

# **FY 2009-10 LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT**

## **PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

### **Introduction**

An Agriculture Review Panel consisting of Professor David B. Beasley (chair), dean of engineering, Arkansas State University (chair), and Professor Dan Schaefer, University of Wisconsin-Madison, met February 19, 2010, in Baton Rouge to evaluate sixteen (16) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund (BoRSF). The proposals requested a total of \$1,918,189 in first-year monies.

Panel members received copies of all proposals, the FY 2009-10 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals, a summary of the Agricultural Sciences proposals submitted, and other pertinent materials including the previous (2007) review report and appropriate rating form for each proposal early in 2010. The reviewers read all of the proposals and materials and arrived at individual rankings prior to the meeting in Baton Rouge. During the evaluation process, the reviewers fully discussed the merits of each proposal; in each case unanimous agreement was reached. It is the panel's consensus that all proposals received thorough and fair evaluations based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP.

The review resulted in six (6) of the sixteen (16) proposals being recommended for either full or partial funding with an allocation of \$326,791. (See Table I for a list of proposals highly recommended for funding.) In the single case in which partial support was recommended, the funding level was determined after a careful review of the budget that resulted in an amount that corresponded to the most urgent needs of the project. Five (5) proposals were recommended for funding if additional monies become available. (See Table II for a list of these proposals.) Only five (5) proposals were not recommended for funding. (See Table III.)

A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are appended at the end of this report.

**TABLE I**  
**AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**  
**PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
1	96	016AG-10	ULL	\$35,577	\$35,577		
2	95	001AG-10	LSU-AG	\$53,816	\$53,816		
3	94	006AG-10	LSU-AG	\$28,228	\$28,228		
4	92	010AG-10	LSU-S	\$15,000	\$15,000		
5	90	011AG-10	LA TECH	\$43,085	\$43,085		
6	88	007AG-10	LSU-BR	\$156,585	\$151,085		
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$332,291</b>	<b>\$326,791</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**TABLE II**  
**PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**  
**IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
7	85	015AG-10	SUBR	\$46,726	\$46,726		
8	81	008AG-10	LSU-BR	\$56,400	\$56,400		
9	79	005AG-10	LSU-AG	\$72,935	\$72,935		
10	78	003AG-10	LSU-AG	\$125,750	\$125,750		
11	76	004AG-10	LSU-AG	\$280,998	\$280,998		
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$582,809</b>	<b>\$582,809</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**TABLE III**  
**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
12	72	009AG-10	LSU-BR	\$38,181	\$0		
13	69	012AG-10	LA TECH	\$271,233	\$0		
14	68	002AG-10	LSU-AG	\$153,920	\$0		
15	66	013AG-10	LA TECH	\$202,545	\$0		
16	64	014AG-10	LA TECH	\$337,210	\$0	\$0	\$0
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$1,003,089</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhanced Imaging Capabilities for Rust Pathogen Identification

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Aime

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 15 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

95
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$53,816  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$53,816

## COMMENTS:

This proposal was submitted by Assistant Professor Mary Aime from the LSU Ag Center, who has highly relevant expertise and a very good publication record. The objective of this proposal is clearly stated: "to provide an image-driven web-based identification tool for the rapid diagnosis of rust fungi in Louisiana". While the purpose of this proposal is to obtain funding for the purchase of a Zeiss stereomicroscope and digital photography equipment, there is a clearly stated, functional purpose for this equipment and an outcome proposed -- uploaded data to a live website -- that is measurable and impactful. The PI proposes hiring a Computer Science undergraduate student for web site development, but otherwise the labor for photomicroscopy will be provided by the PI's graduate students. This is an excellent proposal with a productive trajectory, and it builds on existing support from the Board of Regents. The panel recommends full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for the Enhancement of Filtration Research and Teaching at Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kayanush Aryana

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.2   5   (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 \_\_\_\_\_ 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   0   (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:  \$153,920   
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:   \$0  

COMMENTS:

