

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

ARTS

MARCH 2010

Prepared by:

Dr. Patricia Wasserboehr (Chair)
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Dr. Gregory Blakey
University of Central Arkansas

Dr. Mary Leglar
University of Georgia

**2009-10 Board of Regents Support Fund
Traditional Enhancement
Arts**

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. Patricia Wasserboehr, Chair, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Dr. Gregory Blakey, University of Central Arkansas, and Dr. Mary Leglar, University of Georgia, met in Baton Rouge on March 8-10, 2010, for the purpose of evaluating twenty-seven (27) Arts proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) twenty-seven (27) Arts proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2009-10 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) a copy of the 2006-07 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Arts.

Prior to the review, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the twenty-seven proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the review panel. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and the reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional funding becomes available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the panel did not recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 81. 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.

For many proposals in Table I, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations. The partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling \$2,820,740 were submitted to the Arts review panel. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$666,270.

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

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended
1	96	016ARTS-10	Nicholls	\$38,954	\$38,954
2	92	025ARTS-10	ULM	\$36,058	\$36,058
3	91	027ARTS-10	UNO	\$111,703	\$50,000
4	90.5	012ARTS-10	LaTech	\$115,117	\$70,000
5	90	019ARTS-10	Northwestern	\$91,220	\$32,000
6	89	021ARTS-10	ULL	\$70,558	\$35,000
7	88.5	020ARTS-10	Tulane	\$283,331	\$124,878
8	88	002ARTS-10	Dillard	\$31,355	\$31,355
9	87.5	008ARTS-10	LSU-S	\$51,868	\$45,000
10	87	004ARTS-10	LSU-BR	\$145,515	\$70,000
11	85.5	009ARTS-10	LSU-S	\$13,025	\$13,025
12	85	026ARTS-10	UNO	\$139,818	\$50,000
13	83	018ARTS-10	Northwestern	\$125,800	\$70,000
Totals				\$1,254,322	\$666,270

**Traditional Enhancement Arts Table II
Recommended for Funding if Funding Becomes Available**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	Requested	Recommended
14	81	011ARTS-10	LaTech	\$14,314	\$14,314
Totals				\$14,314	\$14,314

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

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended
15	74	010ARTS-10	LaTech	\$84,391	\$0
15	74	023ARTS-10	ULL	\$115,821	\$0
17	73	022ARTS-10	ULL	\$83,231	\$0
17	73	024ARTS-10	ULL	\$84,510	\$0
19	70	014ARTS-10	LaTech	\$158,097	\$0
19	70	017ARTS-10	Nicholls	\$43,726	\$0
21	69	006ARTS-10	LSU-BR	\$151,595	\$0
22	68	003ARTS-10	GSU	\$350,225	\$0
22	68	005ARTS-10	LSU-BR	\$117,066	\$0
22	68	013ARTS-10	LaTech	\$108,226	\$0
25	65	015ARTS-10	McNeese	\$113,258	\$0
26	59	007ARTS-10	LSU-S	\$41,000	\$0
27	53	001ARTS-10	BPCC	\$100,958	\$0
Totals				\$1,552,104	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001ART-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preparing Students for Careers in Performing Arts

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jim Boyter

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 20 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 53 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$100,958</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests technology to improve classroom instruction. It would be more effective as two separate proposals, one for theater and the other for music. The music portion of the proposal is fairly well documented and clear. The theater component does not demonstrate effectively how the activities will help the faculty achieve the intended level of instructional competence. The conferences listed for the theater faculty to attend are worthy professional development experiences, but they are not related to the educational goals of the proposal. For example, no justification is provided for attending a conference on ticketing trends. The calendar provided does not seem to offer enough time to coordinate all activities, including equipment purchasing and installation as well as faculty training. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002ART-10

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Piano Laboratory for a Sounder Music Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lucian Zidaru

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 10 (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 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (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 9 (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 _____ No _____ x _____

H. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$31,355
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$31,355

