#### FY 2009-10 LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT - ENGINEERING A

#### Introduction

An Engineering A Review Panel consisting of Dr. Richard Seagrave, Iowa State University [chair] (Chemical and Biological Engineering); Dr. Lorraine Fleming, Howard University (Civil Engineering); and Dr. Joseph L.A. Hughes, Georgia Institute of Technology (Electrical and Computer Engineering) met March 8-9, 2010 in Baton Rouge to evaluate 46 Traditional Engineering A Enhancement proposals that requested monies to conduct projects that would enhance their departments or units through the Board of Regents Support Fund (BoRSF). The forty-six (46) proposals requested a total of \$4,827,072 in first-year funds.

Prior to the panel's arrival in Baton Rouge, each proposal was read by at least two reviewers, depending on the discipline, and many proposals were read by all three reviewers. Each reviewer was prepared for a detailed review and presentation of the proposals at the meeting. The panel discussed each proposal in detail, which resulted in comments, suggestions, and sometimes debate about the various aspects of the proposal, vis-à-vis the three reviewers' distinct backgrounds and fields. In each case, unanimous agreement was reached with respect to each proposal's rank and funding level. The panel felt that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based upon the criteria enumerated in the RFP.

The twelve (12) proposals in Table I (all of which received a score of 85 or above) were recommended in the full amounts requested for a total allocation of \$1,075,635. The twenty-three (23) proposals in Table II were recommended in the rank order stated for full funding if additional monies become available. The eleven (11) proposals in Table III were not recommended for funding. This year as in the FY 2007 competition there were a very large number of outstanding proposals and no really poor proposals. The overall high quality of the proposals made the cut-off point between Tables II and III rather high (the bottom ranked proposal in Table II scored 74).

#### **Panel General Comments**

The panel wishes to commend the institutions on the overall high quality of proposals considered this year. The breadth of innovative ideas continues to grow with the fields, and the leading proposals continue to be at the forefront. The quality of the proposals this year is distinctly higher than those that the panel considered in the 2007 review.

The determining characteristic that separated the proposals in Table III from those recommended for funding was the response to section B.3 "The Enhancement Plan" that deals with the extent that the proposed project would catapult the department or unit into attaining or maintaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence, commensurate with degree offerings and functions. Proposals in Table III, while usually very good otherwise, were found to be significantly less convincing in this regard.

#### Panel Recommendations to Higher Education Institutions and the Board of Regents

Despite the panel's previous cautionary comments in regard to this matter, some institutions continue to submit several proposals from the same organizational unit that request funds for complementary equipment supporting the same or nearly the same research and/or specific discipline or sub-discipline. Since the panel lacked an institutional prioritization of relative needs, each such proposal was evaluated on its own merits. Applicants and contract administrators would be well advised to note the RFP statement requiring such a prioritization, if for no other reason than to have the PIs cognizant of other colleagues' efforts.

This panel recommends that the Board continue to support the proposal preparation process — particularly at small and/or minority institutions—by holding grantsmanship workshops as well as through other means, to encourage faculty to write, edit, have someone else read, and then rewrite and submit successful proposals. This year as in previous years there were some good ideas in the group of proposals that failed to be funded because of (1) the manner in which the proposal was written, or (2) how ideas were communicated. Faculty who intend to submit Enhancement proposals are strongly encouraged to allow sufficient time to construct them carefully, following BoR guidelines, and then having someone, even a layman, read the proposal to promote clarity and eliminate possible ambiguities.

Finally, the review panel recommends that item B.7 of the scoring sheet, dealing with outcomes assessment, proof of success and achievement of goals, be reconsidered. Currently, a response is required but there are no assigned points. The panel, while finding responses in almost every case, found them insufficient and often inappropriate. The panel believes that the importance of this item should be increased by assigning a significant weight to it in the review process.

TABLE I
2010 ENGINEERING A
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
-1	01	0225NCA 10	1111	4112 210		¢112.210	
I	91	033ENGA-10	ULL	\$113,218		\$113,218	
2	90.5	002ENGA-10	LSU AG	\$126,068		\$126,068	
3	90	007ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$182,060		\$182,060	
4	89.5	037ENGA-10	ULL	\$64,372		\$64,372	
5	88.5	035ENGA-10	ULL	\$74,128		\$74,128	
6	87.5	019ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$24,512		\$24,512	
7	87	026ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$33,926		\$33,926	
8	86.7	028ENGA-10	NICHOLLS	\$121,130		\$121,130	
9	86	029ENGA-10	NORTHWESTERN	\$86,925		\$86,925	
10	85.5	025ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$70,057		\$70,057	
11	85.3	016ENGA-10	LSU-S	\$26,564		\$26,564	
12	85.2	040ENGA-10	ULL	\$152,675		\$152,675	
			TOTALS:	\$1,075,635	\$0	\$1,075,635	\$0

#### TABLE II 2010 ENGINEERING A

# PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
13	84	003ENGA-10	LSU-BR	¢12E 000		¢12F 000	
	-			\$135,000		\$135,000	
14	83.5	010ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$60,000		\$60,000	
15	83	011ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$125,000		\$125,000	
16	82.5	041ENGA-10	ULL	\$114,125		\$114,125	
17	82	031ENGA-10	TULANE	\$162,815		\$162,815	
18	81.7	027ENGA-10	McNEESE	\$250,000		\$250,000	
19	81.2	021ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$42,445		\$42,445	
20	81	023ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$65,700		\$65,700	
21	80.5	005ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$113,580		\$113,580	
22	80.2	008ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$191,484		\$191,484	
23	80	034ENGA-10	ULL	\$111,200		\$111,200	
24	79.5	013ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$193,943		\$193,943	
25	79	046ENGA-10	UNO	\$48,294		\$48,294	
26	78.5	043ENGA-10	UNO	\$105,008	\$15,000	\$105,008	\$15,000
27	78	039ENGA-10	ULL	\$39,575		\$39,575	
28	77.5	017ENGA-10	LSU-S	\$151,901		\$151,901	
29	77	014ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$82,750		\$82,750	
30	76.5	032ENGA-10	ULL	\$92,584		\$92,584	
31	76	036ENGA-10	ULL	\$71,831		\$71,831	
32	75.5	024ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$46,107		\$46,107	
33	75	012ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$136,426		\$136,426	
34	74.5	042ENGA-10	ULM	\$15,082		\$15,082	
35	74	044ENGA-10	UNO	\$298,249		\$298,249	
			TOTALS:	\$2,653,099	\$15,000	\$2,653,099	\$15,000

# TABLE III 2010 ENGINEERING A PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
36	69	004ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$60,277		\$0	
37	68.5	009ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$149,323		\$0	
37	68.5	020ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$59,975		\$0	
39	68	001ENGA-10	DILLARD	\$95,291		\$0	
40	67.5	006ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$200,760		\$0	
41	67	022ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$86,439		\$0	
42	66.5	038ENGA-10	ULL	\$128,780		\$0	
43	66	015ENGA-10	LSU-BR	\$41,447		\$0	
44	65.5	018ENGA-10	LA TECH	\$126,257		\$0	
45	65	045ENGA-10	UNO	\$70,289		\$0	
46	63	030ENGA-10	SUBR	\$79,500		\$0	
			TOTALS:	\$1,098,338	\$0	\$0	\$0

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	001ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Dillard University		
PRINCIPAL INVE	ESTIGATOR:	Abdalla Darwish	_
TITLE OF PROPO	OSAL: Enhance	ment of Instruction and Research	n in the Electrical
	Engineer	ing Program at Dillard University	
A. The Current Sit	tuatior	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points) A.1 Yes X	No	(Total of 52 Points) B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.1 1CS A 5	(of 5 points)	$\frac{1}{10}$	(of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	$\frac{B.2}{B.3} = \frac{10}{10}$	(of 20 points)
	_ (or a points)	B.4 3	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6 3	of 5 points
C.1 4	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 1	(of 1 point)		
C.3 3	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertisc
		(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/o		D.1 8	of 12 points)
Development and I	mpac		
(Total of 12 Points)		F. Additional Fundin	g Source:
E.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	( 0 1 )
E.2a 7	(For S/E)	F.1 2	of 4 points)
or E. 21	(of 10 points)		T 1
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
		(No Points Assigned) G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score:	68 (of 100 p	oints)	_
(Note: Proposals w	vith a total score below	70 will not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGE		d Amount: \$95,291	_
RECOMMENDAT	IONS: Recomme	ended Amount \$0	

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

This proposal describes plans for course modification and laboratory integration following the development of an electrical engineering laboratory for pre-engineering and physics students. The overall goals and objectives as presented are very general. The work plan is all-encompassing but not specific. The proposal did not make a good case for direct economic impact, and the institutional matching funds are very limited. The prospects for increasing the eminence of the units involved are not convincing, thus the panel does not recommend funding the proposal.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	002ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State Univer	sity and A&M College - Ag	ricultural Center
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: To	odd Shupe	
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhanceme	nt of Bio-Based Processing	Facilities at the
	orest Products Developmer	
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)	<b>B. The Enhanceme</b> (Total of 52 Points)	ent Plar
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 5 (of 5 points)	B.2 14.5	(of 15 points)
$\begin{array}{c}                                     $	B.3 16	(of 20 points)
(err press)	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	$\overline{B.5}$ $\overline{2}$	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No No
$\frac{1}{1}$ (of 1 point)		
$\overline{\qquad}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Sta	ff Expertise
(ere penne)	(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		(er 12 penns)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fund	ding Source:
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
$\frac{2}{\text{E.2a}} \frac{\text{(of 2 points)}}{\text{(For S/E)}}$	,	(of 4 points)
or $\frac{1}{1000}$ (of 10 points)		(or 1 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Suppo	ort Fund Awards
(1011(8/1(2)	(No Points Assigned	
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score: 90.5 (of 100 point		
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70	will not be recommended fo	r funding
	YEAR	1 YEAR 2

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

\$126,068

\$126,068

\$0

\$0

**Requested Amount:** 

**Recommended Amount** 

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** 

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** 

This is an excellent and well-presented proposal for improving the processing facilities at the Louisiana Forest Products Development Center, with strong possibilities for significant economic development and enhancement. The panel recommends that the proposal be fully funded. The project would be strengthened further by seeking collaboration with other university academic departments. Additionally, it could be important to avoid critical dependence on a single individual, in this case the principal investigator, by recruiting more collaborators from related academic departments.

