

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS  
REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
EARTH/ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

**MARCH 2010**

Prepared by:

**Dr. P. Jonathan Patchett (Chair)**  
University of Arizona

**Dr. Kevin Mickus**  
Missouri State University

# **2009-10 Board of Regents Support Fund Traditional Enhancement Earth and Environmental Sciences**

## **INTRODUCTION**

A review panel consisting of Dr. P. Jonathan Patchett, Chair, University of Arizona; and Dr. Kevin Mickus, Missouri State University convened via phone conference on March 17, 2010, for the purpose of evaluating twelve (12) Earth and Environmental Sciences 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 conference: a) twelve (12) Earth and Environmental Sciences 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 Earth and Environmental Sciences.

Prior to the review, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the twelve proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two reviewers. 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 79. 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 Tables I and II, 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 \$1,110,298 were submitted to the Earth and Environmental Sciences review panel. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$279,151.

**TABLE I  
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	92	008EAR-10	LUMCON	\$176,970	\$78,697		
2	90	002EAR-10	LSU-BR	\$44,837	\$40,437		
3	88	005EAR-10	LSU-S	\$5,465	\$5,465	\$0	\$0
4	87	007EAR-10	LUMCON	\$151,071	\$67,047		
5	85	010EAR-10	Nicholls	\$127,400	\$87,505		
<b>TOTALS:</b>				<b>\$505,743</b>	<b>\$279,151</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**TABLE II  
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
6	82	004EAR-10	LSU-BR	\$80,949	\$71,000		
7	81	009EAR-10	Nicholls	\$105,656	\$46,200		
8	79	006EAR-10	LSU-S	\$90,639	\$50,000		
<b>TOTALS:</b>				<b>\$277,244</b>	<b>\$167,200</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**TABLE III  
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
9	69	001EAR-10	Dillard	\$67,350	\$0		
10	67	003EAR-10	LSU-BR	\$58,310	\$0		
11	65	012EAR-10	UL-L	\$44,076	\$0		
12	61	011EAR-10	Nunez	\$157,575	\$0		
<b>TOTALS:</b>				<b>\$327,311</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001EAR-09

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Environmental Ethics in Global Caribbean

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alain Durocher

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 11 (of 20 points)  
B.3 18 (of 25 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

## E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 1 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 

69
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,350  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to enhance undergraduate education for 15 selected Dillard students through a four-week study program at the University of the Sacred Heart in Puerto Rico. The study abroad would be a valuable experience for the students. The panel commends the active collaboration with the University of the Sacred Heart, the concise number of Dillard faculty who will travel, and the inclusion of a linguistics expert on the proposal team. A significant weakness in the current proposal, however, is that field research in ecology or environmental science is not described even in a general way, nor are plans to develop projects discussed. Fieldwork is envisaged and one of the courses to be taught is biology research, but no specific projects in biology are provided either. It appears to the panel that the main science undertaken by the students might be more related to biology than environmental studies. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002EAR-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Spectroscopy Instrumentation to Characterize Dissolved Organic Matter

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Annette Engel

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

90
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: \$44,837  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,437

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

This is a proposal to acquire spectrophotometric equipment for use in characterizing dissolved organic matter (DOM) in a range of natural waters. The Principal Investigator is an extremely energetic and well-funded scientist who is expanding her geomicrobiology research into DOM. Currently her group uses borrowed facilities, where time is limited. There is a high probability that the proposal will result in both productive research and educational enhancement. The technical aspects of the methods and machines are very well detailed. However, the motivation for the natural-system studies is only described in general terms, and future plans seem to consist of whatever collaborations come along. The proposal could have benefited from a few sentences about potential important, exciting and/or intriguing outcomes of specific projects, like the Edwards Aquifer, or the drainage from the Green River Shale. The panel is impressed by the PI's record including students advised, publications, funding and citations, and believes that this DOM research will lead to very productive outcomes at LSU. The "supplies", consisting of replacement lamps, measurement standards, etc., might be purchased from the PI's ongoing grants, and in this lean funding year the panel recommends funding at a reduced level, for the main instruments only. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003EAR-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of an Alpha Spectrometer for Environmental and Oceanographic Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kanchan Maiti

