that was promised to HHMI to augment the \$800,000 request from that organization. Though the panel felt the proposal was very competitive, with limited funds available no funds are recommended.

*The RFP permits a maximum request of \$50,000 in the second year.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Nano Universal Testing System for Integrated Enhancement
of Multidisciplinary Research and Education on
Nanomechanics, Geosciences, and Biomaterials

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Guoping Zhang

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$148,121</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$148,121</u>

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

This proposal requests funding for a nano-scale universal testing machine and combines the disciplines of civil engineering, environmental sciences, and health sciences. A strength of the proposal is that it adds a needed equipment resource that complements existing capabilities while adding a capability that is not available on the campus. Another strength is the capabilities of the Principal Investigators from various disciplines who have cooperated in the proposal development. Full funding is recommended.

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Quantitative Analysis Instrumentation Enhancement for Multidisciplinary Education & Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: M. Cran Lucas

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$152,692
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal would allow the University to significantly expand capabilities for measuring diverse chemical entities through the use of high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC). Specifically, the proposal would replace an obsolete Waters HPLC system with a new, much more capable one. The applicants provide examples of impact on a number of disciplines that would benefit from this equipment. There is a meaningful institutional match. Since the equipment is critical to so many lines of research and education the applicants should have developed a more secure plan for timely replacement rather than waiting for it to become obsolete. Though the proposal is competitive and relatively well constructed, funding is not recommended due to limited funds available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Motion Capture & Analysis Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raffaele Scaduto-Mendola

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score:

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$109,771
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This project is well designed to support several units at LSU Shreveport, including Kinesiology/Health Sciences, Animation/Visual Effects and Drama/Theatre. It calls for the purchase of equipment to record motion that can be subsequently analyzed for performance movement as well as for diagnosis. In that regard, the proposed uses among several educational units is very attractive. The budget includes the purchase of a system with 10 total cameras, though specific justification for 10 units is missing. Also, the identification of additional external funding would have helped the score. While the panel found the proposal to be relatively competitive, due to limited funds available no funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nanomaterials Safety Lab: Research Integrated with Service and Education (RISE)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark DeCoster

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 20 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4.5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score: 94.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$64,965
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$64,965

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

This is a proposal for a lab to characterize nanoparticles and their safety aspects. The Principal Investigators already specialize in nanomaterials research and are quite well funded externally for this work. It seems inescapable that careful characterization of nanomaterials and their safety hazards will be increasingly necessary as they come into greater use, or as the recognition of ongoing pollution by nanoparticles becomes greater. The equipment requested is well suited to this characterization and the PIs have the necessary expertise to use it to maximum advantage. One weakness is that specific research pathways and protocols are not described, even in a general way. Although courses taught by the PIs are detailed, the manner in which this laboratory and equipment will be used in them is not. The proposal would have been improved with the addition of a couple of examples from existing nanoparticle inventories describing what successive steps would be followed to characterize them and their potential toxicity and how that might be used in teaching. Nevertheless, the panel believes this type of laboratory is necessary to the PIs' research, valuable to the University, and will be well used both in research and education. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Model Garden / Outdoor Learning Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter Gallagher

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 20 points)
 B.3 18 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$79,220 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

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

This proposal would create an upgraded play area for the early childhood education center at Louisiana Tech. To do so students in agriculture, architecture, and the child development areas would team up to design and build a multi-faceted play area which has already been conceptualized. The applicants indicate that this would be a "creative and significant educational experience". It is not clear how much input the students would have, since a final design (or nearly one) was described in the proposal. Further, this would be a one-time experience that would involve agricultural students only to a marginal degree. The proposed work has merit, though submitting it as a special multidisciplinary project allied with agriculture appears to be a stretch. This effort primarily benefits early childhood education, which will be eligible next-year. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancements to the Art and Architecture Workshop:
Precision, Safety, and Portability of Tools Used in the Making
of Art and Architecture

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kevin Kennedy

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
 E.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b 4 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 15 points)
 B.3 5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 0 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