	PR	OPOSAL NUMB	ER:	003ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana State University a	and A&M College	- Bato	n Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVES	TIGATOR: Steve	C.S. Cai		
TITLE OF PROPOS	SAL. Acquiring a Dietri	hutad Eibar Optic	. Sonci	na Systom for
IIILE OF FROFUS	Acquiring a Distri			· ·
	-	Research and Ed	Jucatio	IT Related to Civil
	Infrastructures			
A. The Current Situ	ation	B. The Enhar	ıcemen	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Po		
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1	5	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2	10	$\overline{}$ (of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3	15	(of 20 points)
	- ` '	B.4	5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5	1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6	4	(of 5 points)
Č.1 5	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes	X	- No
$\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$	(of 1 point)			
$\overline{}$ 3	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty an	d Staff	Expertise
	- ' - '	(Total of 12 Po	oints)	•
E. Economic and/or	Cultura	D.1	11	(of 12 points)
Development and Im	ipac			_ ` ` ` `
(Total of 12 Points)		F. Additional	Fundi	ng Source
E.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Poi	nts)	
E.2a 8	(For  S/E)	F.1	4	(of 4 points)
or	(of 10 points)			
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous S	Support	t Fund Awards
	-	(No Points Ass	signed)	
		G.1 Yes	X	No
H. Total Score:	84 (of 100 points)			<u> </u>
(Note: Proposals wit	th a total score below 70 will n	ot be recommend	led for	funding
(1.000. 110posmis Wit				
SPECIFIC BUDGET	TARY Requested Amoun	nt: \$°	135,000	1

become available)

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

**Recommended Amount** 

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** 

This successful and prestigious project team proposes to enhance the teaching of a materials course and senior design projects by creating a distributed sensing system to complement their existing local point system. The educational impact is speculative, with little detail, and matching funds are minimal. It is not clear how the requested equipment will enhance ongoing research projects. Nevertheless, given the overall strength of the department, the panel recommends that the proposal be fully supported if additional funds become available.

\$135,000 (if additional funds

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	004ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State Universit	y and A&M College - Bato	n Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kerr	y Dooley	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of F	Residual Gas Analyzer for	Advanced Materials
Development		
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 8	- (of 15 points)
$\overline{5}$ (of 5 points)	B.3 10	(of 20 points)
( 1 /	B.4 3	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 2	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	$B.7 \text{ Yes} \frac{}{X}$	- No
$\begin{array}{ccc} C.2 & \hline  & & & \\ \hline  & & $	B., 105	
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
	(Total of 12 Points)	Laperus
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac	D.1 11	_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	E Additional Eundin	a Course
` '	F. Additional Fundir	ig source:
\ 1 /	(Total of 4 Points) F.1 1	(of A nainta)
,	F.1 1	of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)	C. David	E 1 A 1
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
	(No Points Assigned)	NI.
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 69 (of 100 points)		
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 wi	ll not be recommended for f	funding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amo	ount: \$60,277	
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended		_

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

The very broad goals of the project as described in this proposal are not well linked to the work plan. The proposed purchase, while likely sustaining existing research capability and supporting the new DOE Energy Center, appears to have limited impact otherwise, particularly in education, and in enhancing the prestige of the unit. There is minimal matching from the institution. No funding is recommended.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	005ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State	e University and A&M College - Baton	Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Mostafa Elseifi	
	rading the X-Ray Computed Tomograp	•
Pron	note Progress and Innovation in Civil E	ingineering
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)	B. The Enhancement F (Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes $X$ No $A.2$ $5$ (of 5 points)	B.1 4 B.2 13	(of 5 points)
A.2 5 (of 5 points) A.3 5 (of 5 points)	B.2 13 B.3 15	(of 15 points) (of 20 points)
A.5 (01.5 points)	$\begin{array}{c} B.3 \\ B.4 \end{array}$	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	$B.7 \text{ Yes } \frac{3}{X}$	No
${}$ (of 1 point)		
$\overline{}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff E.	xpertise
`` ` •	(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11.5	(of 12 points)
<b>Development and Impac</b>		· •
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Funding	Source
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a $\frac{8}{}$ (For $\hat{S}/E$ )	F.1 <u>1</u>	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support F (No Points Assigned)	und Awards
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 80.5 (of 1	00 points)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score be	elow 70 will not be recommended for fu	nding
SPECIFIC RUDGETARY Requ	uested Amount: \$113 580	

Requested Amount:

\$113,580 (if additional funds **RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount** become available)

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

This is a very good proposal, but the lack of evidence of department support is a concern. It is not clear how the overall objectives will be evaluated. Evidence of support from the Louisiana Transportation Research Center would have strengthened the proposal. The work plan could have been made more specific and focused. Overall, the panel recommends that this proposal be supported if additional funds become available.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	006ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana Sta	te University and A&M College - Baton	Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVE	ESTIGATOR:	Jost Goettert	_
TITLE OF PROPO	DSAL: Ent	nancement of Optical Lithography Capa	abilities for
	CAI	MD Cleanroom	
A. The Current Si (Total of 10 Points)	tuation	<b>B. The Enhancement</b> (Total of 52 Points)	Plar
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 8	(of 15 points)
A.3 4	(of 5 points)	B.3 10.5	(of 20 points)
		B.4 2	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 1	(of 1 point)		
C.3 2	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff F	Expertiso
		(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/o	or Cultura	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
Development and I	mpac .		-
(Total of 12 Points)		F. Additional Funding	g Source:
E.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a 6	(For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or	of 10 points)		_
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Support I</b> (No Points Assigned)	
		G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score:	67.5 (of	100 points)	
(Note: Proposals w	vith a total score	below 70 will not be recommended for fu	ınding
SDECIEIC DIIDCI	ETADV Daa	woosted Amounts \$200.760	

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$200,760RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$0

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

This project could result in some upgrading of the research infrastructure to support LSU and other institutions, and some industry projects. It appears to have minimal educational impact. The work plan is very vague, and it is not convincing that major enhancement benefits would accrue to the units involved. Matching funds appear to be minimal for a project of such proposed wide-ranging impact. The panel does not recommend funding.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	007ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana State Univ	versity and A&M College - Bator	n Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVE	STIGATOR:	Sherif Ishak	_
TITLE OF PROPO	SAL: A Driving	Simulator to Study Human Beh	avior and Improve
	Traffic Op	eration and Safety in Louisiana	
A. The Current Sit	uation	B. The Enhancement	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 14	(of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3 18	(of 20 points)
	_ ` ` ` ′	B.4 5	of 5 points
C. Equipment		B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6 5	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	- No
C.2 $1$	of 1 point)		_
C.3 $3$	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
	_ ( 1 /	(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/o	r Cultura	D.1 8	(of 12 points)
Development and In			_ (00 02 F 00002)
(Total of 12 Points)	<b>F</b>	F. Additional Fundin	ng Source:
E.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	-9
E.2a 8	$-\frac{\text{(For S/E)}}{\text{(For S/E)}}$	F.1 3	(of 4 points)
or	$\frac{1}{10}$ (of 10 points)		_ (** ' F*****)
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
	_ (	(No Points Assigned)	
		G.1 Yes X	No
II T-4-1 C	(-6100		
H. Total Score:	90 (of 100 po	ints)	
(Note: Proposals w	ith a total score below ?	70 will not be recommended for f	funding

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$182,060RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$182,060

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

This is an excellent proposal that fits well into the mission of the institution and would result in a significant program-building resource. While the proposed measures of success could be strengthened and the faculty expertise could be stronger, the overall potential for enhancing the reputation of the programs involved results in the recommendation that this proposal be fully funded.

P	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	008ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University	and A&M College - Bator	n Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Orha	n Kizilkaya	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Photoemissic	n System for Chemical ar	d Environmental
Sciences at CA	MD	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	: Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 2	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 12.2	(of 15 points)
$\overline{5}$ (of 5 points)	B.3 18	(of 20 points)
<u> </u>	B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
$\phantom{aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa$		_
$\overline{3}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertiso
( 1 /	(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		_ (== F=====)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source:
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a (For S/E)	F.1 0	(of 4 points)
or $(of 10 points)$		_ (61 · points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
(1 of 145/14L)	(No Points Assigned)	Tunu Marus
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 80.2 (of 100 points)	G.1 1 <b>c</b> 5 <u>11</u>	
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 80.2 (of 100 points)		
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will	not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amor	unt: \$191,484	_
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b> Recommended A	<b>Amount</b> \$191,484	(if additional funds

become available)

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

This is basically a strong proposal with some shortcomings. The panel recommends full funding for the project if sufficient additional funds become available. While faculty expertise and support are solid, the matching funds are inadequate for such a strong research institution. The work plan is not well articulated, and there are no significant results proposed during the first year.

and A&M College - Baton	Davisa
ina riaini conoge Baton	Rouge
Koppelman	_
Cluster Testbed for Devel	oping Energy-
ging, Communication, ar	nd Computation
entific and Commerical V	Vorkloads
B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 52 Points)	
B.1 4	(of 5 points)
	(of 15 points)
	(of 20 points)
	(of 5 points)
	(of 2 points)
	(of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X	No
	Expertisc
,	
D.111	of 12 points)
	~
	g Source:
F.1 2	(of 4 points)
	Fund Awards
	N.I.
G.1 Yes X	No
	(Total of 52 Points) B.1 4

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$149,323RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$0

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

It appears that the possible benefits of this project are inconsistent with its high cost. While the proposal details an important topic, it seems likely that there would be little impact beyond faculty and graduate student publications. The matching contributions and the probable economic impact are minimal. Overall, this is a meritorious proposal that does not appear to be a good fit for this program. No funding is recommended.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	010ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State L	Jniversity and A&M College - Baton	Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Xin Li	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Real	Time Autonomous Intelligent Robo	ot for Pipeline
Inspec	tion	
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)	B. The Enhancement (Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No (of 5 points)	$\frac{\text{B.1}}{\text{B.2}} \frac{4}{13}$	(of 5 points) (of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)	B.3 17.5	(of 20 points)
(ere pense)	B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 5	(of 5 points)
C.1 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 (of 1 point)		_
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff I	Expertisc
	(Total of 12 Points)	( 0.10 )
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 9	of 12 points)
Development and Impac	E A 1422 1 E 12	- C
(Total of 12 Points) E.1 2 (of 2 points)	F. Additional Funding	g Source
E.1 (of 2 points) E.2a (For S/E)	(Total of 4 Points) F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or (For S/E) (of 10 points)	r.1 1	_ (01 4 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Support</b> (No Points Assigned)	Fund Awards
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 83.5 (of 100	points)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score belo	ow 70 will not be recommended for for	unding
SPECIFIC RUDGETARY Reques	sted Amount: \$60,000	

Requested Amount: \$60,000 (if additional funds **RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount** 

become available)