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 Music Department at Dillard University seeks funds to acquire state-of-the-art keyboards to replace thirty-year-old, outdated equipment in the piano laboratory. This project addresses a major hurdle in the core mission of the department and proposes an overdue and much needed upgrade in the music area. The proposal clearly justifies the new technology, enhances established practices, and creates opportunities for innovation. The keyboards are essential to the music pedagogy. It is disappointing that the institution is not offering matching funds, given the level of impact that the new sound equipment would have on the music program. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003ART-10

INSTITUTION: Grambling State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collaborative Learning Spaces for the Connected Generation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rosemary Mokia

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 15 points)
 B.3 8 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (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 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 _____

H. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$350,225
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 resources for a broad range of initiatives including web site revisions, personnel training, staff development, and leadership training by Franklin Covey trainers. Overall, it is well written. The Principal Investigator has recieved previous Support Fund awards for library enhancement. The requests are supported by assessment organizations such as SACS and National Arts Education Association. A clear statement of role coordination among personnel is outlined. However, some of the requested equipment seems peripheral or extraneous to the stated initiative to create collaborative learning spaces for students in the visual and performing arts. The focus appears to be on enhancements for the library. The new computers, for instance, will serve a broad student and staff clientele. Could these new resources prepare a higher percentage of student teachers for careers in art education? Could library staff train arts faculty to use the new technology as a research or educational resource? The proposal does not describe the relationship of the library to or any collaborations with visual or performing arts departments that would justify funding. The section on the promotion of economic and/or cultural resources also lacks specific details. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004ART-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrated Digital Environment for Artists (IDEA)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynne Baggett

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 8 (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 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (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 _____ No _____ x _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$145,515
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$70,000

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

The School of Art proposes to augment digital equipment and create a shared space in order to cultivate an Integrated Digital Environment for Artists (IDEA). This proposal is well written and documented. The ideas presented are interesting and cutting edge. The proposal would be strengthened by including additional information regarding how this project will enhance education. This ambitious project may also require more time to implement than indicated. The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005ART-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Laptop Orchestra of Louisiana: A Music Interaction
Laboratory/Library for Exploring New Musical Interfaces and
Related Technologies for Musical Expression

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Beck

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 3 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 68 (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 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 11 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$117,066
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.)

In a time when so few high-tech ensembles exist in the United States, a proposal to create a 20-seat laptop orchestra is an interesting and novel idea. Given its leadership role in electro-acoustic music, LSU Baton Rouge seems like the appropriate institution to launch this initiative. The proposal is generally well written but lacks important information about the type of music to be explored and produced in such a high-tech environment. The components of research and experimentation as integral to new genres of musical performance are not included. This type of ensemble could lead to the development of exciting and innovative compositional methodologies, but these possibilities are not described. The proposal offers a comprehensive list of equipment. The technological advances made possible by the computers, software, etc., need to be linked to the potential for new forms in contemporary music practice. Central to the initiative is curriculum design and the development of a new course proposal. A brief summary of the course content in the context of the overall curriculum would be helpful. Are the course outcomes centered on composition and performance for music majors? In addition, how would the 20-seat laptop orchestra strengthen the music program? In a tight budget year the presentation of need and potential is not compelling and funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006ART-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Safety and Innovation: Enhancing Research, Teaching and Learning in Art & Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leslie Koptcho

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 69 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (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 10 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$151,595
 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 School of Art at Louisiana State at Baton Rouge requests new equipment with modern safety features for the purpose of enhancing teaching, research, and learning in art and design. In the art programs of today it is imperative to provide safe learning environments for faculty, students, and staff. The proposal could be strengthened by an assessment of safety, including an explanation of current safety and hazardous waste materials guidelines such as MSDS guidelines, inspections, maintenance agreements or contracts. Often, an institution's office of safety or OSHA can endorse or require equipment upgrades for the purpose of safety. It is also important to state if the new art building currently on the "planning horizon" will include financial support for the exhaust systems including the proposed booths, fans, and hoods. In section 3.c. there is no indication of the current equipment inventory and whether or not the School of Art will use it. This proposal is not persuasive. The lack of institutional support does not demonstrate commitment. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007ART-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Student/Professional Theatre Series