H. Total Score: 49 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$97,323
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to upgrade tools and equipment shared by faculty and students in the Art and Architecture Woodshop facilities. Associated with the upgrade is the need for safety and portability. The equipment can potentially be used by a wide variety of disciplines. The applicants provide impressive examples in art and architecture of successful outreach activities on campus and in the private sector. The proposal is not well written. It needs thorough editing, is repetitive in places, and lacks cohesive organization. The multidisciplinary feature of this proposal is the common woodshop facility that will be shared by two separate departments with distinctly different educational agendas. It seems that architecture students can enroll in art courses as electives, and collaborative projects and workshops are suggested for students in both departments, but details and examples of co-curricular initiatives are not stated. The project goals are general and lack specificity. For example, what are methods and contemporary practices inherent in the curriculum that the goal of upgrading the woodshop will assist in creating? The proposal calls for development of "syllabi and curriculum for the enhancement to take place through classroom projects," but course descriptions or program developments are omitted from all sections of the proposal. Section E., "Economic or Cultural Development and Impact," could be more convincing by including the Habitat for Humanity design/build house projects or site-specific sculpture commissions, projects that have a direct impact on the creative and cultural economy. The proposal appears to be still in its draft stage and needs to be further developed and resubmitted. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advancing Innovative Product Design at Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Maggio

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score:

79

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$94,271
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal describes how a school, college, and center at Louisiana Tech University will collaboratively explore product design, and in doing so, impact the entrepreneurial potential on campus. The proposal is generally well written and the vision is clearly articulated. The capabilities of the requested equipment items are clearly defined. However, the proposal could be strengthened in many ways. The project summary outlines four main goals, two of which are not fully explained in the body of the proposal. For instance, a "new interdisciplinary plan of study" and a "framework for interdepartmental collaboration" are stated goals, but curricular or programmatic initiatives are not presented in the section labeled "Impact on Curriculum and Instruction." The proposal clearly articulates the collaborative goal to design products, but it would be strengthened by examples of products that have already been produced to meet the needs of potential customers. The performance measures of the enhancement plan should include an evaluation for the outcomes of marketing the products to affiliate companies. In an age of interdisciplinary enterprise in academia, this proposal is compelling and achievable. However, due to limited funds available no funds are recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Nanoparticle Manufacturing Lab Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dennis O'neal

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14.5 (of 15 points)
B.3 16.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score:

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$71,098
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a well written proposal to acquire equipment that will add significantly to nanotechnology education and research capabilities of a large corps of experienced faculty. It will benefit both from the expanded ability to teach as well as the ability to expand their own successes in research. The role in aiding faculty development lacked detail. The identification of external sources of funding would have also helped. While the panel found the proposal to be very competitive, due to limited funds available funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multi-Disciplinary Enhancement of the Speech-Language
Pathology, Audiology, Health Information Management
Programs at Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kerri Phillips

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$124,167
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a compelling proposal that will assist in bringing two large elements, the Speech & Hearing program and the Health Information Management program, together for education and potentially for research. The requested equipment is well-justified for education, but could have been better justified for research and for connections with the communities served. Also, the writing of some sections with very large numbers of abbreviations was often difficult to follow, especially if undefined as in "ABD status". Not all reviewers will be familiar with all abbreviations. The budget is large but appropriate. However, due to limited funds available no funding is recommended.

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech Universtiy

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: School of Biological Sciences Multi-Analyte Bioassay
Detection System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jeffry Shultz

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

96

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$57,085
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$57,085

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

This proposal seeks funds to acquire a Luminex 200 bioassay instrument in order to expand capabilities for performing bioassays in a number of disciplines at Louisiana Tech. The Principal Investigators have experience with the technology and the need is clearly demonstrated. Although the institutional match is relatively small, the proposal has significant merit. It will provide a boost both to educational and research efforts across a number of departments. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015MUL-10

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 2 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 57 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$75,250
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The strengths of this proposal are that the small mobile robots will provide a laboratory experience not currently available to McNeese students and the requested equipment will very likely result in development of a second robotics course. However, there are several weaknesses to this proposal. First, there is no evidence that the faculty have discussed this kind of robotic equipment with their stakeholders from industry. Such small, mobile robots are not nearly as common in industry as are the stationary robots already available at MSU. In fact, they are more commonly used in various competitions, demonstrations, and similar activities. Second, the proposal does not make a convincing case that this would make the department more regionally or nationally prominent. Third, the proposal states that this would significantly improve retention from freshman to sophomore year, yet there is no rationale given for this claim nor any data provided that would substantiate this assertion. Fourth, the Principal Investigator has not published in nearly 20 years in either the technical or the engineering education literature. Thus, if the project did make a difference at McNeese, it likely would not have impact beyond that campus. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016MUL-10