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

This is a good proposal on an important topic that should be fully funded if sufficient additional funds become available. The proposed collaboration with senior faculty is strong. The proposal would be improved, however, if it had a stronger justification for economic impact and if the measures of success were improved. Evidence of support from industry and more significant internal matching support would also be beneficial.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	011ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University	ersity and A&M College - Bator	Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Ayman Okeil	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition	of a Strong Reaction Floor for	Large-Scale Testing
of Infrastru	cture Systems	
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)  A.1 Yes	B. The Enhancement (Total of 52 Points) B.1	(of 5 points) (of 15 points) (of 20 points) (of 5 points) (of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	$\begin{array}{c} B.5 \\ B.6 \end{array}$	(of 5 points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points) C.2 1 (of 1 point)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.3 (of 3 points)	<b>D. Faculty and Staff</b> (Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 <u>10</u>	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac (Total of 12 Points)  E.1  E.2a  (of 2 points) (For S/E)	F. Additional Fundin (Total of 4 Points) F.1 3	g Source (of 4 points)
or (of 10 points) E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support (No Points Assigned)	- `
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 83 (of 100 poi		
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 7	0 will not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommen	Amount: \$125,000 ded Amount \$125,000	_ (if additional funds

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

The proposed project would greatly enhance an ongoing laboratory renovation and should be supported in full if sufficient additional funds become available. It has strong support from the department and the institution, and a wide range of multidisciplinary experimental expertise from participating faculty. The work plan lacks proposed measures for the success of the project. More evidence describing the potential collaborations would strengthen the proposal.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	012ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State Univ	versity and A&M College - Baton	ı Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Emy Roider	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integration	of State of the Art Technologic	os in Construction
<u></u>	n of State-of-the-Art Technologic on and Control within Construct	
		ion Management
Education		
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	( 0.7 )
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2	B.2 9	(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)	B.3 14	(of 20 points)
C. Fauinmant	B.4 B.5 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)	$\frac{B.5}{B.6}$ $\frac{2}{4}$	of 2 points) (of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	$\frac{B.0}{B.7}$ Yes $\frac{4}{X}$	No No
C.2 (of 1 points)	D./ TesX	
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff l	Evnertis
(or 5 points)	(Total of 12 Points)	Expertist
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 10	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		_ (or 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source:
	(Total of 4 Points)	8
E.1 (of 2 points) E.2a (For S/E)	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		- ` ' ' '
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
	(No Points Assigned)	
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 75 (of 100 po	ints)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 7	70 will not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested	<b>Amount</b> : \$136,426	
=	·	(if additional funds

become available)

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

This innovative proposal should be fully supported if sufficient additional funds become available. It evidenced good support from industrial partners, although little matching support from the department or college. The description of the activities to promote collaboration in research and education could have been developed further. The relationship between the very broad goals and the relatively vague work plan could have been strengthened.

r	ROPOSAL NUMBER:	013ENGA-10
NSTITUTION: Louisiana State University	and A&M College - Bato	n Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: George	ge Voyiadjis	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing LSU	Structural Materials and	Systems Lab to
Meet Infrastruct	ure Research Demands	
A. The Current Situation Total of 10 Points)	<b>B.</b> The Enhancement (Total of 52 Points)	t Plar
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
$\frac{1}{4.2}$ $\frac{1}{5}$ (of 5 points)	B.2 11	- (of 15 points)
$\frac{4}{4}  (\text{of 5 points})$	B.3 14.5	(of 20 points)
(* * <b>F</b> * **)	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 1	- (of 2 points)
Total of 10 Points)	B.6 5	(of 5 points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	- No
$\overline{}$ (of 1 point)		
$\overline{2}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
	(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		_ ` ' ' '
Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	ng Source:
2.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	6
$\overline{2.2a}$ (For $S/E$ )	F.1 3	(of 4 points)
r (of 10 points)		_ ` ' ' '
E.2b (For NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Support</b> (No Points Assigned)	
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 79.5 (of 100 points)		<u> </u>
Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will	not be recommended for	funding
Tion Troposuis mini a total score scion /o min	not be recommended for	
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amou	int: \$193 943	

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$193,943 (if additional funds)

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$193,943 (if additional funds)

become available)

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

This is a proposal that should be supported in full if sufficient additional funds become available. The work plan is vague, but the project would result in the upgrading of equipment in the Structural Materials Lab, although this proposal makes no mention of related proposals dealing with the laboratory renovation. The relationship between this project and continued or furthered eminence could have been presented better, as could some discussion of how the objectives would be evaluated.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	014ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana State Universi	ty and A&M College - Bato	n Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVES	STIGATOR: Ying	g Wang	
		<u> </u>	_
TITLE OF PROPOS	SAL: A Solar Cell To	ester for Full Characterizat	ion of Solar Cells
	with High Pred	cision	
A. The Current Situ	ation	B. The Enhancemen	t Plar
Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 10	$\frac{1}{\text{(of 15 points)}}$
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3 12	(of 20 points)
	_	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 2	(of 2 points)
Total of 10 Points)		B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes	No X
$\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$	(of 1 point)		
$\overline{}$	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
		(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/or	Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
Development and Im	ıpac -		_ ` ' '
Total of 12 Points)	•	F. Additional Funding	ng Source
E.1 1 1	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	0
E.2a 6	(For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or —	(of 10 points)		<u> </u>
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	t Fund Awards
		(No Points Assigned)	
		G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score:	77 (of 100 points)		
	(01 100 points)		
Note: Proposals wit	th a total score below 70 wi	ill not be recommended for	funding
Tiote. Troposais wit	in a total score below 70 W	m not be recommended for	runding
SPECIFIC BUDGET	ΓARY Requested Am	ount: \$82,750	
RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMENDATION OF THE COMM			(if a dditional fund-
AECUMIMIENDA H	ONS: Recommended	<b>Amount</b> \$82,750	(if additional funds

become available)

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

This is a proposal that should be supported in full if additional funds become available, but it would have been improved if the work plan were coupled more closely with the overall goals of the project and if the measures of success were strengthened. The proposed departmental match is good and the plan addresses an important niche capability that could benefit both the program's enhancement and economic development.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	015ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State Universit	y and A&M College - Bato	n Rouge
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. W	/oods	
	5 .	<del>_</del>
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Optical Probe	for Acoustic Devices	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 2	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 11	(of 15 points)
$A.3 \qquad \boxed{5} \qquad (of 5 \text{ points})$	B.3 11	(of 20 points)
( 1 /	B.4 3	of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	- (of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	$\frac{1}{N_0}$
${}$ (of 1 point)		
${}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
(********************************	(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 7	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		_ (er 12 penns)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundir	ng Source:
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	-9
$\frac{1}{5} \frac{\text{(or S/E)}}{\text{(For S/E)}}$	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		_ (er : peints)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
(10110,112)	(No Points Assigned)	
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)		<del>-</del>
11. Total Score. 00 (01 100 points)		
	11 41 116 4	p 1•
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 wi	ii not be recommended for i	runaing

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$41,447RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$0

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

The goal of this proposal is to establish a new research capability in a potentially important field that, while not new, would complement existing work of the principal investigator and graduate research students. Matching contributions are in the form of prior contributions to the laboratory. No good case is made for increasing the potential for eminence or for positively affecting economic development. The goals of the project could have been more concisely presented. Overall, the proposal lacks the details and focus that would make it more competitive with those in Table II. No funding is recommended.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	016ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State Universi	ty and A&M College - Shre	veport
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gar	y Boucher	
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: SMT Compon	ent Placement System for l	_ Indergraduate
Student Traini	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)	<b>B. The Enhancement</b> (Total of 52 Points)	t Plar
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 14	(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)	B.3 16.3	(of 20 points)
	B.4 3	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 (of 1 point)		
$\overline{3}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
	(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
<b>Development and Impac</b>		_
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Funding	ng Source
E.1 2 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a For $S/E$ )	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		
E.2b (For NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Support</b> (No Points Assigned)	Fund Awards
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score: 85.3 (of 100 points)		
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 w	ill not be recommended for f	funding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Am	ount: \$26,564	

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

**Recommended Amount** 

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** 

\$26,564

This is a very strong proposal that is recommended for full funding. The modest equipment requested would significantly improve student experiences in circuit designing, constructing and testing using automatic surface mount technology. The matching contributions from the institution are very good, as is faculty expertise in the area. The panel has high hopes that student research stipends could be continued after the initial year.

		PROPOSAL NUMBE	CR: 017ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana State	University and A&M College -	Shreveport
PRINCIPAL INV	ESTIGATOR:	Emre Celebi	
TITLE OF PROP	POSAL: Comp	outational Infrastructure Enhan	cement
A. The Current S (Total of 10 Points		<b>B. The Enhanc</b> (Total of 52 Poi	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1	5 (of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)		2.5 (of 15 points)
A.3 4	(of 5 points)	B.3	(of 20 points)
-	(1 1 F 1 12)	B.4	5 (of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5	2 (of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points		B.6	3 (of 5 points)
C.1 5	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes	X No
C.2 1	(of 1 point)		<del></del>
C.3 3	(of 3 points)	<b>D. Faculty and</b> (Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and	or Cultura	`	11 (of 12 points)
Development and			(cr == p =====)
(Total of 12 Points		F. Additional F	unding Source
E.1 1	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Point	
E.2a 6	${}$ (For S/E)	F.1	2 (of 4 points)
or	(of 10 points)		\ 1 /
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Su</b> (No Points Assig	pport Fund Awards
		G.1 Yes	X No
H. Total Score:	77.5 (of 10	00 points)	

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$151,901 **RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount** \$151,901 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a proposal that should be supported in full if sufficient additional funds become available. It would enhance the computational capabilities for the institution and its partners. The proposal would have been stronger if it had specifically addressed the potential applications that would result from the increased capability, but it does benefit from significant matching support. The goals and the work plan are very general and should be made more specific if it receives funding.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	018ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana Tech	University	
PRINCIPAL INV	ESTIGATOR:	Erez Allouche	
TITLE OF PROP	POSAL: Enha	ncement of LTU Structural Testir	ng Laboratory
A. The Current S	Situation	B. The Enhancem	ient Plar
(Total of 10 Points		(Total of 52 Points)	)
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
$A.2$ $\overline{5}$	(of 5 points)	B.2 12	(of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3 10	
	`` '	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points		B.6 $3$	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes $\overline{X}$	No No
C.2 1	(of 1 point)		
C.3 3	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and St	aff Expertise
	(**** F******)	(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and	or Cultura	D.1 6	(of 12 points)
Development and		<u> </u>	(or 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points		F. Additional Fun	nding Source:
E.1 0	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a $\frac{3}{2.5}$	(For S/E)	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or <u>2.5</u>	${}$ (of 10 points)		(or rpoints)
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Supp	ort Fund Awards
	(1 01 115/11E)	(No Points Assigne	
		G.1 Yes X	No
II Total Casses	65.5 (af.1)		
H. Total Score:	65.5 (of 1	00 points)	
<b>a</b>			
Noto Proposals	with a total gooms he	Navy 70 will not be recommended f	or funding

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$126,257RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$0