While the capabilities of the requested equipment were described, a compelling justification for how the equipment would be implemented to meet research or instructional objectives was absent. While the panel acknowledges the importance of the requested equipment, specific, compelling needs were not identified, except for general needs such as promotion of collaboration for interdisciplinary research proposals, hands-on training of students, development of novel food products with healthful implications, and dairy product development for two pending NIH projects. Absent was a positive trajectory for ongoing research or teaching programs that would be enhanced by this equipment. While purchase of the requested pilot plant unit would be an accomplishment, there is no academic challenge associated with this task, so this is not considered a credible evaluation metric. The proposal does claim to assess impact of the purchased equipment on student applicant numbers and independent research credits, but there are many factors that influence those metrics, so they are not considered reliable indicators of project success. The theme of the proposal seemed to be dairy-foods centric, yet its justification lacked focus. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Enhanced, Adaptable, Multi-service Agricultural Automated Weather Information System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Richard Bengtson

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
B.3 15 (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 1 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

78
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$125,750 (if additional funds  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$125,750 become available)

## COMMENTS:

The LAIS is a nationally known meteorological resource that has received four previous BoRSF awards. The goals of the proposal are to enhance the existing agricultural weather information system by purchasing improved data loggers, improving the reliability of current sensors, standardizing network measurements protocols, and developing new web tools to take advantage of the improved LAIS capabilities. The web tools needed, however, may not be those that are identified (e.g., pest and potential disease alarms) by the PIs or by LAIS users who may have specialized needs. The latter goal involving web development is not well described, so the panel is uncertain how its attainment will be assessed. The panel feels that LAIS would benefit by being considered an essential component of Louisiana's agricultural infrastructure. LAIS is an important resource for Louisiana agriculture and commerce, though at this stage of its development it is unclear to the panel that this project qualifies as an agricultural program enhancement; the panel considers the proposal a better fit in Engineering B. The principal function of LAIS does not appear to be research or instruction. The enhancements are considered by the PIs to be necessary for LAIS to sustain its prominence in the agricultural meteorological community. This proposal should be funded fully if sufficient additional funding becomes available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Processing and Characterization Equipment for Bioenergy and Bionanotechnology Applications

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dorin Boldor

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 14 (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 (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 \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

76
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$280,998 (if additional funds  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$280,998 become available)

## COMMENTS:

This proposal was submitted by Professor Boldor and five of his colleagues from the Department of Biological and Agricultural Sciences. The funding requested will be used to purchase equipment (microplate reader, nanoparticle characterization instrument, FTIR system, microwave autotuners and generator, camera and rotovap) to use for processing and characterizing agricultural materials for biotechnology and nano-engineering applications. The requested equipment blends the research interests of the six faculty members' programs and is consistent with the department's goal of building a bioenergy- and nanotechnology-based research program, but the program for implementation of the equipment items is not explicitly cohesive. To their credit, the PIs described an application for each of the eight requested items. The panel feels that this proposal fits better in the Engineering B category. However, we recommend full funding only if sufficient additional funds become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Food Sciences Carbohydrate Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joan King

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 1 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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: \$72,935 (if additional funds  
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$72,935 become available)

## COMMENTS:

This proposal would be strengthened with a clearer description of the analytical questions that would be addressed in the context of the laboratory instruction and research programs of the PI and potential collaborators. What kinds of lab exercises would be possible if the instrument were purchased? Mention was made of the lack of an analytical system for determining the structure of carbohydrates like starch. Justification for the relevance of an anion exchange chromatograph to this research area was not provided. Secondly, relationships with industrial and institutional sponsors were described in a very general manner. Are there entrepreneurs who have posed questions that would more effectively be addressed if this analytical capacity existed in the Food Science Department? Are there specific kinds of shelf-life studies and product analyses that would be facilitated if this instrument were available? The proposal was presented with clarity, yet the rationale for implementation of the anion exchange chromatograph was not explained with sufficient depth or connectivity to the intended audience. The panel recommends full funding if sufficient additional funding becomes available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Genetics and Genomics Research in Coastal Plants