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Instrumentation Designed to Make Efficient Use of Organic Solvents for Instructional, Research, Fiscal and Environmental Purposes

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ron Darbeau

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

92.5

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11.5 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$143,811

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$78,923

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 instrumentation for solvent recycling and for chemistry research. The research activities have applications to drug development and environmental science. The proposal is extremely well prepared. The existing resources, the active researchers, the solvent cost/disposal problem to be addressed, the equipment, and its enhancement of student training are all clearly described in a way that brings out the motivation of Principal Investigator and others in the Department of Chemistry. An adequate institutional match is provided. The equipment requested is divided straightforwardly into two groups: (1) two solvent recyclers, one for Chemistry and one for the Art department; and (2) four research equipment items. The panel is impressed by the motivation to recover solvents for re-use, to reduce purchase costs and disposal costs and issues. The title of the proposal and the abstract mainly reflect the solvent recovery theme, and the matching funds appear to reflect support for this aspect of the project. The research applications are also significant, but with limited funds available they might be viewed as a secondary priority. Therefore the panel recommends partial funding, though reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Laboratory Curricula with Raman Spectroscopy

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Glenn Lo

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$26,898
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to acquire a portable Raman Spectroscopy machine that will be used in undergraduate education in order to familiarize chemistry students with analytical techniques important to the field. The value to future employment in Louisiana is significant. The undergraduate courses and the application of Raman to them are well described. The areas of responsibility of the Principal Investigators are clear. Minor shortcomings in the proposal are (1) that in section 3b it is stated that existing equipment is described "in section 4a.3", but there does not seem to be any section 4a.3 and existing resources are therefore not described; (2) matching funds put forward include salary percentages of faculty for activities they would be doing regardless of funding, activities which will be considerably enhanced by the requested equipment. A potentially greater negative on a proposal like this is that none of the PIs appear to have direct experience of operating the equipment. The fundamentals of the method are not explained anywhere, which tends to reinforce an impression of a lack of familiarity. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Virtual Case Studies for Pre-Health Science Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Garrett Dancik

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14.5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score: 88.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$52,619 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>

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

This application describes a very practical approach to introduce and teach diagnostic reasoning. The students are directly involved and not simply "taught at," but rather learn at the "computer bedside" and benefit both from mistakes and successes. The application would be strengthened by more detail about how students who will be hired to develop software will carry out this part of the project. No major defects were noted and all-in-all it is a strong proposal. The budget is virtually all dedicated to salaries of graduate and undergraduate students who will develop the programs under supervision and is appropriate. While the panel finds the proposal to be competitive, due to limited funds available funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of CAVE at Southern University for LA
Researchers and Educators

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amitava Jana

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$436,352</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposed project is clearly multidisciplinary. The size of the request is very large, especially as it relates to funding available for this competition. The stand-alone virtual reality system would add new and significant capabilities, while the requested projection upgrades add brightness but not important additional capabilities. The proposal does not make a case that the existing CAVE has resulted in major publications, research grants, or national prominence. Accordingly, there is no evidence that adding the digital projectors would make the very high investment justified. The proposal would be much stronger with some rationale for why having the VR system would enhance the education of the engineering students, the faculty research success, or strong demand for this capability from the industry employing graduates of SU and LSU. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Dispersive Raman Capabilities in the
Environmental Sciences for Research and Teaching at SU

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin Walker, Jr.

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$91,575</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks a Raman Spectroscopy machine that will be used in undergraduate education in order that chemistry graduates will be familiar with analytical techniques important to the field. The value to future employment in Louisiana is significant. The facility will also be used in the Principal Investigators' research. The proposal is not very clear in a number of ways. There are a number of typographical errors and sentences that can only be understood by inserting or changing words. Although courses that will be enhanced are mentioned they are in section a.3 instead of b.4 and no detail of how Raman would be used in them is given. In section c.3 it is stated that PI will manage the laboratory, but a section on the next page states that a Co-PI will coordinate utilization and maintenance. For a facility of this cost, the laboratory management is critical. Where current research is described in section b.1, there is ample description of activities, but little targeted description of how Raman will deliver novel enhancement of them, or of ways in which it would be indispensable. The mention of previous BORSF support in section f.5 gives no details. There are no matching funds. An additional potential negative on a proposal like this is that none of the PIs appear to have direct experience of operating Raman lab facilities. It is stated that a Co-PI has extensive user experience, but no details are given. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021MUL-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Research in Civil Engineering and
Composites through the Acquisition of Compact X-ray
Microtomograph (μ -CT) Equipment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Eyassu Woldesenbet