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

The goals and objectives of the proposed project are very good, but the proposal is missing several very important sections. There is no description and estimate of the usable life of the proposed equipment. Although résumés are provided, a clearer specific statement of personnel expertise would have strengthened the proposal. No clear connection between the project and the potential for maintaining or attaining eminence was made, and no discussion of the potential economic or cultural development is provided. Funding is not recommended.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	019ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana	Tech University	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	: Alan Chiu	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	Undergraduate Biomedical Instrumentatio	n Laboratory
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 ${}$ 5 (of 5 point		(of 15 points)
A.3 $\frac{}{}$ (of 5 point	,	(of 20 points)
( F	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	$\overline{B.5}$	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	$\frac{1}{8.6}$	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 point		No No
C.2 (of 1 point	,	
$C.3$ $\frac{1}{3}$ (of 3 point		Expertisa
(or 5 point	(Total of 12 Points)	Enper tist
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac	D.1	_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	σ Source
E.1 2 (of 2 point		S Source
E.2a $\frac{2}{7}$ (For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or $\frac{1}{100}$ (of 10 points)		_ (or r points)
E.2b (For NS/N		Fund Awards
(1011\8/1\	(No Points Assigned)	i unu iiwai us
	G.1 Yes	No X
П. Т.4-16		<u> </u>
H. Total Score: 87.5	(of 100 points)	

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$24,512RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$24,512

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

This is an excellent proposal that is recommended for full funding. It would result in improving the present instrumentation to the most current state of the art. The work plan is very well presented and consistent with the goals. However, the proposal could have benefitted from identifying some collaborators to supplement the efforts of the principal investigator.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	020ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana Tech Univ	ersity	
PRINCIPAL INVE	ESTIGATOR:	Despina Davis	
			<del>-</del> 
TITLE OF PROPO		spersive X-Ray Fluorescence A	
		cement of Graduate and Under	graduate Education
	Through P	ractical Research Training	
A. The Current Si	tuatior	B. The Enhancement	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 2	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 7	(of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3 11.5	(of 20 points)
		B.4 3	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 1	(of 1 point)		
C.3 3	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
		(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/o		D.111	(of 12 points)
Development and I	mpac		_
(Total of 12 Points)		F. Additional Fundin	ig Source:
E.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a 6	(For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or	(of 10 points)		
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
		(No Points Assigned) G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score:	68.5 (of 100 por	ints)	_
(Note: Proposals w	vith a total score below 7	0 will not be recommended for f	lunding
CDECIEIC DIDCI	ETADV Daguested	Amount: \$50.075	

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$59,975RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$0

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

The emphasis of this proposal, which seeks to enhance graduate and undergraduate research education through practical training with a relatively advanced X-Ray Fluorescence analyzer, is apparently on the development of a third-year course. There is apparently no work plan to get significant results beyond installation of the equipment. There does not appear to be significant additional or matching support beyond the efforts of the principal investigator. Lastly, no evidence of prospects for economic development is presented. The panel does not recommend funding the project.

Davis Harbour   Davis Harbour	3A-10	021ENG/	OPOSAL NUMBER:	PR		
Companies   Comp				Louisiana Tech University	TITUTION:	INSTI
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)		<u> </u>	larbour	STIGATOR: Davis	NCIPAL INVES	PRINC
Company of Total of 10 Points)         Company of Total of 52 Points)         Company of Total of 15 Points)         Company of Total of 15 Points)         Company of Total of 15 Points)         Company of Total of 10 Points)         Company		/	icrocontroller Laboratory	SAL: Undergraduate M	LE OF PROPOS	TITLE
A.2   5			(Total of 52 Points)		tal of 10 Points)	(Total o
A.3						
B.4   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)  D. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)  E. Economic and/or Cultura Development and Impac (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.5 1 (of 2 points)  B.6 4 (of 5 points)  B.7 Yes X No  C.2 1 (of 1 points)  D. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)  F. Additional Funding Source: (Total of 4 Points)  F. 1 4 (of 4 points)  G. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)				(of 5 points)	4	A.3
Comparison of 10 Points   B.6   4   (of 5 points)					<b>.</b>	C F
C.1       6       (of 6 points)       B.7 Yes       X       No         C.2       1       (of 1 point)       D. Faculty and Staff Expertise         C.3       3       (of 3 points)       D.1       11       (of 12 points)         E. Economic and/or Cultura       D.1       11       (of 12 points)         Development and Impac       F. Additional Funding Source:         (Total of 12 Points)       (Total of 4 Points)         E.1       1       (of 2 points)         E.2a       6       (For S/E)       F.1       4       (of 4 points)         or       (of 10 points)         E.2b       (For NS/NE)       G. Previous Support Fund Awards         (No Points Assigned)						
C.2		_ `				
C.3 3 (of 3 points)  E. Economic and/or Cultura  Development and Impac  (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)  D.1 11 (of 12 points)  F. Additional Funding Source:  (Total of 4 Points)  F.1 4 (of 4 points)  F.1 4 (of 4 points)  G. Previous Support Fund Awards  (No Points Assigned)		No	B.7 Yes X		6	
E. Economic and/or Cultura  Development and Impac  (Total of 12 Points)  E.1					1	
E. Economic and/or Cultura  Development and Impac  (Total of 12 Points)  E.1		Expertiso	•	(of 3 points)	3	C.3
Development and Impac (Total of 12 Points)  E.1			(Total of 12 Points)			
Total of 12 Points   F. Additional Funding Source	3)	(of 12 points)	D.1 11			
E.1		_		npac	elopment and In	Develo
E.2a 6 (For S/E) F.1 4 (of 4 points) or (of 10 points) E.2b (For NS/NE) G. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)		g Source	F. Additional Funding		(al of 12 Points)	(Total o
or (of 10 points) E.2b (For NS/NE) G. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)			(Total of 4 Points)	(of 2 points)	1	E.1
E.2b (For NS/NE) G. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)		(of 4 points)	F.1 4	(For S/E)	ı 6	E.2a
E.2b (For NS/NE) G. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)				(of 10 points)		or
G 1 Yes No			(No Points Assigned)	(For NS/NE)	)	E.2b
	X	No	G.1 Yes			

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$42,445
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$42,445 (if additional funds)

become available)

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

This is a proposal that should be fully supported if sufficient additional funds become available. It would result in upgrades to existing undergraduate laboratories for electrical engineering and technology. While it has limited direct economic impact, it could significantly enhance departmental eminence in the area of microcontroller technology. The development of the associated course is the only goal delineated in the work plan. The panel notes that this project's budget is scalable, and the absence of any significant institutional matching funds suggests to us that the PIs might consider the alternate approach of seeking industrial contributions. The panel also notes that a combination of this proposal and number 023ENGA-10 might have ranked higher than either one alone.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	022ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech Un	iversity	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Aziz Saber	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Per	formance Materials Laboratory	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 3	(of 5 points)
A.2 5 (of 5 points)	B.2 11	of 15 points)
A.3 $\frac{1}{5}$ (of 5 points)	B.3 12	of 20 points)
( 1 /	B.4 4	of 5 points)
C. Equipment	$B.5 \qquad \overline{\qquad \qquad 2}$	of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	of 5 points
C.1 3 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
$\phantom{aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa$		<u> </u>
$\overline{}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff l	Expertise
(1 - F 1 - 11)	(Total of 12 Points)	· ·
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 7	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source:
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	8 ~ 0 41 0 0
E.2a (For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		(or · points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support (No Points Assigned)	Fund Awards
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 67 (of 100 p	points)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score below	70 will not be recommended for f	unding

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$86,439RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$0

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

This proposal would create a high-performance testing laboratory for composite materials, but the panel notes that it has several shortcomings that resulted in its not competing well with other proposals in the area. Although the stated goal is to provide equipment to faculty involved in research in the discipline, there are no objectives or plans related to that goal and there are no performance measures suggested. The matching contribution is modest, and there is no convincing linkage to either economic development or program enhancement.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	023ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana T	ech University	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Rastko Selmic	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: <u>E</u>	Enhancement of Control Systems Laborat	ory
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 ${}$ (of 5 points)	B.2 15	(of 15 points)
A.3 ${}$ (of 5 points)		(of 20 points)
\ 1	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 1	of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)		No
C.2 (of 1 point)		_
${}$ C.3 ${}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff I	Expertise
(=================================	(Total of 12 Points)	<b>P</b>
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac	<u> 12</u>	_ (or 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Funding	g Source:
E.1 (of 2 points)		5 Source
E.2a $\frac{1}{5}$ (For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or $\frac{10.24}{\text{(of 10 points)}}$		_ (or 1 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE		Fund Awards
(1 01 115/116	(No Points Assigned)	runu Awarus
	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<br/>RECOMMENDATIONS:Requested Amount:\$65,700<br/>(if additional funds become available)

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

This is a proposal that should be fully supported if sufficient additional funds become available. The proposed upgrading of the control laboratory in electrical engineering could benefit other departments such as biomedical and mechanical engineering, and have a significant curricular impact. The direct economic impact is modest. The institutional matching contribution is meager when compared to the possible benefits that could accrue. The panel also notes that a combination of this proposal and number 021ENGA-10 might have ranked higher than either one alone.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	024ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana Tech	University	
PRINCIPAL INVE	STIGATOR:	Jay Wang	
TITLE OF PROPO	SAL: Enhar	ncement of Geotechnical Engineering Lab	ooratory
A. The Current Sit (Total of 10 Points)	tuation	<b>B. The Enhancement Plan</b> (Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	` '	5 points)
A.2 4	(of 5 points)		15 points)
A.3 4	(of 5 points)		20 points)
	_ (*** F*****)		5 points)
C. Equipment			2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)			5 points)
C.1 4	(of 6 points)		No
C.2 1	$-\frac{\text{(of 1 point)}}{\text{(of 1 point)}}$		
C.3 3	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff Exper	·tis(
	_ (*** F******)	(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/o	or Cultura	,	12 points)
Development and I		(0)	F)
(Total of 12 Points)	•	F. Additional Funding Sou	rce
E.1 1	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a 7	$-$ (For $\hat{S}/E$ )	,	4 points)
or	(of 10 points)	(	,
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support Fund	Awards
	<u> </u>	(No Points Assigned)	
			No

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$46,107
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$46,107 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a proposal that should be supported in full if sufficient additional funds become available. The proposed basic equipment would enhance the laboratories by providing additional experiments and more field equipment. The proposal could have been improved by recognizing that the stated goals of the project are amorphous, and the associated incomplete work plan fails to support even the overall goals of promoting faculty research or providing means for students to perform research and addressing these shortcomings. There is no evidence of strong relationships with industrial partners, which would be expected in this area.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	025ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University	sity	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: St	nengnian Wang	_
<del></del>	Chemical Engineering Course	s with PIV and
microPIV An	alysis	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	·Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	. 1 141
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 13	- (of 15 points)
A.3 ${}$ (of 5 points)	B.3 17	(of 20 points)
	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
$\overline{}$ (of 1 point)		
$\overline{}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
	(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		_ ` ` ` `
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a For $S/E$	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
<u> </u>	(No Points Assigned)	
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score: 85.5 (of 100 point	s)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70	will not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested A	mount: \$70,057	
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended		_