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Alford

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 20 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes No x

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 No x

G. Total Score: 59 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$41,000</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The applicant proposes to invite guest artists and educators to enhance class work and to develop students' skills at technical craft. While prior support for the theatre is well documented, the impact on curriculum and instruction lacks educational goals and evaluation. It is not clear how students will be engaged in significant learning experiences with guest artists. There is a long list of types of artists involved with the theatre profession, but there are no specific names or biographical information. Who are these artists-in-residence, and what professional experiences do they bring to the students? Furthermore, the section on faculty development is vague. For instance, what kind of training will faculty receive? There is, at best, an unfounded assumption that professional guests will enhance the theatre program. How does the theatre plan to sustain any prominence guest artists could provide? Also, the relationship the two programs and the community is unclear. Generally, the proposal is not well written and lacks focus and specificity. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008ART-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhanced Digital Compositing and Motion Graphics Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Allen Garcie

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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: 87.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8.5 (of 15 points)
 B.3 20 (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 10 (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: \$51,868
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$45,000

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

The Department of Fine Arts seeks funds to acquire equipment for a digital compositing and motion graphics lab. This innovative project would support the growing animation and digital effects industry in their region. The proposal is well written, convincing, and tightly put together. A strong institutional match demonstrates a commitment to this project. The panel does question the notion, inherent in the timeline, that faculty training will take place at the same time as teaching. Partial funding is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009ART-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Intersections in Art History and Musicology: Creating a Dynamic Seminar Facility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sarah Lippert

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 8 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

85.5

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10.5 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (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 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: \$13,025
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$13,025

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

The proposal seeks funds to transform an under-used seminar room into a smart classroom. The proposal is well written, documented, and justified. It provides clear and convincing examples of how the classroom will be equipped and utilized to develop an interdisciplinary focus in graduate and undergraduate education. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010ART-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing The School of Art with Digital Photographic Manipulation, Printing and Video Arts for Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jay Gould

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 5 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

74

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (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 10 (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 _____ No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$84,391

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 School of Art at Louisiana Tech proposes the purchase of equipment to expand digital course offerings and offer digital options within traditional courses as well as access to all students in the program. The proposal is well written, and a convincing "vision" statement is provided. The program envisions an expanded and interactive facility where students in multiple studio disciplines can engage in digital technology. The proposal would be strengthened by a specific description of co-curricular activities and syllabi development. It takes time to develop new courses and programmatic changes. Could these activities take place along with the grant's stipulation for assessment within an academic year? In the category of "Economic Development and Impact," examples of student internships in design and art-associated businesses could be provided along with a roster of graduates in art-related careers. Institutional support for this proposal does not demonstrate a commitment to purchase or sustain upgrades to the equipment. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011ART-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: School of Performing Arts Armory Enhancement Proposal
2009-2010

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Guinn

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

81

 (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 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 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: \$14,314
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$14,314

(If additional funds become available)

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

The Department of Theatre seeks funding to enhance its stage combat armory. The proposal is well written and documented, focused, and concise. Every category of the proposal provides precise information and justification. The Principal Investigator is to be commended for building an exemplary training program that has been recognized by external constituencies. The proposal would be strengthened by including the number of theater performances that utilize the stage weapons in the next academic year. The combat training sessions are highly specialized and will reach only a small number of students and, therefore, the priority of this particular need appears relatively less compelling in a very competitive cycle. With limited funds available, the panel recommends full support should additional funding become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012ART-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Howard Auditorium Rigging Enhancement Proposal 2009-2010

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Guinn

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 3 (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 17.5 (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 _____

H. Total Score: 90.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$115,117</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$70,000</u>

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

The School of Performing Arts proposes to enhance the Howard Auditorium stage with a new rigging system. This straightforward proposal clearly demonstrates need. In every proscenium theater safety is of the utmost importance and should be guaranteed. The rigging installation will be used by a variety of programs both on- and off-campus and represents a worthy investment. The proposal lacks detailed performance measures, and the impact of the project on curriculum and instruction needs specific information. The panel recommends partial funding. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013ART-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creative Designs: From the Lab to the Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
 C.2 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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (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: 68 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$108,226</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.)