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$130,895
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The primary strength of this proposal is that the Principal Investigator and other faculty involved are active in materials research, especially work in fiber-reinforced composites. The requested equipment would add a non-destructive evaluation capability that would compliment an impressive materials engineering laboratory. The major and very important weakness of this proposal is its questionable eligibility. The topic of the proposal, which is used to determine eligibility, is clearly materials science and engineering, which, according to the RFP, falls under Engineering B. Two other weaknesses are important. One is that the choice of this particular equipment is not ever discussed or justified. That is, there is no discussion of alternatives, their cost or capabilities, nor why they were rejected. Another problem is the inadequate work plan and its relationship to moving the materials engineering group to eminence. Simply stating what existing research projects might use the equipment is not a work plan describing how this particular equipment is critical to building a stronger research program. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Tulane University Health Sciences Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Geographic Information Systems and Spatial Methods
Research and Education Opportunities at Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frances Mather

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$108,893
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks funding for equipment in a teaching lab for GIS approaches, to bring in outside speakers for a training course in the area, and for equipment to conduct remote GIS surveys. The case for applicability of GIS to a range of research areas is well made, and the need for training, both of principles through a dedicated course delivered by experts, and of students through regular classroom instruction, is clear. The main hurdles in utilizing GIS in projects with a geographic dimension are achieving awareness of what GIS can do, acquiring familiarity with the software, and possessing a network of information-gathering and information-processing equipment. The proposal addresses all these needs. The PIs are all active researchers with good publication records and respectable citation levels, who will use the equipment to good advantage both in research and teaching. The PIs have presented the case for GIS expansion well, and they have a plan that seeks to deliver GIS expertise to research areas beyond their own. The training course is worthwhile, provided speakers are well chosen, and real practical exercises are performed by class participants during the visits. There is no explanation of how the new facilities will interact with those existing. The primate research is interesting, but it is not clear what the role of GIS would be in the study of captive primates, as these are by definition in controlled locations and environments. The need for retractable workstations in the GIS teaching lab is not fully explained in terms of the space available. The matching funds consist of the PI's own time to develop concepts, courses and laboratories, and waived indirect costs. A direct cash contribution would have improved the rating in this category. Though the panel supports this competitive proposal, funding is not recommended due to limited funds available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023MUL-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collaborative Visualization Testbed for Curriculum
Enhancement in Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christoph Borst

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 18 (of 20 points)
 B.3 20 (of 25 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 3 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$75,586
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

The proposal's work plan is detailed and persuasive. The faculty involved are well qualified with excellent recent publication records. It is truly multidisciplinary, as it includes significant involvement from faculty from different disciplines. Much of the budget is for graduate assistants, who will no longer be at the University after graduation. Thus, sustainability is somewhat of a concern. Though the panel believes the proposal is competitive, funding is not recommended due to limited funds available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024MUL-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Fused Deposition Modeling Rapid Prototyping System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ahmed Khattab

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$91,265
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The abstract of this proposal states that the "Industrial Technology Department (College of Engineering) and the Industrial Design Department (College of the Arts), in partnership with the Manufacturing Extension Partnership of Louisiana (MEPOL), are working together to acquire a Fused Deposition Modeling Rapid Prototyping System utilizing Direct Digital Manufacturing Technology". However, a letter of support from MEPOL acknowledges a partnership with the College of Engineering. An Advanced Materials Lab is to be developed through this project, but a detailed description of this lab is omitted. It is clear that the FDM System with DDM will enhance separately the disciplines of engineering and industrial design, but there is no information on interdisciplinary requirements or developments. How will the new technology be integrated into co curricular engineering and industrial design learning experiences? How many students will be enrolled in courses that utilize the new equipment? In the work plan of the proposed project there is no timetable for all of the tasks with attendant benchmarks. In the performance measure section evaluations of educational outcomes are not included. The institutional match is relatively low, considering the existing partnership with MEPOL and the potential for economic development. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025MUL-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Robotics System into Electrical Control and
Automation Technology Courses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gholam Massiha

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$77,506
 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.)