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Prasanta Subudhi

## 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)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

94
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$28,228

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$28,228

## COMMENTS:

This proposal is submitted by Dr. Subudhi, an Associate Professor in the School of Plant, Environmental and Soil Science, to improve the capacity for sample nucleic acid analyses in his laboratory. He leads the Coastal Plants Genetics Laboratory, which focuses on the development of improved clones and varieties in sea oats, smooth cordgrass, black mangrove and rice. The lab is used by two post-docs, one research associate, one graduate student and one undergraduate. Dr. Subudhi has a steady record of productivity throughout his career. Techniques emphasized in his laboratory are DNA fingerprinting, gene mapping, marker-assisted selection and gene cloning. The PI requests funding for three instruments that would accelerate genetics and genomics research in his lab. The integration of these instruments into several ongoing projects was addressed. His grantsmanship record for funding his laboratory is excellent. The PI did not mention the nature of the institutional match; nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007AG-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing and Expanding Digital Apparel Product Development Using CAD System and Body Scanner

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lisa McRoberts

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 5 (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 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 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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: \$156,585  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$151,085

## COMMENTS:

Professors McRoberts and Belleau, experts in apparel design, request funding for the purchase and installation of equipment to enhance the computer-aided design lab in the School of Human Ecology. The PI and Co-PI need new equipment so that their students can be trained with state-of-the-art technology for apparel design and printing. To do so, they are requesting a body scanner, digitizer, plotters, steamer, scanner and printer, two months of summer salary, and \$15,000 for a graduate assistant. The panel believes that LSU should absorb the cost of the software (\$5,500), but funding of \$151,085 for the remainder of the requested budget is recommended. The purchase of the equipment should enhance the hands-on training component for students in the Division of Textiles, Apparel Design and Merchandising, and therefore result in curricular enhancement.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008AG-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Farm, Postharvest, and Storage Equipment for "Production to Table" Student Lab Experiences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carl Motsenbocker

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 18 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

81
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$56,400 (if additional funds  
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$56,400 become available)

## COMMENTS:

The applicant seeks funding for the purchase of field equipment that will facilitate student experiential learning in the production, postharvest storage, and cooking of food crops produced at the LSU Horticulture Hill Farm Teaching Facility. The proposal is submitted by two faculty members in the School of Plant, Environmental and Soil Sciences, and claims collaboration with two professors of Horticulture, an instructor in Foods and Nutrition, and a professor of Food Science. Purchase of this equipment would allow the PIs to adapt curricula to accommodate students with interests in sustainable agricultural methods. The description of the requested equipment would have been strengthened by justifying the niche that would be filled by the Kubota tractor, in view of the existence of the Farmall and John Deere tractors. Similarly, the timeline for crop production, harvest, storage and cooking was not explained. Is it the intent that seeds would be planted during spring semester courses, that crops would be harvested during summer session, and that cooking would occur during the fall semester? Conversely, would the refrigerated storage facility have avoided such seasonal constraints? The concept of experiential learning was effectively communicated, but the coordination necessary to capture the seed-to-consumption span in the curriculum was not articulated. This proposal should be fully funded if sufficient additional funding becomes available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009AG-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Outreach Capabilities of the Louisiana State University Herbarium by Improving Digital Capabilities

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lowell Urbatsch

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 11 (of 15 points)  
B.3 16 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (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 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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

72
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$38,181  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

## COMMENTS:

This proposal would fund the acquisition of an enhanced digital image capturing capability for the Louisiana State University Herbarium. This equipment would, apparently, increase a capability already available and which was purchased with Enhancement funding in 2004. The applicants indicate that this is an Agricultural Sciences proposal. However, the work described and the disciplinary base of the proposers and the work envisioned is clearly biology/botany. The panel feels that this proposal has merit with regard to the work proposed. However, we also feel that this proposal does not fit the agricultural sciences as well as could be expected. The applicants are encouraged to apply in the biological sciences in its next cycle. An institutional match would also help a proposal such as this one. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010AG-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Agriculture Education in Northwest Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dalton Gossett