Louisiana Tech proposes to enhance student learning by purchasing new computer equipment and software for the existing MCS Design Lab and an additional classroom. The proposal is well written and informative. However, its scope is too broad. There are goals to provide enhanced computer technology for six design-related courses, ten textile/merchandizing-related courses, and fourteen unrelated courses offered in other departments in the College of Human Ecology. The proposal might appear more clearly focused on the design curriculum with the elimination of the non-design-specific courses listed in 2.d, "Impact on Curriculum and Instruction." The proposal could be strengthened by an emphasis on the design skills and costume history knowledge inherent in the design curriculum. It could also be improved by including design-specific outcomes for students such as a portfolio of apparel images. In general, the role of design is diminished by this multifaceted proposal. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014ART-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Performance Space Audio and Video Capture Studio and Digital
Archive for the School of the Performing Arts at Louisiana Tech
University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Randall Sorensen

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 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: 70 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 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: \$158,097

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 School of Performing Arts proposes to create a Digital Recording Studio and to install state-of-the-art audio and video recording equipment in three performance spaces. The proposal provides a convincing budget narrative. However, it could be strengthened in many ways. The goal to enhance the capacity of student learning in all performance areas is stated repeatedly throughout the proposal but is not addressed with a plan for curricular development. The impact of the equipment is not clearly linked to school's educational mission. Some sections of the proposal were vaguely written and would have been improved with specific examples. Section 2.c., "The Enhancement Plan," makes a general reference to alumni as professionals in related careers but does not include employment statistics. It also proposes to provide graduates with skills comparable to programs on the national scene but does not reference the skills that nationally reputed programs teach. In section 5.a., "Economic and/or Cultural Development," it is not clear how this project will enhance prospects for external sources of funding. The panel advises revisions and resubmission. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015ART-10

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Technologies and Hybrid Experiences in Photography and Non-Toxic Screen Printing

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Schuh

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 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 5 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 65 (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 2 (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 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: \$113,258
 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 Visual Art Department seeks funding to support additional digital equipment to enhance every studio discipline, especially photography and printmaking. The proposal is not well written or convincing and is weakened by a number of general and unsupported statements. For instance, the proposal supports curricular enhancement as an outcome of new technology but does not offer information about course/program development. As a result of purchasing new equipment the proposal claims that students will have better skills than students attending other art departments, but it does not provide a detailed description of these skills or a comparison. Furthermore, assessment measures to compare student achievements across state programs are not provided. The proposal could be strengthened by linking curriculum development to the new digital equipment and by addressing learning outcomes. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016ART-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Digital Learning Resources for the BFA, the BA in Art Education, and General Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Deborah Cibelli

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 10 (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 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 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: \$38,954

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$38,954

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 Department of Art proposes the enhancement of two lecture classrooms with computers and digital projectors. The proposal is well written and demonstrates real need. The impact of the digital equipment on education is clearly described. Several art courses and a large number of students will be served. Matching funds from the institution are impressive and show a commitment to the project. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017ART-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of 3-D Studio area

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Williams

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 9 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (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 _____

H. Total Score:

70

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$43,726
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 seeks to enhance a 3-D studio with the purchase of new equipment. This proposal is not well written or convincing. It does not follow the application outline described in the RFP. It reads like a draft version and needs extensive proofreading. Throughout the document there are grammatical errors and awkward word choices. The current condition of equipment on hand is not described. Does the existing equipment pose real safety hazards? Will projectors/computers be used in the production areas of the studio? If so, how will they be protected from ever-present airborne contaminants? In section 2.d, "Impact on Curriculum and Instruction," the equipment requested should be more convincingly linked to new instructional practices and techniques. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018ART-10