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes            No            x  
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           3           (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)

H. Total Score: 

67
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1           3           (of 5 points)  
B.2          10           (of 15 points)  
B.3          14           (of 20 points)  
B.4           3           (of 5 points)  
B.5           1           (of 2 points)  
B.6           3           (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes           x           No                   

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1          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:           \$58,310            
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:           \$0          

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

This proposal seeks to establish an alpha-emitting nuclide measurement capability in the Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences. The Principal Investigator has experience with the analytical methods from his postdoctoral work, as well as a strong, developing publication record. He is taking up his appointment at LSUOR in 2010 and intends to create a course on radiotracers in which the equipment would be used, and to develop research in marine geochemistry of the Gulf of Mexico and surrounding environments. The fact that the PI was not already at LSUOR at the time the proposal was written has led description of the future plans, both in research and instruction, to be necessarily somewhat vague. This does not mean that the PI will not develop very targeted plans in the future. Re-application would probably be very persuasive, once the PI is installed and his instructional and research networks are more established. The proposal lacks a firm quotation for the proposed equipment, and the price of \$35,000 for the alpha spectrometer is substantially higher than a firm quotation in a competing proposal. At this point, in a lean funding year, the panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004EAR-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for a Fission Track Thermochronology Research and Teaching Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Andrew Alexander Webb

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 13 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (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 6 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

82
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$80,949  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$71,000

(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.)

This proposal requests equipment to develop a laboratory for fission-track (FT) dating. The requested development seems timely in that LSU currently has no facilities for geological sample dating, and FT is not only a cheap and effective technique for dating tectonic uplift, but also has a role in oil reservoir investigation. As noted in the proposal, it will be hard for the Principal Investigator, the new appointee in tectonics, to attract the best graduate students without any kind of capability for dating. The PI has an impressive track record in tectonics developed at UCLA, a top-ranked institution for his field. A negative for this proposal is the limited experience of the PI with FT dating. He visited a state-of-the-art laboratory in Germany to learn methods in 2009 and he has experience of other geochronologic techniques, but no details are given. Another unfortunate disadvantage for this proposal, in a lean funding year, is that partial funding is difficult. The PI has requested the minimum amount to properly develop FT dating capability, and significantly reduced funding makes no sense. Items such as supplies or minor pieces of equipment (such as hotplates and labware) should be available within the department. The core laboratory could be developed for approximately \$10,000 less than the requested amount. Partial funding is recommended if additional funds become available with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI, with the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005EAR-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: To the Sea and Back: Building a Bridge Between Louisiana State University Shreveport (LSUS) and Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium (LUMCON)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amy Erickson

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1   9   (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  17   (of 20 points)  
 B.3  22   (of 25 points)  
 B.4   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   2   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   4   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$5,465</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$5,465</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks funding for a 5-day laboratory field trip to the Louisiana coast for students in a marine biology class. The class is taught by a recently hired professor who is introducing marine and coastal biology/ecology to LSUS. The instructor is an energetic scientist bringing fresh approaches and is very worthy of support. LSUS is providing matching funds for equipment. It seems very desirable for her and her department to foster ties with LUMCON, and this will be a natural outcome of the field excursion. It is not clear to the panel exactly who at LUMCON is helping with the venture. An education coordinator is mentioned, presumably at LUMCON, though that is not stated. The proposal would have been improved with a letter from LUMCON detailing this. The panel also questions the sustainability of the project. It is not clear how future trips will be funded if this one is successful. However, the request is very modest and the immediate benefits are obvious and clearly stated. The panel recommends full funding.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006EAR-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Critical Thinking and Analytical Skills in  
Environmental and Ecological Studies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amy Erickson

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 15 (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 9 (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: \$90,639  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

(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.)