Strengths of this proposal include a clear work plan that is well connected to improvement of instruction in robotics, control, and manufacturing automation. The faculty involved are clearly capable of integrating this laboratory experience into the existing industrial technology program.

The weaknesses of the proposal relate to the impact on faculty development, research and achieving eminence. Part of the problem is that the proposed equipment is appropriate for technology level teaching, but not for robotics or automation research. It is not clear that this can contribute to bringing the program or faculty to national prominence when similar teaching laboratories are in use at many other institutions. Overall, the proposal is clear and makes a case that it will improve the education for electrical engineering and industrial technology students. However, due to limited funds available no funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026MUL-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laser Scanning Microscope (LSM) to Support Teaching and
Research of Polymer/Tissue Compatibility, Drug Delivery
Systems, and Hydration Inhibited Auto-fluorescence

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. Devesh Misra

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$287,070
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a very good equipment proposal with a clear work plan and strong case that the Laser Scanning Microscope can contribute to strengthening the research programs of the Principal Investigators. The faculty involved have been publishing regularly and the PI has obtained significant funding from the National Science Foundation for several research projects. The weaknesses in the proposal are in the rather modest impact it would have on instruction and the very small contribution on the part of the University toward this purchase. This has resulted in a request that is relatively high for this competition. It also does not show much commitment on the part of the University to support this research area. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027MUL-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Optical Fiber Fusion Splicer for the Development of a
Multidisciplinary Program at UL Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zhongqi Pan

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 94 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 19.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$49,281
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$49,281

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 strong proposal requesting a moderate amount of funding for a device to fuse optical fibers. The work plan is clear and appropriate. The faculty involved have very good publication and funding records. While this equipment is not entirely critical to any of the department's education or research objectives, it is a worthy investment that will provide an exciting new capability at relatively low cost. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028MUL-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Instrument Enhancement for Monitoring Climate Change and Establishment of Center for Biometeorology at the University of Louisiana, Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joydeep Bhattacharjee

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

72

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$161,011
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks funding for a climate/weather tower in bottomland hardwood forest (BHF) in northern Louisiana, with the main goal of measuring carbon dioxide fluxes in this environment. All instruments required to equip a measurement tower are presented in details, and requested. The proposed facility would enhance the research profile of the Principal Investigators, make ties between the Biology and Geoscience departments, help with student instruction, and foster links with national organizations related to climate change. ULM offers some matching funds in cash, and in addition some of the required equipment already exists. The PIs have the necessary knowledge to implement the project, particularly with the help of the consultant from North Carolina State. The proposal is well written, and careful homework has been done on the instruments requested. However, while CO₂ flux data would certainly be of value from this forest, no case is made of a special significance for climate change, which would justify the large expense. The fact that BHF are a threatened ecosystem is due to removal for agriculture, but this does not mean that the CO₂ flux within them is of extraordinary value for global climate change. The facility would certainly enhance the profile of the PIs and act as a vehicle for presentations and papers, as well as being a novel element of student instruction. The results would add to national and global databases, but no case is made that they have a chance to change any major interpretations or policies. As such, this proposal seems to have a reduced priority. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029MUL-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advancing ULM Free Radical Research through Acquisition of
ESR/EPR Spectrometer

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Meyer

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$147,734
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$147,734

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 lays out the rationale, need, educational and research plans in exceptionally direct and thorough detail. Louisiana's involvement in pharmacy and toxicology programs is discussed completely and fulfill all the required elements listed in the RFP as well as every question posed by the panel. Only very minor weaknesses were noted and do not detract from the overall value of the proposal. The budget is appropriate and is basically an all-or-none budget for two pieces of equipment. Additional funding from external sources would have helped the score. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Universtiy of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of A High Performance Single Crystal X-Ray
Diffractometer for Structural Analyses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ralph Zehnder