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Performance Instruction in Piano through the Use of Electronic Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christine Allen

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 10 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (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: \$125,800
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,000

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

The Department of Music seeks to enhance piano instruction with the purchase of two grand pianos and an upright piano, along with equipment to establish distance learning. The National Association of Schools of Music mandated improvements in the quality and condition of the pianos, which provides an important rationale for the project. The proposal includes strong evidence for NSU to expand the significance of the program through distance learning. The idea of expanding the availability of electronic pedagogy to other locations is innovative, but it may be less of a priority than the requested pianos. The matching funds from the institution demonstrate commitment to the project. The panel recommends partial funding for one grand piano and the upright piano. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019ART-10

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Creation of a Theatre and Dance Performance Laboratory in
the Northwestern State University Theatre and Dance Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christopher Burrell

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 1 (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: 90 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (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 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: \$91,220
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$32,000

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

The theater/dance program at Northwestern State University proposes to create a performance laboratory. The proposal is well written and demonstrates need. The National Association of Schools of Theater recommendations are appropriately outlined, as are the health and safety issues regarding the teaching of dance on a cement floor. All equipment requests are justified, though plans for adequate equipment storage should be specified. The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020ART-10

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Definition Digital Production and Post-Production Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Blue

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17.5 (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 10 (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 _____

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: \$283,331
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$124,878

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

The proposal requests funds to equip a high-definition production and post-production center. The proposal is very well written, concise, and supported by touching testimonies from alumni. The panel is concerned with a few issues, including the lack of a long-range financial commitment by the institution to support upgrades, equipment replacement, and repairs. It is also a concern that budgeting for software licenses are covered only for two years. Equipment security and maintenance is not well addressed. The time table is also questionable considering the learning curve inherent in new technology and the approval process required for changes to the curriculum. Nonetheless, this is a very worthy proposal. Due to the size of the request relative to the limited funds available the panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021ART-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multimedia Recording Facility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Garth Alper

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 1 (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: 89 (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 15 (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 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: \$70,558
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$35,000

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

The School of Music at the University at Lafayette proposes a new cutting-edge Multimedia Recording Facility for the creation of quality audio/video productions. This well written proposal provides an exemplary work plan, goals, a schedule of activities with appropriate benchmarks, and credible evaluation of objectives. It is well noted in the section concerning "Performance Measures" that an expert in the field will evaluate the success of the integration of recording techniques and projects in the curriculum. The donation of equipment by leading manufacturers is a strong indication of the potential of the program. It was unclear to the panel how the equipment will be checked out for student use and how it will be maintained. Will the school establish maintenance contracts? Due to limited funds available the panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022ART-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Infrastructure and Collection Preservation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lee Gray

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 20 points)
 B.3 12 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (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 _____ No x

G. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$83,231 </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.)

In this proposal the University's art museum seeks to upgrade its collection management system. The rationale for this proposal is justified and worthy. However, the proposal seems to be split into two requests: one to conserve the Henry Botkin collection and the other to purchase a new computer and software to update and manage the entire collection. The proposal would be strengthened by a focus on one of the initiatives to be completed and assessed in a one-year period. In the "Performance Measures" section external assessment, for instance, is not addressed. The proposal does not adequately describe the educational benefits of the proposed enhancements. There is no doubt about the importance of both initiatives for the museum, but the proposal attempts to serve too many diverse interests. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023ART-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: UL Lafayette Graphic Design Pantone® Color-Proofing
Laboratory Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kevin Hagan

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (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 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 _____ No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$115,821
 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 applicants seek funding for a first-in-the-state Graphic Design Pantone Color-Proofing Laboratory. The proposal outlines an ambitious plan to purchase workstations, peripherals, and supplies. The proposal is well written and documented. However, an excessive number of initiatives affect its main focus to upgrade and enhance education. Plans to host an international exhibition of poster art, commercial service activities, and archiving goals should have less emphasis than the impact the equipment will have on expanding the curriculum to include poster art. The panel recommends that this proposal be more sharply focused and resubmitted to the next grant cycle. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024ART-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creation of High Definition Video Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Webber