This proposal requests 30 small computers with software licenses linked for laboratory exercises in the Department of Biological Sciences, plus an additional 49 machines in other laboratory settings. The new HP tablets would be used primarily in two courses, Biological Inquiry and Principles of Ecology. The enhancement to student learning should be considerable, and the Principal Investigator's use of comparative testing to document outcomes is commendable. Matching funds in cash or parallel equipment purchase are promised by LSUS. The case is not really made for the installation of the software on 20 tablets in Chemistry and Physics departments, and in addition the use of the software on 16 computers in the Genetics/Botany lab area is not explained in the proposal. For this competition more specific use of the new facilities in environmental projects should be described. Viable enhancement could be achieved with reduced funding by acquiring only 15 to 20 HP tablets, and two laser printers, and outfitting only those and the 13 computers in the Biology open-use area with the expensive software licenses. The panel recommends partial funding if additional funds become available with cuts to be made at the discretion of the PI and with the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007EAR-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing LUMCON's Ability to Measure Rates of Environmental Change Using Naturally Occurring and Anthropogenic Radionuclides

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alexander Kolker

**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     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    10    (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     3     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes     x     No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:     \$151,071      
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:     \$67,047    

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

This proposal seeks to establish full facilities for measurement of radionuclides by alpha, beta and gamma counting at LUMCON. The need for characterization of geological and ecological processes in the Delta and coastal Louisiana region is significant for the State considering the vulnerability of these environments. The PIs are active in research and publications and each study important elements of these sedimentary/biological processes. LUMCON staff collaborate with researchers in Louisiana universities, host educational visits from K-12 groups, and give classes for undergraduates from colleges and universities statewide, so the enhancement benefits more than just the primary institution. The ability to study parameters like sedimentation rates and productivity using radionuclides would considerably enhance the constraints that LUMCON researchers could place on Delta and coastal processes. One criticism of the proposal is that although several interesting research projects are described in moderate detail, the way in which radionuclide measurements would be made in them and used to yield scientific conclusions, is often left for the reviewer to interpolate or guess. In the budget, it is not clear how the requested lump-sum dollar figures correspond to the quotations (generally the request is lower than the quotation). Are some peripheral items being omitted from the request? The gamma-counting equipment seems to represent the clearest enhancement out of the three capabilities requested, especially for research of the lead PI. Therefore, in a lean funding year, the panel recommends partial funding, though reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008EAR-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Capabilities to Analyze Impacts of Environmental  
Change on Ecosystem Processes in Coastal Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Geoffrey Sinclair

**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)

H. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    13    (of 15 points)  
 B.3    18    (of 20 points)  
 B.4     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     3     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**     \$176,970      
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**     \$78,697    

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

This proposal seeks to establish or replace full facilities for incubation and controlled-environment growth at LUMCON. The Principal Investigators are all very active in research and publication. All the applications of the controlled-environment equipment are well described, and their relevance to processes in the Delta and coastal Louisiana region is high. The changing environments of the region are a research priority for Louisiana. The enhancement will have significant benefits beyond the immediate facility, including collaborative research with statewide universities and K-12 initiatives. The consortium has two 20-plus-year-old controlled-environment chambers that are worn out. The most urgent need appears to be for new controlled-chamber facilities, and the CO2-controlled incubation would represent an important new capability. Therefore, in a lean funding year the panel recommends partial funding for one new chamber and one CO2 incubator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 009EAR-10

**INSTITUTION:** Nicholls State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancement of Environmental Science Education at Nicholls State University

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Raj Boopathy

**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   7   (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  11   (of 15 points)  
 B.3  15   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   2   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1  10   (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   3   (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

**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:**   \$105,656    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**   \$46,200  

(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.)

This proposal seeks replacement of 10- to 20-year old equipment used in environmental science instruction. The proposal is well argued and the panel is impressed by the commitment to teaching of the Principal Investigator and his team, as well as their ongoing achievements in research. The Biology Department serves 400 majors and has a new MS program with 20 students. Of the equipment requested, three are significant measuring devices for student laboratories, totaling \$82,800. In a reduced budget year, the enhancement to instruction could still be significant if the first two (Hydrolab and Spectrophotometer) were provided for with the Microbial analyzer left off. Of the other items, instruction could still be effective with two oxygen probes instead of four. The projector plus laptop dedicated to the environmental lab are a lower priority. The Panel recommends partially funding this proposal if additional funds become available for the Hydrolab and Spectrophotometer, two oxygen probes, and half the miscellaneous laboratory equipment. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010EAR-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Heavy Metal Analytical Capability for Marine and  
Environmental Science Education and Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Enmin Zou