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 9 (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 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 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: 

92
----

 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$15,000</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$15,000</u>

## COMMENTS:

This is an inspiring proposal by Professors Gossett and Banks for which the panel recommends full funding. Funds are requested for the purchase of four portable laboratory instruments that are capable of measuring 26 water quality variables. These instruments will be deployed to dual-enrollment science instructors for the purpose of engaging undergraduate students in water quality research. The PIs will sample agricultural runoff water exiting a constructed wetland and compare the measurements to those from samples of water that did not pass through wetland remediation. The benefit-to-cost ratio for this requested funding is very high in the estimation of the evaluation panel. This is a very well-constructed proposal. It is unclear what the \$3,000 for institutional equipment match is; this money should be clearly defined when contracts are negotiated.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Physiological Ecology Laboratory Grant

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dylan Dillaway

**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     9     (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    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    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 \_\_\_\_\_

**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:**     \$43,085      
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**     \$43,085    

**COMMENTS:**

This proposal requests funding for the purchase of a LiCor Portable Photosynthesis and Fluorescence System that will be used in the Forest Eco-Physiology Lab. Six experiments were mentioned for use of this instrument in four core forestry courses. The plan is to engage 80-100 students in a more active style of learning. The College of Applied and Natural Sciences (\$500) and School of Forestry (\$3,000) have pledged cash matches. Additionally, the LiCor company is providing a substantial "grant" for the acquisition of the equipment (\$40,000). The metrics proposed to assess success of the project (syllabi, student recruitment and retention, and undergrad research projects) are modestly quantitative. The engagement of undergrads in research projects is commendable. The program should significantly improve its capabilities in quantifying the processes of respiration, photosynthesis, plant growth rate, carbon balance, and plant metabolism as a function of light availability. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana Tech University Dairy Processing Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Kennedy

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. 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 7 (For S/E)  
 or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
 E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 14 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 69 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$271,233  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

**COMMENTS:**

Funds are requested for the replacement of the ammonia-based refrigeration system in the Louisiana Tech Dairy Processing Plant. The plant and refrigerated areas are also used for storage and merchandising of retail dairy and meat products, as well as training sanitarians for the Louisiana Department of Health. Commitments of cash matching funds have been obtained or pledged from a private donor, the LA Tech President's Office, the College of Applied and Natural Sciences, and the Department of Agricultural Sciences. Although the Louisiana dairy industry is small, it appears that Louisiana Tech wants to maintain its dairy program from production to consumption for the sake of student experiential learning and agricultural enterprise diversification. If this goal is to be achieved, the 53-year-old refrigeration system will require replacement. However, the panel wrestled with whether this kind of expenditure truly fits the mission of BoRSF Enhancement Program. It is unclear why the equipment requested (only \$58,000) requires \$231,882 for installation. On the surface, this proposal appears to be an infrastructure project that is needed due to deferred maintenance; it is also unclear that the dairy program's capabilities will be "enhanced" by this large expenditure. The panel is bothered that the program continues to lose approximately \$200,000 annually. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013AG-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Feed Efficiency, Residual Feed Intake, and Feeding Behavior Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Murphey

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   3   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  10   (of 15 points)  
 B.3  11   (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   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: 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:   \$202,545    
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:       \$0      