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

76

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$323,540
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal requests a state-of-the-art single-crystal X-ray diffraction unit to be shared between ULM and Grambling State. It would be used in support of research activities principally in chemistry of metal ion complexes. Presently several of the Principal Investigators send their samples to LSU-BR for crystallographic characterization, but that laboratory is heavily subscribed and response is slow. The LSU laboratory director has written in support of the current proposal. It is true, as noted in his letter and in the proposal, that X-ray characterization of synthetic samples is needed during projects to guide further experiments rather than as added value shortly before publication. As such, the slow response time for X-ray analyses is a significant impediment to the PIs' research. The panel is supportive of the argument that placement of a high-quality facility for crystallography at ULM would be strategic regionally, in promoting the research of the PI team, and in fostering collaborations between them, with other institutions, and perhaps industry. It would also raise the level of student training at ULM and Grambling State significantly. All these aspects are very cogently presented in the proposal. However, the panel notes that X-ray crystallography is not the primary field of the PIs. In the current situation, several of them are users of analytical data provided by existing X-ray laboratories, but have not acquired data themselves, or run a facility like the one proposed. It seems safe and fair to say that all the PIs would be beginners in performing single-crystal X-ray crystallography. While the sincerity of the efforts that would be made is not doubted, the research support need is evident, and the educational benefit obvious, the panel is concerned that without an X-ray crystallographer to manage the facility it would not be used to full advantage. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031MUL-10

INSTITUTION: Universtiy of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Use of 4K Digital Projection to Enhance Theatrical Scenic
Design, Film History, Criticism, and Postproduction Programs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Racine

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$199,386
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$160,000

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 proposal is well written and well documented. It explains the need to equip a renovated theater with a 4K digital projector at UNO for a variety of purposes as well as for the benefit of the surrounding communities. Performing art centers on university campuses are usually the hub of cultural and artistic endeavors of a given community and have the potential to boost the "creative" economy. In addition, many students will benefit from a wide variety of courses that will be enhanced across disciplines. The University has already invested funds in the renovation of the theater and has pledged substantial matching funds for the equipment. To strengthen this proposal in the category of performance measures, audience numbers need to be recorded as well as increases in revenue. Partial funding is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Multi Disciplinary
for the FY 2009-10 Review Cycle**

#	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equip./ Non Equip.	Project Title	Amount Requested		
						Year 1 -----	Year2 -----	Total
001MUL-10	Hassan, Marwa	LSU-BR	1 Yr	Equipment	Establishing an Advanced Sustainable Materials Laboratory to Enhance Sustainable Research and Education	\$198,243		\$198,243
002MUL-10	Liggett, Sarah	LSU-BR	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancing Students' Communication Skills Through Advanced Multimodal Projects	\$318,896		\$318,896
003MUL-10	Spivey, James	LSU-BR	2 Yrs	Equipment	X-Ray Absorption Spectroscopy at CAMD: Version 2.0	\$250,375	\$0	\$250,375
004MUL-10	Warner, Isiah	LSU-BR	2 Yrs	Non Equipment	Hierarchical Mentoring - Transforming Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education	\$100,000	\$100,000*	\$200,000
005MUL-10	Zhang, Guoping (Gregg)	LSU-BR	1 Yr	Equipment	A Nano Universal Testing System for Integrated Enhancement of Multidisciplinary Research and Education on Nanomechanics, Geosciences, and Biomaterials	\$148,121		\$148,121

006MUL-10	Lucas, M. Cran	LSU-S	1 Yr	Equipment	Quantitative Analysis Instrumentation Enhancement for Multidisciplinary Education & Research	\$152,692		\$152,692
007MUL-10	Scaduto-Mendola, Raffaele	LSU-S	1 Yr	Equipment	Motion Capture & Analysis Enhancement	\$109,771		\$109,771
008MUL-10	DeCoster, Mark	La Tech	1 Yr	Equipment	Nanomaterials Safety Lab: Research Integrated with Service and Education (RISE)	\$64,965		\$64,965
009MUL-10	Gallagher, Peter	La Tech	1 Yr	Non Equipment	Development of a Model Garden / Outdoor Learning Center	\$79,220		\$79,220
010MUL-10	Kennedy, Kevin	La Tech	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancements to the Art and Architecture Workshop: Precision, Safety, and Portability of Tools Used in the Making of Art and Architecture	\$97,323		\$97,323
011MUL-10	Maggio, Michael	La Tech	1 Yr	Equipment	Advancing Innovative Product Design at Louisiana Tech University	\$94,271		\$94,271
012MUL-10	O'Neal, Dennis	La Tech	1 yr	Equipment	Undergraduate Nanoparticle Manufacturing Lab Enhancement	\$71,098		\$71,098
013MUL-10	Phillips, Kerri	La Tech	1 Yr	Equipment	Multi-Disciplinary Enhancement of the Speech-Language Pathology, Audiology, Health Information Management Programs at Louisiana Tech University	\$124,167		\$124,167