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 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 5 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)
 B.3 9 (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 10 (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 _____ No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$84,510
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The Department of Visual Arts seeks to create a High Definition Video Studio and enhance its Media Arts Studio. This proposal is generally well written and organized but could benefit from additional details, along with the deletion of all superfluous assumptions and generalized statements. The applicants could have more adequately described the need through a more thorough description of the condition of the current equipment. The section concerning "Impact on Curriculum and Instruction" did not include specific information on developing and expanding teaching methods, research, and creative production. The proposal does not succeed in describing how the equipment, software, and peripherals will be used. The section concerning "Performance Measures" does not indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine the success of the project and the degree to which it has achieved its goals. The applicants are encouraged to rewrite the proposal and resubmit it. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025ART-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: New Brass Instruments for Music Teacher Education at ULM

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Micah Everett

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 92 (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 4 (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 _____ No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$36,058
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$36,058

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 music education program at the University of Louisiana at Monroe proposes the purchase of several new brass instruments. Current instruments are few in number or in a state of severe disrepair. The proposal is effectively written and demonstrates urgent need. The university match is less than adequate considering the impact of the new instruments on music education. However, the need is great, the request is relatively moderate, and the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026ART-10

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: MUSE Learning Centers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tura Hayes

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
 C.2 0 (of 1 point)
 C.3 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: 85 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

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 4 (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: \$139,818
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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

The Department of Music at the University of New Orleans proposes to purchase software, computers, and related equipment for a MUSE Learning Center. The impact on curriculum and instruction could be strengthened by linking curriculum development and advancement to the new equipment. As with most requests for new technology, the software learning curve and the speed at which courses can be altered, created, and approved is overly ambitious. The plan for implementing the project is clear, but the assessment plan is not. The institutional match demonstrates adequate support. Due to limited funds available the panel recommends funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027ART-10

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Teaching the Imaging Curriculum: Building the Department of Fine Arts' Digital Resources in the New Imaging Area

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Daniel Rule

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

H. Total Score:

91

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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: \$111,703
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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

The Department of Fine Arts at the University of New Orleans seeks to upgrade outdated and inadequately equipped digital art and photo facilities. The primary strength of this proposal is the connection made between curricular revisions and the equipment. The new curriculum is innovative and reflects twenty-first century media. It is unclear how the imaging super-area will affect recruiting. The proposal provides no real performance assessment. It would be useful to know how many faculty need to be taught the new software and how quickly the software will be assimilated into the curriculum. The institutional match is adequate and demonstrates commitment. Due to limited funds available the panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program – Arts for the FY 2009-10 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	Link/ID	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	Project Title	1 st Yr Funds Requested
001ART	ENH-00004112-2009	Boyter, Jim	Bossier Parish Community College	1 Year	Not Equipment	Preparing Students for Careers in Performing Arts	\$100,958
002ART	ENH-00004221-2009	Zidaru, Lucian	Dillard University	1 Year	Equipment	Piano Laboratory for a Sounder Music Education	\$31,355
003ART	ENH-00003987-2009	Mokia, Rosemary	Grambling State University	1 Year	Equipment	Collaborative Learning Spaces for the Connected Generation	\$350,225
004ART	ENH-00004216-2009	Baggett, Lynne	LSU-BR	1 Year	Equipment	Integrated Digital Environment for Artists (IDEA)	\$145,515
005ART	ENH-00004232-2009	Beck, Stephen	LSU-BR	1 Year	Equipment	The Laptop Orchestra of Louisiana: A Music Interaction Laboratory/Library for Exploring New Musical Interfaces and Related Technologies for Musical Expression	\$117,066
006ART	ENH-00004238-2009	Koptcho, Leslie	LSU-BR	1 Year	Equipment	Safety and Innovation: Enhancing Research, Teaching and Learning in Art & Design	\$151,595
007ART	ENH-00004240-2009	Alford, Robert	LSU - Shreveport	1 Year	Not Equipment	Student/Professional Theatre Series	\$41,000
008ART	ENH-00004228-2009	Garcie, Allen	LSU - Shreveport	1 Year	Equipment	Enhanced Digital Compositing and Motion Graphics Lab	\$51,868