**COMMENTS:**

Professors Murphey and Green request funding for GrowSafe units and associated feed storage and diet preparation equipment. In addition, they seek funds for a livestock scale and chute. It is not clear how many GrowSafe units would be purchased with the requested investment of \$100,000. The proposal is weakened by the fact that neither PI has a publication record in the area of residual feed intake data analysis and interpretation, and neither has reported a refereed publication in beef cattle science since 2000. The feed storage and diet preparation equipment should already be available at the Livestock Production Lab. Adding these infrastructural components to this proposal dilutes the justification for the GrowSafe purchase and implementation. Measurement of feed conversion efficiency in terms of residual feed intake is an important component of future beef cattle genetic improvement, but interpretation of these kinds of data requires considerable expertise in experimental design and interpretation of results. Mention of service projects further diffused the focus of this proposal. Although the proposal indicates that there will be a significant impact on curriculum and instruction and the quality of students, none of the performance measures appear to address these important areas. The two PIs are heavily committed to instructional responsibilities as well as supervisory and outreach responsibilities; therefore, the trajectory for impactful novel research in the Louisiana Tech beef cattle program is not promising. The panel could not determine the source of the \$5,500 cash matching funds. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 014AG-10

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Louisiana Tech University Meat Science Laboratory  
Enhancement

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Erin Tucker

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. 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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    10    (of 15 points)  
 B.3    11    (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     9     (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:** 64 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	\$337,210	\$0
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	\$0	\$0

**COMMENTS:**

Professors Tucker and Murphey seek funds to retrofit the Louisiana Tech Meat Science Lab in the areas of the harvest floor, meat coolers, meat processing area and test kitchen. The requested funding is \$337,210 and does not include costs for building modifications or equipment installation (a cost estimate was not provided for these components). This proposal would be strengthened by inclusion of a cost estimate for the work that would be done by Building and Grounds personnel. The evaluation panel perceives that the cost for retrofitting the circa 1978 Meat Science Lab is far greater than \$357,000. Apart from the age of this laboratory, there was insufficient justification for this investment. The impact of this upgrade on the research and teaching programs of Ph.D.-level meat science faculty was not addressed, nor were animal/meat product capacities or linkages with faculty programs in the Institute for Micromanufacturing, Human Ecology, or the School of Biological Sciences. It is unclear if either applicant has any current research. This is a very expensive proposal with very little in the way of substantive performance measures. The linkage between the Louisiana Tech meat science program and the meat industry of the State should have been addressed. No funding is recommended.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 015AG-10

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University-Baton Rouge

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancing Research Infrastructure in Agricultural Sciences at  
Southern University and A&M College

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Glenda Johnson

**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     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    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    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   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**H. Total Score:** 85 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$46,726   (if additional funds  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**   \$46,726   become available)

**COMMENTS:**

Professor Johnson and her collaborators request funds for the purchase of 15 Perpetual Predictive Analytics Software site licenses, 5 Nutrition Data System for Research site licenses and statistical and software consultant time for a three-day workshop for 15 faculty members. The goal of this proposal is to enhance the infrastructure of CAFCS at Southern University so that undergraduates can experience and be trained in all aspects of conducting a research project. At this point, the applicant asserts that data analyses are currently limited to those that can be completed manually. The panel commends the PI for realizing the need for access to statistical software packages for faculty and students, and the cost for accomplishing the statistical software access is modest. However, the panel does not agree with the assumption that "faculty members who have had little or no exposure to SPSS software or no direct access to a statistician will become confident in converting their data into information for the advancement of knowledge in their professional areas." Ability with statistical analyses and associated software is akin to ability with a foreign language--due to non-use and the passage of time, one's skill-level fades. The core knowledge exists, but its implementation is rusty. We recommend that if funding is awarded for the purchase of the requested site licenses, it should be tied to the institution's ongoing investment in a statistical consultant who would be available for student and faculty consultations. Funding for this proposal is recommended if additional funds become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016AG-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Agricultural Biotechnology Teaching and Research Infrastructure in the Department of Renewable Resources at UL Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yi-Hong Wang

## 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 11 (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 \_\_\_\_\_ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$35,577