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

This is a very strong proposal that is recommended for full funding. The applications of the particle imaging velocimetry studies are well presented. It has significant potential for enhancing eminence and modest implications for economic development. The work plan is well coordinated with the stated goals.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	026ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Louisiana Tech Univ	ersity	
PRINCIPAL INVE	ESTIGATOR:	Nazimuddin Wasiuddin	<u></u>
TITLE OF PROPO	SAL Supernove	e Gyratory Compactor for High	way Engineering
TILE OF TROP	Laboratory		way Linginicering
	Laboratory	1	
A. The Current Sit	tuation	<b>B.</b> The Enhancemen	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 14	- (of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3 16	(of 20 points)
	`	B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	- No
C.2 1	(of 1 point)	·	
C.3 $3$	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
		(Total of 12 Points)	1
E. Economic and/o	or Cultura	D.1 10	(of 12 points)
Development and I			_ ` ' '
(Total of 12 Points)	•	F. Additional Fundin	ng Source
È.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	8
E.2a 9	$-$ (For $\hat{S}/E$ )	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or	(of 10 points)	·	_ ` ' '
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
		(No Points Assigned)	
		G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score:	87 (of 100 poi	ints)	<u> </u>
11, 100010010	(01 100 poi	,	
(Notes Droposals w	with a total gappa halaw 7	A will not be recommended for	funding
(Inote: Proposals W	viui a totai score delow /	0 will not be recommended for	iunaing
CDECIEIC DUDC		фээ ээээ 4	
SPECIFIC BUDGE	ETARY Requested	<b>Amount:</b> \$33.926	

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$33,926 **RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount \$33,926

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

This is an excellent proposal with a straightforward, well-targeted goal. The requested compactor is high on the college's prioritized list. The panel found strong letters of support from industrial partners and government agencies. The proposal could be strengthened further by indications of support from other faculty involved in pavement design and the courses that would be modified. The economic potential and enhancement possibilities are strong. It is recommended for full funding.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	027ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: McNeese State University	ersity	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Nikos Kiritsis	_
	ase of a Model Chemical Plant	t for Teaching and
Training		
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)	<b>B. The Enhancement</b> (Total of 52 Points)	Plar
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 12.7	(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)	B.3 13	(of 20 points)
	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 5	of 5 points)
C.1 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 1 (of 1 point)		
C.3 (of 3 points)	<b>D. Faculty and Staff Expertise</b> (Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 6	(of 12 points)
<b>Development and Impac</b>	<u> </u>	_ (
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source:
E.1 2 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	8
E.2a $\frac{2}{9}$ (For S/E)	F.1 3	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)	·	_ \ r/
E.2b (For NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Support</b> (No Points Assigned)	Fund Awards
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 81.7 (of 100 poi	nts)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 7	0 will not be recommended for f	unding
CDECIEIC DUDCETADY Doggooded	A 0250 000	

RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$250,000 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be funded fully if sufficient additional funds become available. The proposed addition of a large-scale distillation unit to the existing model chemical plant would enhance the academic program for chemical engineering technologists in an area important to the region. While it has limited potential for enhancing eminence, it could have some significant economic impact. The proposal would have ranked higher if there were a better linkage between the stated goals and planned activities, and if it had better measures of success. The institutional matching proposed is good. The panel suggests that if unsteady-state and process control aspects were included in future uses of the equipment, it would have vaulted this proposal significantly higher in the rankings.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	028ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Nicholls State Un	niversity	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Balaji Ramachandran	
	sition of Terrestrial Laser Scanning S tional Teaching and Research Enha	•
<u>IIIStitu</u>	tional reaching and Research Enna	ncement
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 5 (of 5 points)	B.2 12	(of 15 points)
$\overline{5}$ (of 5 points)	B.3 15.7	(of 20 points)
\ /	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 5	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 (of 1 point)		
$\overline{3}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff E	Expertiso
	(Total of 12 Points)	_
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 9	(of 12 points)
<b>Development and Impac</b>		•
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Funding	g Source:
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a 9 (For S/E)	F.1 3	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support I	Fund Awards
	(No Points Assigned)	Ma
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 86.7 (of 10)	0 points)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score bel	ow 70 will not be recommended for fu	nding

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$121,130RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$121,130

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

This good proposal is recommended for full funding. The proposed equipment for the geomatics program has a potentially broad impact on the academic program in a specialized field with strong local value. The sharing of the academic and research capabilities with a local community college is a positive feature. The proposal could have been improved if the PI had more clearly defined the relationship between the objectives and the work plan.

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University  PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Daniel Withey  TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laboratory Equipment for BMET Concentration  A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)  A. The University Daniel Withey  B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 52 Points)	ENGA-10
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:  Laboratory Equipment for BMET Concentration  A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)  B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 52 Points)	
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)  B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 52 Points)	
(Total of 10 Points) (Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes $X$ No B.1 5 (of 5 points)	nts)
A.2 5 (of 5 points) B.2 15 (of 15 po	
A.3 $\frac{}{}$ (of 5 points) B.3 $\frac{}{}$ (of 20 po	
B.4 (of 5 points)	
C. Equipment B.5 $\frac{1}{2}$ (of 2 points)	
(Total of 10 Points) B.6 4 (of 5 points)	
C.1 6 (of 6 points) B.7 Yes No	X
C.2 (of 1 point)	
C.3 (of 3 points) D. Faculty and Staff Expertise	
(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/or Cultura  D.1  9 (of 12 po	ints)
Development and Impac	1110)
(Total of 12 Points)  F. Additional Funding Source:	
E.1 2 (of 2 points) (Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a $\frac{2}{8}$ (For S/E) F.1 2 (of 4 points)	nts)
or $\frac{1.1}{(\text{of } 10 \text{ points})}$	100)
E.2b (For NS/NE) G. Previous Support Fund Awa	rds
(No Points Assigned)	I WK
G.1 Yes X No	
H. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)	
(of 100 points)	
Note: Proposals with a total sagra halaw 70 will not be recommended for funding	

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$86,925RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$86,925

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

This strong proposal addresses a growing need for biomedical technicians and technologists by enhancing a primarily instructional program unique to the region by adding fundamental biomedical laboratory equipment. The panel recommends full funding.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	030ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	Southern Univers	sity and A&M College - Baton Roug	ge
PRINCIPAL INVE	ESTIGATOR:	Hak-chul Shin	_
TITLE OF PROPO	OSAL: Acquis	sition of High Speed Monitoring Sys	stem
A. The Current Si	tuation	B. The Enhancemen	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 3	(of 5 points)
A.2 4	(of 5 points)	B.2 9	(of 15 points)
A.3 4	(of 5 points)	B.3 10	(of 20 points)
		B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 3	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	- `No
C.2 1	(of 1 point)		<del></del>
C.3 3	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
(or 5 points)		(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/o	or Cultura	D.1 8	(of 12 points)
Development and I			(** ** F ******)
(Total of 12 Points)		F. Additional Fundi	ng Source:
E.1 1	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	8
E.2a 6	$-\frac{(For S/E)}{(For S/E)}$	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or	(of 10 points)	· ———	(*
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	t Fund Awards
	(1011,5/1,2)	(No Points Assigned)	
		G.1 Yes	No X
H. Total Score:	63 (of 10	0 points)	
11. Tutai stuit.	(01 10)	o ponits)	
ON 4 D	.41 4 4 1 1 1 1	70 11 41 116	e i
(Note: Proposals w	vith a total score bel	ow 70 will not be recommended for	tunding

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$79,500RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$0

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

This is a proposal from a Southern University PI who seeks to acquire a test system to be used in conjunction with a pending DOD equipment proposal. The primary benefit is to support faculty research with very limited benefit to courses or curricula. There is no matching contribution, the work plan is not focused on activities or projects, and the project has a low potential for enhancing eminence. Additionally, if the DOD proposal is not funded, its fate is unclear. For these reasons the panel does not recommend funding this proposal.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	031ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: Tulane University		
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Noshir Pesika	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisiti	on of an Atomic Force Microscop	e (AFM)
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	: Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 3	(of 5 points)
A.2 $\frac{5}{}$ (of 5 points)	B.2 12	- (of 15 points)
$A.3 \qquad \boxed{5} \qquad (\text{of 5 points})$	B.3 16	(of 20 points)
( 1 )	B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	- No
C.2 (of 1 point)		
$\frac{1}{3}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertisa
(ere penne)	(Total of 12 Points)	p • - • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac	<u> </u>	_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	og Source
E.1 2 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	ig bource,
E.2a (of 2 points) (For S/E)	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or $\frac{1000 \text{ G/E}}{\text{(of 10 points)}}$	1.1	_ (01 + points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
(1 of 105/11L)	(No Points Assigned)	Tunu Awarus
	G.1 Yes	No X
H T 4 10		
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 82 (of 100 p	ooints)	
	<b>-</b> 0	

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$162,815
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$162,815 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be fully funded if sufficient additional funds become available. The PI proposes upgrading an existing atomic force microscope to enhance the research capabilities of a strong department and to promote collaboration among faculty. There are no specific plans for improvements in courses or the curriculum, and there is no direct economic impact claimed. The proposal is vague regarding additional sources of funding, and the panel could find no significant matching funds. The work plan, which is very general, needs to be more closely coupled with the stated goals.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	032ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana a	at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Che	erif Aissi	_
	d Control System Laboratory	y for Undergraduate
Instruction an	d Research	
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points) A.1 Yes	B. The Enhancement (Total of 52 Points) B.1	Plan  (of 5 points) (of 15 points) (of 20 points) (of 5 points)
C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points) C.1 5 (of 6 points)	B.5 B.6 B.7 Yes X	(of 2 points) (of 5 points) No
C.2 (of 1 point) C.3 (of 3 points)	<b>D. Faculty and Staff</b> (Total of 12 Points)	Expertiso
E. Economic and/or Cultura Development and Impac	D.111	(of 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points) E.1 (of 2 points)	F. Additional Fundin (Total of 4 Points)	g Source:
E.2a (For S/E) or (of 10 points)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support (No Points Assigned) G.1 Yes X	Fund Awards
H. Total Score: 76.5 (of 100 points)		
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 w	ill not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Am	sount: \$92,584	