**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)

H. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$127,400  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$87,505

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 an Atomic Absorption (AA) Spectrometer and a Mercury (Hg) analyzer to enable research on southern Louisiana wetlands, coastal waters and marine life to be extended to heavy metals. The Principal Investigator and the team are active in research and teaching. The enhancement of their coastal environmental research by adding a capability for heavy-metal analysis appears very worthwhile. Monitoring of Hg levels in fish consumed by humans is important. Although the proposal emphasizes research more than teaching, the requested equipment would enhance student instruction. In particular, it would be very beneficial to the developing MS program in environmental biology at Nicholls State. There are no matching funds. The AA Spectrometer is the main item of equipment, and with limited available funds the panel recommends partial funding for this item.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011EAR-10

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Environmental Science at the Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1   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   7   (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   6   (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: 

61
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:   \$157,575    
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:   \$0  

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

This proposal seeks to establish environmental science instruction facilities including a greenhouse and a wetland pond. The proposal appears timely given that the College has been recovering from Hurricane Katrina, and environmental science currently has no instructional facilities and has only been reinstated within the past two years. However, the proposal is very difficult to evaluate because a number of specifics are not given. There is no description of courses currently offered, or of any plans for future courses should the facilities be funded. There is no description of how the instructors, in particular all three Principal Investigators, will go about devising practical exercises in the facilities, or even whether they have any targeted experience in environmental science laboratories. The proposal describes the educational enhancement in general terms throughout, with similar generic language about enhancement used in most sections. In the budget all minor equipment is described in detail. However, the major items, including the greenhouse and its slab plus the wetland pond, are budgeted in rounded ballpark figures totaling \$85,000 without documentation of any kind, suggesting that the PIs really do not know how much the installation would cost. The proposal estimates a blanket 20% of all equipment costs for shipping and handling, whereas suppliers generally include shipping and handling in quotations, or even provide shipping and handling for no additional cost. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012EAR-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Analysis of Rock Microstructure Using High Resolution STIM  
Microtomography

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Louis Houston

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)  
 E.2a 6 (For S/E)  
 or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
 E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (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 9 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 12 (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 6 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:** \$44,076  
**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to add equipment to the Louisiana Accelerator Center for measuring and computing 3D tomography of rocks by Scanning Transmission Ion Microscopy. The additional capability seems a natural enhancement at reasonable cost to the facilities already available at the beam line, and the physics and mathematics of the measurement and computations are well described. The Principal Investigators are clearly well qualified to implement this measurement facility. A serious effort to match funding has been made. The rationale for the project is primarily based on characterizing the 3D structure of porosity in rocks of interest to the oil & gas industry in Louisiana. A single example of a clastic sedimentary rock is mentioned as a target of research because it seems to have been characterized by other methods and can serve as a sample for reference and feasibility study. The possibility is mentioned of this technology being a rival (because of the requisite beam lines being more available) to the synchrotron X-ray methods currently used for rock tomography. In this regard, the major weaknesses of the proposal are: (1) there are no plans, detailed or otherwise, for work on oil reservoir or other rocks, except the single unit mentioned; (2) there is no geologist or expert on rock mechanics on the PI team or as a consultant; and (3) there are no letters of interest and support from the oil & gas industry, nor any contacts mentioned. The approach seems to be that the PIs should build it, and then industry and other users will come. No arguments are presented that this technique would lead to superior data for the oil & gas industry, only that it might be more available than synchrotron X-ray sources. Therefore the panel finds the rationale for this enhancement weak, and does not recommend funding.