014MUL-10	Shultz, Jeffrey	La Tech	1 Yr	Equipment	School of Biological Sciences Multi-Analyte Bioassay Detection System	\$57,085		\$57,0850
015MUL-10	Aghili, Seyed	McNeese State	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancement of Robotics Laboratory and Developing Multidisciplinary Course Contents	\$75,250		\$75,250
016MUL-10	Darbeau, Ron	McNeese State	1 Yr	Equipment	Acquisition of Instrumentation Designed to Make Efficient Use of Organic Solvents for Instructional, Research, Fiscal and Environmental Purposes	\$143,811		\$143,811
017MUL-10	Lo, Glenn	Nicholls State	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancing Laboratory Curricula with Raman Spectroscopy	\$26,898		\$26,898
018MUL-10	Dancik, Garrett	NSU	1 Yr	Equipment	Virtual Case Studies for Pre- Health Science Students	\$52,619		\$52,619
019MUL-10	Jana, Amitava	SUBR	2 Yrs	Equipment	Enhancement of CAVE at Southern University for LA Researchers and Educators	\$436,352	\$0	\$436,352
020MUL-10	Walker, Jr., Edwin	SUBR	2 Yrs	Equipment	The Enhancement of Dispersive Raman Capabilities in the Environmental Sciences for Research and Teaching at Southern University	\$91,575	\$0	\$91,575
021MUL-10	Woldesenbet, Eyassu	SUBR	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancement of Research in Civil Engineering and Composites through the Acquisition of Compact X-ray Microtomograph (μ -CT) Equipment	\$130,895		\$130,895

022MUL-10	Mather, Frances	Tulane University Health Sciences Center	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancing Geographic Information Systems and Spatial Methods Research and Education Opportunities at Tulane University	\$108,893		\$108,893
023MUL-10	Borst, Christoph	ULL	1 Yr	Non Equipment	Collaborative Visualization Testbed for Curriculum Enhancement in Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences	\$75,586		\$75,586
024MUL-10	Khattab, Ahmed	ULL	1 Yr	Equipment	Acquisition of Fused Deposition Modeling Rapid Prototyping System	\$91,265		\$91,265
025MUL-10	Massiha, Gholam	ULL	1 Yr	Equipment	Integrating Robotics System into Electrical Control and Automation Technology Courses	\$77,506		\$77,506
026MUL-10	Misra, R. Devesh	ULL	1 Yr	Equipment	Laser Scanning Microscope (LSM) to Support Teaching and Research of Polymer/Tissue Compatibility, Drug Delivery Systems, and Hydration Inhibited Auto-fluorescence	\$287,070		\$287,070
027MUL-10	Pan, Zhongqi	ULL	1 Yr	Equipment	Optical Fiber Fusion Splicer for the Development of a Multidisciplinary Program at UL Lafayette	\$49,281		\$49,281
028MUL-10	Bhattacharjee, Joydeep	ULM	1 Yr	Equipment	Instrument Enhancement for Monitoring Climate Change and Establishment of Center for Biometeorology at the University of Louisiana,	\$161,011		\$161,011

					Monroe		
029MUL-10	Meyer, Sharon	ULM	1 Yr	Equipment	Advancing ULM Free Radical Research through Acquisition of ESR/EPR Spectrometer	\$147,734	\$147,734
030MUL-10	Zehnder, Ralph	ULM	1 Yr	Equipment	Acquisition of A High Performance Single Crystal X-Ray Diffractometer for Structural Analyses	\$323,540	\$323,540
031MUL-10	Racine, Robert	UNO	1 Yr	Equipment	Use of 4K Digital Projection to Enhance Theatrical Scenic Design, Film History, Criticism, and Postproduction Programs	\$199,386	\$199,386

* **The Enhancement Program RFP restricts requests for 2nd-year funding to no more than \$50,000**

Total Number of Proposals submitted	31
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$4,344,899
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$100,000
Total Money Requested	\$4,444,899

Appendix B

Rating Forms

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2009-10

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 52 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 15 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 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts. F.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

G. 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:

H. 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: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2009-10
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 62 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 20 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 5 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:

B. 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:

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

_____ of 2 pts.

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

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

_____ of 10 pts.

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts.

E.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES__ NO__

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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: _____