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$92,584 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be fully funded if sufficient additional funds become available. It complements the existing curriculum and facilities in a strong department, and the equipment would be used by students in both Industrial Technology and Mechanical Engineering. However, the matching contribution is modest. The proposal would have been more competitive if it were focused better, particularly with respect to the work plan, and if it were more convincing with respect to enhancing the eminence of the programs and department.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	033ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University	y of Louisiana at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	R: James Carroll	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	Structural Engineering Laboratory Initiation	n Program
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 ${}$ 5 (of 5 poin		(of 15 points)
A.3 $\frac{}{}$ (of 5 poin	,	(of 20 points)
(0.0 point	B.4 5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 <u></u>	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 poin		No No
$C.2$ ${}$ (of 1 points)	,	
C.3 $\frac{1}{3}$ (of 3 poin		Expertisa
(or 5 point	(Total of 12 Points)	Laperus
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 10	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac	D.1 10	_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source
E.1 2 (of 2 poin		S Source
E.2a $\frac{2}{8}$ (For S/E)		(of 4 points)
or $\frac{100 \text{ G/E}}{\text{or}}$		_ (01 + points)
E.2b (For NS/N		Fund Awards
E.20 (FOI NS/I	(No Points Assigned)	Tuliu Awai us
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b></b>	a	
H. Total Score: 91	(of 100 points)	

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$113,218RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$113,218

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

This well-prepared proposal is recommended for full funding. The applicant proposes the creation of a structural engineering laboratory and focus area in an existing strong department. The work plan is very detailed and well focused, and the goals far-reaching. Space has been made available, departmental support appears to be strong, and there are matching funds from the college and from industry.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	034ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana a	at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dar	niel Gang	<u>_</u>
	Mercury Monitoring System	
Environmenta	I Engineering Research and	d Education
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)	<b>B. The Enhancement</b> (Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 13	(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)	B.3 13	(of 20 points)
C. Fauinmant	B.4 B.5 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)	B.6 3	(of 2 points) (of 5 points)
	B.7 Yes X	- No
C.1 (of 6 points) C.2 (of 1 point)	B./ TesX	
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Evnartisa
(or 5 points)	(Total of 12 Points)	Experusi
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 9	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source
E.1 2 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	<b>8</b> ** * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
$\overline{\text{E.2a}}$ (For S/E)	F.1 3	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)		_ ` ' ' '
E.2b (For NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Support</b> (No Points Assigned)	Fund Awards
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)		
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 w	ill not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Am	nount: \$111,200	

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$111,200 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be funded in full if sufficient additional funds become available. It addresses an important interdisciplinary problem and involves faculty from three strong departments. It is likely, however, to enhance research capabilities more than educational capabilities. The proposal could have been improved by a stronger case for enhancement of the program and institutional prestige. The institutional matching support is good. One drawback that the panel noted is that plans to initiate partnerships with fossil fuel industries six months into the project occur too late in the overall timeline.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	035ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of	f Louisiana at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Emad Habib	
	evelopment of a Rainfall Field Laboratory  Flydrologic Engineering Education and R	
A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points) A.1 Yes	B. The Enhancement I (Total of 52 Points) B.1 5	
C.2 (of 1 point) C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff E (Total of 12 Points)	xpertis:
E. Economic and/or Cultura Development and Impac	D.1 11	(of 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)  E.1	F. Additional Funding (Total of 4 Points) F.1 2	Source (of 4 points)
or (of 10 points E.2b (For NS/NE)		•
H. Total Score: 88.5	of 100 points)	110
(Note: Proposals with a total scor	e below 70 will not be recommended for fu	nding
	ecommended Amount \$74,128 \$74,128	

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

This is an interesting proposal that is recommended for full funding. It has very good potential for enhancing eminence and economic impact. The enhancement of classroom experience is a strong feature, and there is good support from faculty in collaborating departments. The panel noted that it had one surprising weakness: the lack of any significant matching funds or support from the department, the college or industry.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	036ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of Lou	iisiana at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Miao Jin	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Real T	Time 3D Scanner for Geometry Proc	essing Lab
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 3	(of 5 points)
A.2 ${}$ (of 5 points)	B.2 11	(of 15 points)
A.3 ${}$ (of 5 points)	B.3 13	(of 20 points)
`` ` '	B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes $\overline{X}$	No
$\phantom{aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa$		<del></del>
$\overline{3}$ (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff I	Expertise
(* - F)	(Total of 12 Points)	<b>F</b>
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 9	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac		(61 12 penns)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Funding	Source:
E.1 2 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	, Source
$\frac{2}{\text{E.2a}} \frac{\text{(of 2 points)}}{\text{(For S/E)}}$	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or $1000000000000000000000000000000000000$		(or i points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support 1	Fund Awards
(101115/1112)	(No Points Assigned)	runu riwarus
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. Tatal Carres 77		
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 76 (of 100	0 points)	
	<b>-</b> 0	

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

 SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
 Requested Amount:
 \$71,831

 RECOMMENDATIONS:
 Recommended Amount
 \$71,831
 (if additional funds become available)

become available)

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

This is an interesting proposal that should be fully funded if sufficient additional funds become available. It represents a good extension of existing capabilities but the proposed addition seems to have only limited impact. The proposal would have been improved if the PI had described the specific research projects less speculatively, and if he had more convincingly discussed its direct economic impact. The goals and the work plan are unnecessarily general.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	037ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana a	at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rer	nuka Jindal	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement	of RF and Noise Measurem	nent Laboratory for
Devices, Circu	uits and Systems Characteri	zation in the Multi-
Gigahertz Reg	gime for Wireless and Lightw	vave Communications
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 14	(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)	B.3 18	(of 20 points)
	B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 2.5	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
$\begin{array}{c} \text{C.2} & \boxed{1} & \text{(of 1 point)} \\ \hline \end{array}$	D E 1 10 001	
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff I	Expertise
	(Total of 12 Points)	( 610 )
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac	E A J 3'4' 1 E 3'	- C
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Funding	g Source:
E.1 (of 2 points) E.2a (For S/E)	(Total of 4 Points)	(of A nainta)
	F.1 3	of 4 points)
or (of 10 points) E.2b (For NS/NE)	C. Duarious Support	Fund Awards
E.20 (FOI NS/NE)	<b>G. Previous Support</b> (No Points Assigned)	runa Awaras
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. T-4-1C (00.7) (01.00 : (1)		
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 89.5 (of 100 points)		
		••
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 w	fill not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC RUDGETARY Requested Am	S64 372	

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$64,372RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$64,372

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

This is a strong proposal from a strong investigator from ULL that is recommended for full funding. While it has a limited instructional component beyond the described teaching modules, it has strong potential for a significant enhancement of the prestige of the program and economic impact. Matching funds are adequate but not outstanding.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	038ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana	at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ah	med Khattab	_
	Thermo Analysis-Infared Sp	pectrometer Coupled
System for M	aterials Characterization	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 3	of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 9	(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)	B.3 9.5	(of 20 points)
	B.4 3	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 1	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
C.2 (of 1 point)	D D 1/ 10/ 66	T
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertisc
E E	(Total of 12 Points)	(-£12:
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 9	of 12 points)
Development and Impac	E Additional Eurodin	- C
(Total of 12 Points) E.1 (of 2 points)	F. Additional Funding	ig Source
\ 1 /	(Total of 4 Points) F.1 2	(of 4 points)
	Г.1	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points) E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
(FOI NS/NE)	(No Points Assigned)	runu Awarus
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Cooper		
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 66.5 (of 100 points	)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 v	vill not be recommended for f	funding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested An	nount: \$128,780	_
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b> Recommende	d Amount \$0	

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

The primary goal of this proposal appears to be the enhancement of the principal investigator's research laboratory. There is limited educational impact described, including the indication that support is to be limited to a single master's-level research project. There is a considerable mismatch between the stated goals of the project and the research plan. The proposal's discussion of the enhancement potential for the program, department, and institution is not convincing, and the external matching is not significant. The panel does not recommend funding the proposal.

		PROPOSAL NUMBE	CR: 039ENGA-1
INSTITUTION:	University of Louisiana	at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVE	STIGATOR: Gh	olam Massiha	
TITLE OF PROPO	SAL: Integrating Mo	obile Tablet PC Techn	ology-Based Instruction
TITLE OF THOSE			gineering Technology
	Courses		.ggg
A. The Current Sit	tuation	B. The Enhance	
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Point	nts)
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1	5 (of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2	10 (of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3	(of 20 points)
		B.4	3 (of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5	1 (of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6	4 (of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes	X No
$C.2$ $\frac{3}{1}$	(of 1 point)		
C.3 $3$	$-\frac{\text{(of 3 points)}}{\text{(of 3 points)}}$	D. Faculty and	Staff Expertise
<u> </u>	(or 5 points)	(Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/o	or Cultura	D.1	12 (of 12 points)
Development and I		D.1	(or 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	mpac	F Additional I	Funding Source
E.1 1	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Point	
E.2a 7	(For S/E)	F.1	2 (of 4 points)
	$\frac{(\text{Fol } S/E)}{(\text{of } 10 \text{ points})}$	1.1	(01 4 points)
or E 21		C. Duariana Cu	annout Frank Arroads
E.2b (For NS/NE) G. Previous Support Fund Av			
		(No Points Assig G.1 Yes	
			X No
H. Total Score:	78 (of 100 points)		
(Note: Proposals w	vith a total score below 70 w	ill not be recommende	d for funding
SPECIFIC BUDGI	ETARY Requested Am	nount: \$3	9,575
DECOMMENDAT			0.575

**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount** \$39,575 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be fully funded if sufficient additional funds become available. The primary concept is interesting, but the proposal lacks details of the specific course modifications that would effectively use tablet devices. The proposal could have been improved if the PI had considered a formal educational research plan to assess the effectiveness of the proposed new facilities and the subsequent course modifications on student learning outcomes. The matching described is minimal.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	040ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana	at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R	. Devesh Misra	
_		_
	alysis System to Enhance Po	lymer Science and
Engineering	Teaching and Research	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	t Dlor
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	l F I a I
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
$A.1  ext{ 1 es}                                  $	B.1 3 12.2	(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points)  (of 5 points)	B.3 16	(of 20 points)
(or 5 points)	B.3 10 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	$\frac{B.5}{B.6}$ $\frac{2}{3}$	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	$\frac{1}{1}$ B.7 Yes $\frac{3}{1}$	No No
C.2 (of 1 points) (of 1 point)	B./ TesX	
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Evnartice
(or 5 points)	<b>D. Faculty and Staff Expertise</b> (Total of 12 Points)	
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
Development and Impac	D.1 12	_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundir	ng Source
E.1 2 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	ig Source;
E.2a (of 2 points) (For S/E)	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or $\frac{8}{1000}$ (of 10 points)	1.1	(01 4 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
(1 of NS/NL)	(No Points Assigned)	runu Awaru:
	G.1 Yes X	No
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 85.2 (of 100 point		
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 85.2 (of 100 point	is)	
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70	will not be recommended for t	funding
SDECIFIC DUDGETADY Dequested A	mount: \$152.675	

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$152,675RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$152,675

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

This is an excellent proposal that the panel recommends for full funding. The proposed acquisition is a thermal analysis system that is usually found in similar research laboratories. It would be used by faculty and students in three departments. The potential for program enhancement is significant and well described. There is modest cash matching, and the work plan, though very ambitious, is well focused.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	041ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana a	at Lafayette	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zho	ongqi Pan	_
	Error-Rate Test Set for Tele ECE Department	communications
	•	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	: Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points)	B.2 12	(of 15 points)
$\overline{5}$ (of 5 points)	B.3 15	(of 20 points)
` <b>^</b>	B.4 4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	$\overline{B.6}$ $\overline{3}$	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)	B.7 Yes $\frac{3}{X}$	No No
C.2 (of 1 points)	B.7 Tes X	
\ 1 /	D. Faculty and Staff	Erra antia.
C.3 (of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Experusi
	(Total of 12 Points)	( 612 : )
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 11.5	of 12 points)
<b>Development and Impac</b>		
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Fundin	g Source
E.1 (of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	
E.2a $\overline{7}$ (For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 points)	<del></del>	_ `
E.2b (For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
(**********************************	(No Points Assigned)	
	G.1 Yes X	No
H. T-4-1C (-C100 : (-)		
<b>H. Total Score:</b> 82.5 (of 100 points)	1	
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 w	ill not be recommended for f	unding
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Am	sount: \$114,125	

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$114,125 (if additional funds become available)

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

This is a good proposal from a strong program that should be fully funded if sufficient additional funds become available. The proposed test set would support seven courses at both the graduate and undergraduate levels by adding needed capability to an existing laboratory. The proposal could have been improved had the PI specified a more definitive work plan and evidence of more significant matching funds.