# **Appendix A**

## **Summary List of Proposals**



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

Proposal Number	#	PI Name	Institution	Length	Equipment /Non Equipment	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1 -----	Year2 ---	-----Total
<a href="#">ENH-00004183-2009</a>	001EAR	Durocher, Alain	Dillard	1 Yr	Non Equipment	Environmental Ethics in Global Caribbean	\$67,350	\$0	\$67,350
<a href="#">ENH-00003976-2009</a>	002EAR	Engel, Annette	LSU-BR	1 Yr	Equipment	Acquisition of Spectroscopy Instrumentation to Characterize Dissolved Organic Matter	\$44,837	\$0	\$44,837
<a href="#">ENH-00004148-2009</a>	003EAR	Maiti, Kanchan	LSU-BR	1 Yr	Equipment	Acquisition of an Alpha Spectrometer for Environmental and Oceanographic Research and Education	\$58,310	\$0	\$58,310
<a href="#">ENH-00004230-2009</a>	004EAR	Webb, Andrew Alexander	LSU-BR	1 Yr	Equipment	Equipment for a Fission Track Thermochronology Research and Teaching Laboratory	\$80,949	\$0	\$80,949
<a href="#">ENH-00004241-2009</a>	005EAR	Erickson, Amy	LSU- S	2 Yrs	Non Equipment	To the Sea and Back: Building a Bridge Between Louisiana State University Shreveport (LSUS) and Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium (LUMCON)	\$5,465	\$0	\$5,465
<a href="#">ENH-00004213-2009</a>	006EAR	Erickson, Amy	LSU-S	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancement of Critical Thinking and Analytical Skills in Environmental and Ecological Studies	\$90,639	\$0	\$90,639
<a href="#">ENH-00004191-2009</a>	007EAR	Kolker, Alexander	LUMCON	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancing LUMCON's Ability to Measure Rates of Environmental Change Using Naturally Occurring and Anthropogenic Radionuclides	\$151,071	\$0	\$151,071

<a href="#">ENH-00004194-2009</a>	008EAR	Sinclair, Geoffrey	LUMCON	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancement of Capabilities to Analyze Impacts of Environmental Change on Ecosystem Processes in Coastal Louisiana	\$176,970	\$0	\$176,970
<a href="#">ENH-00003989-2009</a>	009EAR	Boopathy, Raj	Nicholls State	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancement of Environmental Science Education at Nicholls State University	\$105,656	\$0	\$105,656
<a href="#">ENH-00003978-2009</a>	010EAR	Zou, Enmin	Nicholls State	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancing Heavy Metal Analytical Capability for Marine and Environmental Science Education and Research	\$127,400	\$0	\$127,400
<a href="#">ENH-00004065-2009</a>	011EAR	Waddell, Stephen	Nunez	1 Yr	Equipment	Enhancing Environmental Science at the Community College	\$157,575	\$0	\$157,575
<a href="#">ENH-00004074-2009</a>	012EAR	Houston, Louis	ULL	1 Yr	Equipment	Analysis of Rock Microstructure Using High Resolution STIM Microtomography	\$44,076	\$0	\$44,076

Total Number of Proposals submitted	12
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$1,110,298
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$0
Total Money Requested	\$1,110,298

# **Appendix B**

## **Rating Forms**

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

RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
**PURCHASE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT**

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts. A.2 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 20 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 6 pts.      C.1      To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan and the items of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 1 pt.      C.2      Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 3 pts.      C.3      To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate?

COMMENTS:

D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE--Total of 12 points

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 12 pts      D.1      Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?

COMMENTS:

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

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts.      E.1      To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

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

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      E.2a      For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?
- E.2b      For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_ G.1 If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Recommended Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

=====

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2009-10  
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points**

- |                    |     |  |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| YES _____ NO _____ | A.1 | Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources? |
| _____ of 5 pts.    | A.2 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?  |
| _____ of 5 pts.    | A.3 | To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?  |

COMMENTS:

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points**

- |                  |     |   |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts.  | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?  |
| _____ of 20 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?   |
| _____ of 25 pts. | B.3 | To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?  |
| _____ of 5 pts.  | B.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged? |
| _____ of 2 pts.  | B.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?  |
| _____ of 5 pts.  | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?   |

No Points Given, But this is a required component      B.7      Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

B. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE--Total of 12 points

\_\_\_\_\_ of 12 pts      C.1      Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts.      D.1      To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      D.2a      For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES\_\_ NO\_\_      F.1      If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points



Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount:\$ \_\_\_\_\_ Recommended Amount:\$ \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

=====

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_