009ART	ENH-00004205-2009	Lippert, Sarah	LSU - Shreveport	1 Year	Equipment	Intersections in Art History and Musicology: Creating a Dynamic Seminar Facility	\$13,025
010ART	ENH-00004162-2009	Gould, Jay	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Equipment	Enhancing The School of Art with Digital Photographic Manipulation, Printing and Video Arts for Louisiana Tech University	\$84,391
011ART	ENH-00004171-2009	Guinn, Mark	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Equipment	School of Performing Arts Armory Enhancement Proposal 2009-2010	\$14,314
012ART	ENH-00004182-2009	Guinn, Mark	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Equipment	Howard Auditorium Rigging Enhancement Proposal 2009-2010	\$115,117
013ART	ENH-00004114-2009	Heiden, Kathleen	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Equipment	Creative Designs: From the Lab to the Classroom	\$108,226
014ART	ENH-00004150-2009	Sorensen, Randall	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Equipment	Performance Space Audio and Video Capture Studio and Digital Archive for the School of the Performing Arts at Louisiana Tech University	\$158,097
015ART	ENH-00004210-2009	Schuh, Larry	McNeese State University	1 Year	Equipment	Digital Technologies and Hybrid Experiences in Photography and Non-Toxic Screen Printing	\$113,258
016ART	ENH-00003966-2009	Cibelli, Deborah	Nicholls State University	1 Year	Equipment	Enhancement of Digital Learning Resources for the BFA, the BA in Art Education, and General Education	\$38,954
017ART	ENH-00004129-2009	Williams, Michael	Nicholls State University	1 Year	Equipment	Enhancement of 3-D Studio area	\$43,726
018ART	ENH-00004061-2009	Allen, Christine	Northwestern State University	1 Year	Equipment	Enhancing Performance Instruction in Piano through the Use of Electronic Technology	\$125,800

019ART	ENH-00003974-2009	Burrell, Christopher	Northwestern State University	1 Year	Equipment	The Creation of a Theatre and Dance Performance Laboratory in the Northwestern State University Theatre and Dance Program	\$91,220
020ART	ENH-00004029-2009	Blue, Mary	Tulane University	1 Year	Equipment	High Definition Digital Production and Post-Production Center	\$283,331
021ART	ENH-00004026-2009	Alper, Garth	ULL	1 Year	Equipment	Multimedia Recording Facility	\$70,558
022ART	ENH-00004019-2009	Gray, Lee	ULL	1 Year	Not Equipment	Infrastructure and Collection Preservation	\$83,231
023ART	ENH-00004046-2009	Hagan, Kevin	ULL	1 Year	Equipment	UL Lafayette Graphic Design Pantone® Color-Proofing Laboratory Enhancement	\$115,821
024ART	ENH-00004062-2009	Webber, David	ULL	1 Year	Equipment	Creation of High Definition Video Studio	\$84,510
025ART	ENH-00004103-2009	Everett, Micah	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	New Brass Instruments for Music Teacher Education at ULM	\$36,058
026ART	ENH-00004052-2009	Hayes, Tura	UNO	1 Year	Equipment	MUSE Learning Centers	\$139,818
027ART	ENH-00004047-2009	Rule, Daniel	UNO	1 Year	Equipment	Teaching the Imaging Curriculum: Building the Department of Fine Arts' Digital Resources in the New Imaging Area	\$111,703

Total Number of Proposals Submitted	27	Total Money Requested	\$2,820,740
-------------------------------------	----	-----------------------	-------------

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: _____

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: _____