	PROPOSAL NUMBER:	042ENGA-10
INSTITUTION: University	of Louisiana at Monroe	
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	Hollis Bray	_
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:	Enhancement for Soils Lab	
A. The Current Situation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)	(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X No	B.1 5	of 5 points)
A.2 (of 5 points		(of 15 points)
A.3 (of 5 points	,	(of 20 points)
	B.4 3	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment	B.5 2	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)	B.6 4	(of 5 points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points	$B.7 \text{ Yes } \overline{X}$	No
C.2 (of 1 point)		
$\overline{}$ (of 3 points	S) D. Faculty and Staff I	Expertise
```	(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/or Cultura	D.1 10	(of 12 points)
<b>Development and Impac</b>		_ ` ' ' '
(Total of 12 Points)	F. Additional Funding	g Source
E.1 1 (of 2 points		6
E.2a ${6}$ (For S/E)	F.1 2	(of 4 points)
or (of 10 poin	ots)	_ (
E.2b (For NS/NI		Fund Awards
(10110711	(No Points Assigned)	
	G.1 Yes	No X
H. Total Scores 74.5		
H. Total Score: 74.5	(of 100 points)	

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARYRequested Amount:\$15,082RECOMMENDATIONS:Recommended Amount\$15,082
(if additional funds)

become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be funded in full if sufficient additional funds become available. The project fits well with program plans to create a model construction site laboratory. The proposal could have been strengthened by better elaboration of the work plan to address how the new experiments would be integrated into courses and by a better description of the timeline for implementing the new equipment. Also, support letters from industry and further provision of matching funds would have been assets to the project. Lastly, its economic development prospects could have been addressed more fully.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	043ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	University of Nev	v Orleans	
PRINCIPAL INVI	ESTIGATOR:	Huimin Chen	_
TITLE OF PROPO	OSAL: A Mult	imedia Based Peer Instruction Envi	ronment for
	Inform	ation Fusion and Distance Learning	]
A. The Current Si	tuation	B. The Enhancement	Plar
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 5	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 12	of 15 points)
A.3 5	- (of 5 points)	B.3 13	(of 20 points)
	(*** F*****)	B.4 4.5	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		$\frac{1}{1}$ B.5	(of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		$\frac{2.6}{B.6}$	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes $\frac{3}{X}$	No
$C.2$ $\frac{0}{1}$	(of 1 point)	B./ 105	
$C.3$ $\frac{1}{3}$	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff 1	Evnartica
C.5	(or 5 points)	(Total of 12 Points)	expertist
E. Economic and/o	or Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
Development and l		D.1 12	_ (01 12 points)
(Total of 12 Points)		F Additional Fundin	a Couraci
E.1 1		F. Additional Fundin	g Source:
	$-\frac{\text{(of 2 points)}}{\text{(For S/F)}}$	(Total of 4 Points)	(-C1:t-)
E.2a 5	(For S/E)	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or	(of 10 points)		T 14 1
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
		(No Points Assigned)	N1 37
		G.1 Yes	No X
H. Total Score:	78.5 (of 100	0 points)	
(Note: Proposals v	vith a total score belo	ow 70 will not be recommended for f	unding
,			<del>e</del>
		YEAR 1	YEAR 2

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** \$105,008 \$15,000 **Requested Amount: Recommended Amount** \$105,008 **RECOMMENDATIONS:** \$15,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be funded in full if sufficient funds become available. The ambitious and meritorious goals for this educational project would be difficult to accomplish in the timeline of the project. The proposal could have been strengthened by addressing this aspect in greater detail and also by addressing its economic impact. The indicated matching funds, primarily in-kind, should be increased.

		PROPOSAL NU	MBER:	044ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	University of Nev	w Orleans		
PRINCIPAL INVE	STIGATOR:	Norma Mattei		<u>_</u>
TITLE OF PROPO	SAI.∙ Enhar	ncement of the Laboratori	ies of the l	Iniversity of New
TILL OF TROPO		ns Civil and Environmenta		
			•	
A. The Current Sit	uatior	B. The En		t Plar
Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52		
1.1 Yes X	No	B.1	4	(of 5 points)
1.2	(of 5 points)	B.2	10	of 15 points)
5.3	(of 5 points)	B.3	13	(of 20 points)
		B.4	4	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5	2	(of 2 points)
Total of 10 Points)		B.6	3	of 5 points)
C.1 5	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes	X	No
$\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$	of 1 point)	-		
$\overline{}$	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty	and Staff	Expertise
	_ ( 1 /	(Total of 12		•
E. Economic and/o	r Cultura	D.1	10	(of 12 points)
Development and I		-		(01 12 points)
Total of 12 Points)	input.	F. Additio	nal Fundir	19 Source
E.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4		18 Source
$\frac{2.1}{6}$	(For S/E)	F.1	1	(of 4 points)
2.24 <u> </u>	$\frac{(1013/L)}{(\text{of } 10 \text{ points})}$	1.1	1	_ (or 4 points)
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	C Proviou	us Support	Fund Awards
	_ (FOI NS/NE)	(No Points		Tullu Awalus
		G.1 Yes	Assigned,	No
T 75 / 10		_	Λ	
H. Total Score:	74 (of 10	0 points)		
Note: Proposals w	ith a total score bel	ow 70 will not be recomm	ended for t	funding
SPECIFIC BUDGE	TARY Reque	sted Amount:	\$298,249	
RECOMMENDAT	IONS: Recom	mended Amount	\$298,249	(if additional funds

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

This proposal should be fully funded if sufficient additional funds become available. The proposal could have been improved in several ways. It appears to be a request to update every departmental laboratory without any indication of priority. It is unclear to the panel how private matching funds relate to the proposed efforts. All of the equipment and software items are not well justified. It is also unclear who will provide overall coordination of this complex project.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	045ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	University of New	Orleans	
PRINCIPAL INVI	ESTIGATOR:	Ashok Puri	
	0017		_
TITLE OF PROPO		ted Real-Time Image Monitoring	
	Equipm	ent for Physical Measurement of 0	Optical Processes
A. The Current Si	ituatior	B. The Enhancement	: Plar
Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 10	(of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3 11	(of 20 points)
		B.4 3	(of 5 points)
C. Equipment		B.5 1	(of 2 points)
Total of 10 Points)		B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 4	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	No
$\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$	(of 1 point)		_
$\overline{}$ 2.3	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
	` _ ′	(Total of 12 Points)	•
E. Economic and/	or Cultura	D.1 10	(of 12 points)
Development and l	Impac -		_ ` ' '
Total of 12 Points)		F. Additional Fundin	g Source
E.1 1	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	J
E.2a 5	(For S/E)	$\dot{\mathbf{F}}.1$	(of 4 points)
r	(of 10 points)		_ `
E.2b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
	` ′	(No Points Assigned)	
		G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score:	65 (of 100	points)	_
(Note: Proposals v	with a total score below	w 70 will not be recommended for f	unding
		\$70.290	
SPECIFIC BUDG	ETARY Request	<b>ted Amount:</b> \$70,289	

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

This proposal appears to lack a significant or appropriate goal or action plan. It is not convincing with respect to enhancing the prestige of the units or the institution, or providing economic impact. It appears that the project would have very limited undergraduate course or curricular impact. No matching funds are indicated. For these reasons the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal.

		PROPOSAL NUMBER:	046ENGA-10
INSTITUTION:	University of New 0	Orleans	
PRINCIPAL INVES	STIGATOR:	Weilie Zhou	
	G. 7	(T) 7 T   F	<u> </u>
TITLE OF PROPO		on of Three-Zone Tube Furnace	
	Heterost	ructure Synthesis and Engineeri	ng
A. The Current Situ	uation	B. The Enhancement	t Plar
(Total of 10 Points)		(Total of 52 Points)	v
A.1 Yes X	No	B.1 4	(of 5 points)
A.2 5	(of 5 points)	B.2 11	- (of 15 points)
A.3 5	(of 5 points)	B.3 15	of 20 points)
	_ ` ' ' '	B.4 3	of 5 points
C. Equipment		B.5 1	- (of 2 points)
(Total of 10 Points)		B.6 3	(of 5 points)
C.1 6	(of 6 points)	B.7 Yes X	- \ No
$C.2$ $\overline{}$	of 1 point)		<del>_</del>
$\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$	(of 3 points)	D. Faculty and Staff	Expertise
	_ (* * F * **)	(Total of 12 Points)	F
E. Economic and/or	r Cultura	D.1 12	(of 12 points)
Development and In		·	_ (* P****)
Total of 12 Points)	1	F. Additional Fundir	ng Source
Ë.1 2	(of 2 points)	(Total of 4 Points)	8
E.2a 7	$\frac{1}{\text{(For S/E)}}$	F.1 1	(of 4 points)
or	(of 10 points)		_
E. <b>2</b> b	(For NS/NE)	G. Previous Support	Fund Awards
<del></del>	_ (	(No Points Assigned)	
		G.1 Yes X	No
H. Total Score:	79 (of 100 p	ooints)	<del>-</del>
ii. Ioui Scoici	(01 100 p	······	
(Note: Pronosals wi	ith a total score helow	70 will not be recommended for f	funding
(10tc. 110posais Wi	icii a totai scoi e below	, o , mi not be recommended for i	unumg
SPECIFIC BUDGE	TADV Daguagta	ed Amount: \$48,294	

become available)

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

This is a good proposal that should be funded fully if sufficient funds become available. The proposed equipment would enhance the capability of three current research projects to fabricate nano-devices. The proposal could have been improved if the work plan were more closely linked to project goals. No direct matching funds were indicated. The strong faculty expertise that exists in the department should have been able to improve this proposal.

#### **APPENDIX A**

**Summary of Proposals** 

#### Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Engineering A

#### for the FY 2009-10 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Req Year 1		Total
001-ENGA-10	Darwish,Abdalla	Dillard University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of Instruction and Research in the Electrical Engineering program at Dillard University	\$95,291.00	\$0.00	\$95,291.00
002-ENGA-10	Shupe,Todd	LSU AgCenter Rural Development Center	2 Years	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of Bio-Based Processing Facilities at the Louisiana Forest Products Development Center	\$126,068.00	\$0.00	\$126,068.00
003-ENGA-10	Cai,Steve C. S.	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquiring a Distributed Fiber Optic Sensing System for Enhancement of Research and Education Related to Civil Infrastructures	\$135,000.00	\$0.00	\$135,000.00