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$35,577

## COMMENTS:

Professor Wang and his collaborator seek funds to purchase equipment that would allow the laboratory portion of RRES 440 (Survey of Biotechnology) to be taught with a hands-on laboratory experience. The laboratory portion of this course is presently taught as a dry-lab, with no involvement of students in actively learning lab techniques. The list of requested equipment has been thoughtfully assembled and described. The PI previously started a genetics lab course at Penn State, which affirms his commitment and ability to fulfill the instructional goal. His research record also affirms his technological background in attaining this goal for students. The proposed lab exercises further strengthen the justification for this proposal. The panel commends Dr. Wang for this initiative that would significantly enhance the academic experiences of undergraduate students who have an interest in biotechnology. A secondary benefit of the proposed purchases is that they will provide some infrastructure that could enhance the research program of the PI and his collaborator. It does not appear that the proposers have had BORSF support in the past. Full funding is recommended.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **Summary of Proposals**

**Proposals Submitted to the  
Traditional Enhancement Program - Agricultural Sciences  
for the FY 2009-10 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1 -----	Year2 -----	Total
001-AG-10	Aime,Mary	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhanced imaging capabilities for rust pathogen identification	\$53,816.00	\$0.00	\$53,816.00
002-AG-10	Aryana,Kayanush	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Equipment for the enhancement of filtration research and teaching at Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	\$153,920.00	\$0.00	\$153,920.00
003-AG-10	Bengtson,Richard	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	An enhanced, adaptable, multi-service agricultural automated weather information system	\$125,750.00	\$0.00	\$125,750.00
004-AG-10	Boldor,Dorin	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of processing and characterization equipment for bioenergy and bionanotechnology applications	\$280,998.00	\$0.00	\$280,998.00
005-AG-10	King,Joan	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancing the Food Science Carbohydrate Laboratory	\$72,935.00	\$0.00	\$72,935.00
006-AG-10	Subudhi,Prasanta	Louisiana State University And	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of Genetics and Genomics Research in Coastal Plants	\$28,228.00	\$0.00	\$28,228.00

		A&M College - Agricultural Center							
007-AG-10	McRoberts,Lisa	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancing and Expanding Digital Apparel Product Development Using CAD system and Body Scanner	\$156,585.00	\$0.00	\$156,585.00
008-AG-10	Motsenbocker,Carl	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of Farm, Postharvest, and Storage Equipment for "Production to Table" Student Lab Experiences	\$56,400.00	\$0.00	\$56,400.00
009-AG-10	Urbatsch,Lowell	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancing Outreach Capabilities of the Louisiana State University Herbarium by Improving Digital Capabilities	\$38,181.00	\$0.00	\$38,181.00
010-AG-10	Gossett,Dalton	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	ENHANCEMENT OF AGRICULTURE EDUCATION IN NORTHWEST LOUISIANA	\$15,000.00	\$0.00	\$15,000.00
011-AG-10	Dillaway,Dylan	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Physiological Ecology Laboratory Grant	\$43,085.00	\$0.00	\$43,085.00
012-AG-10	Kennedy,Gary	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Louisiana Tech University Dairy Processing Enhancement	\$271,233.00	\$0.00	\$271,233.00
013-AG-10	Murphey,Mark	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Feed Efficiency, Residual Feed Intake, and Feeding Behavior Research	\$202,545.00	\$0.00	\$202,545.00
014-AG-10	Tucker,Erin	Louisiana Tech University	2 Years	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Louisiana Tech University Meat Science Laboratory Enhancement	\$337,210.00	\$0.00	\$337,210.00
015-AG-10	Johnson,Glenda	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancing Research Infrastructure in Agricultural Sciences at Southern University and A&M College	\$46,726.00	\$0.00	\$46,726.00

016-AG-10	Wang, Yi-Hong	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancing Agricultural Biotechnology Teaching and Research Infrastructure in the Department of Renewable Resources at UL Lafayette	\$35,577.00	\$0.00	\$35,577.00
-----------	---------------	--------------------------------------	--------	----------------------------	-------------	--	-------------	--------	-------------

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

Total Number of Proposals submitted	16
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$1,918,189.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$0.00
Total Money Requested	\$1,918,189.00

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Rating Forms Used in This Competition**

- 1. Equipment**
- 2. Non-equipment**

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: \_\_\_\_\_