004-ENGA-10	Dooley,Kerry	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of Residual Gas Analyzer for Advanced Materials Development	\$60,277.00	\$0.00	\$60,277.00
005-ENGA-10	Elseifi,Mostafa	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Upgrading the X-Ray Computed Tomography System to Promote Progress and Innovation in Civil Engineering	\$113,580.00	\$0.00	\$113,580.00

006-ENGA-10	Goettert, Jost	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of Optical Lithography Capabilities for CAMD Cleanroom	\$200,760.00	\$0.00	\$200,760.00
007-ENGA-10	lshak,Sherif	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	A Driving Simulator to Study Human Behavior and Improve Traffic Operation and Safety in Louisiana	\$182,060.00	\$0.00	\$182,060.00
008-ENGA-10	Kizilkaya,Orhan	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	A Photoemission System for Chemical and Environmental Sciences at CAMD	\$191,484.00	\$0.00	\$191,484.00
009-ENGA-10	Koppelman,David	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	A power-aware cluster testbed for developing energy-efficient data-staging, communication, and computation strategies for scientific and commercial workloads.	\$149,323.00	\$0.00	\$149,323.00
010-ENGA-10	Li,Xin	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	A Real Time Autonomous Intelligent Robot for Pipeline Inspection	\$60,000.00	\$0.00	\$60,000.00
011-ENGA-10	Okeil,Ayman	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of a Strong Reaction Floor for Large-scale Testing of Infrastructure Systems	\$125,000.00	\$0.00	\$125,000.00
012-ENGA-10	Roider,Emy	Louisiana State	1 Year	Primary Equipment	New Request	Integration of State-of-the-Art	\$136,426.00	\$0.00	\$136,426.00

		University And A&M College - Baton Rouge		Proposal		Technologies in Construction Visualization and Control within Construction Management Education			
013-ENGA-10	Voyiadjis,George	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancing LSU Structural Materials and Systems Lab to Meet Infrastructure Research Demands	\$193,943.00	\$0.00	\$193,943.00
014-ENGA-10	Wang,Ying	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	A Solar Cell Tester for Full Characterization of Solar Cells with High Precision	\$82,750.00	\$0.00	\$82,750.00
015-ENGA-10	Woods,R	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Optical probe for acoustic devices	\$41,447.00	\$0.00	\$41,447.00
016-ENGA-10	Boucher, Gary	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	SMT COMPONENT PLACEMENT SYSTEM FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TRAINING	\$26,564.00	\$0.00	\$26,564.00
017-ENGA-10	Celebi,Emre	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	COMPUTATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE ENHANCEMENT	\$151,901.00	\$0.00	\$151,901.00
018-ENGA-10	Allouche,Erez	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of LTU Structural Testing Laboratory	\$126,257.00	\$0.00	\$126,257.00
019-ENGA-10	Chiu,Alan	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Undergraduate Biomedical Instrumentation	\$24,512.00	\$0.00	\$24,512.00

						Laboratory			
020-ENGA-10	Davis,Despina	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Energy-Dispersive X-ray Fluorescence Analyzer (EDXRF)- An Enhancement of Graduate and Undergraduate Education Through Practical Research Training	\$59,975.00	\$0.00	\$59,975.00
021-ENGA-10	Harbour,Davis	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Undergraduate Microcontroller Laboratory	\$42,445.00	\$0.00	\$42,445.00
022-ENGA-10	Saber, Aziz	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	High Performance Materials Laboratory	\$86,439.00	\$0.00	\$86,439.00
023-ENGA-10	Selmic,Rastko	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of Control Systems Laboratory	\$65,700.00	\$0.00	\$65,700.00
024-ENGA-10	Wang,Jay	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of Geotechnical Engineering Laboratory	\$46,107.10	\$0.00	\$46,107.10
025-ENGA-10	Wang,Shengnian	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancing Chemical Engineering Courses with PIV and microPIV Analysis	\$70,057.00	\$0.00	\$70,057.00
026-ENGA-10	Wasiuddin,Nazimuddin	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Superpave Gyratory Compactor for Highway Engineering Laboratory	\$33,926.00	\$0.00	\$33,926.00
027-ENGA-10	Kiritsis, Nikos	McNeese State University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Second Phase of a Model Chemical Plant for Teaching and Training	\$250,000.00	\$0.00	\$250,000.00
028-ENGA-10	Ramachandran,Balaji	Nicholls State University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of Terrestrial Laser Scanning Systems for multi- institutional teaching and research	\$121,130.00	\$0.00	\$121,130.00

						enhancement.			
029-ENGA-10	Withey, Daniel	Northwestern State University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Laboratory Equipment for BMET Concentration	\$86,925.00	\$0.00	\$86,925.00
030-ENGA-10	Shin,Hak-chul	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of High Speed Monitoring System	\$79,500.00	\$0.00	\$79,500.00
031-ENGA-10	Pesika,Noshir	Tulane University	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of an Atomic Force Microscope (AFM)	\$162,815.00	\$0.00	\$162,815.00
032-ENGA-10	Aissi,Cherif	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	An Embedded Control System Laboratory for Undergraduate Instruction and Research.	\$92,584.00	\$0.00	\$92,584.00
033-ENGA-10	Carroll, James	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Structural Engineering Laboratory Initiation Program	\$113,218.00	\$0.00	\$113,218.00
034-ENGA-10	Gang,Daniel	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of Mercury Monitoring System to Enhance Environmental Engineering Research and Education	\$111,200.00	\$0.00	\$111,200.00
035-ENGA-10	Habib,Emad	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Development of a Rainfall Field Laboratory for Enhancement of Hydrologic Engineering Education and Research Resources	\$74,128.00	\$0.00	\$74,128.00
036-ENGA-10	Jin,Miao	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Real Time 3D Scanner for Geometry Processing Lab	\$71,831.00	\$0.00	\$71,831.00

037-ENGA-10	Jindal,Renuka	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of RF and Noise Measurement Laboratory for Devices, Circuits and Systems characterization in the multi-gigahertz regime for Wireless & Lightwave communications	\$64,372.00	\$0.00	\$64,372.00
038-ENGA-10	Khattab,Ahmed	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of Thermo Analysis- Infrared Spectrometer Coupled System for Materials Characterization	\$128,780.00	\$0.00	\$128,780.00
039-ENGA-10	Massiha,Gholam	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Integrating Mobile Tablet PC Technology-Based Instruction Delivery System into Electronics Engineering Technology Courses	\$39,575.00	\$0.00	\$39,575.00
040-ENGA-10	Misra,R. Devesh	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Thermal Analysis System to Enhance Polymer Science and Engineering Teaching and Research	\$152,675.00	\$0.00	\$152,675.00
041-ENGA-10	Pan,Zhongqi	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	40-Gbit/s Bit-Error-Rate Test Set for Telecommunications Program at EECE Department	\$114,125.00	\$0.00	\$114,125.00
042-ENGA-10	Bray, Hollis	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement for Soils Lab	\$15,082.00	\$0.00	\$15,082.00
043-ENGA-10	Chen,Huimin	University of New Orleans	2 Years	Primary Equipment	New Request	A Multimedia Based Peer Instruction	\$105,008.00	\$15,000.00	\$120,008.00

				Proposal		Environment for Information Fusion and Distance Learning			
044-ENGA-10	Mattei,Norma	University of New Orleans	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Enhancement of the Laboratories of the University of New Orleans Civil and Environmental Department	\$298,249.00	\$0.00	\$298,249.00
045-ENGA-10	Puri,Ashok	University of New Orleans	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Automated real-time image monitoring and control equipment for physical measurement of optical processes	\$70,289.00	\$0.00	\$70,289.00
046-ENGA-10	Zhou,Weilie	University of New Orleans	1 Year	Primary Equipment Proposal	New Request	Acquisition of Three-zone Tube Furnace for Nanowire Heterostructure Synthesis and Engineering	\$48,294.00	\$0.00	\$48,294.00

 $<sup>^{</sup>st}$  The Enhancement Program RFP restricts requests for 2nd-year funding to no more than \$50,000

Total Number of Proposals submitted	46
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$4,827,072.10
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$15,000.00
Total Money Requested	\$4,842,072.10

#### **APPENDIX B**

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

- 1. Equipment
- 2. Non-equipment

	Proposal Number: _		Principal Investigator:
			Page 1 of 3
	BOAF	RD OF REG	GENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2009-10
	RATIN		FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS RCHASE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT
that cons	panel. Review this form a sideration. Guidelines sho	and the prograud and the inte	on form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of m guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under repreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.
A.	THE CURRENT S	ITUATION	NTotal of 10 points
	YESNO	_ 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)?
CO	MMENTS:		
В.	THE ENHANCEM	ENT PLA	NTotal 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 eminenceor maintaining a current high level of

\_\_\_\_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

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?

eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?

undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?

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

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.

of 2 pts.

component.

**B.4** 

B.5

Proposal Number: COMMENTS:			Principal Investigator:		
			Page 2 of 3		
C.	EQUIPMENTTot	al of 10 poi	ats		
	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?		
CC	OMMENTS:				
D.	FACULTY AND S	TAFF EXP	ERTISETotal 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?		
CC	OMMENTS:				
E.	ECONOMIC AND	OR CULT	URAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACTTotal 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 REVIEW		pending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either E.2a 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:				
	•			Page 3 of 3			
F.	ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCESTotal of 4 points						
	of 4 pts.	F.1	To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contribution institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?	ns from the			
CC	OMMENTS:						
G.	PREVIOUS SUPPO	RT FUND	AWARDSNo points assigned				
	YES NO	G.1	If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund supp been adequately documented?	ort, has it			
CC	OMMENTS:						
H.	TOTAL SCORE (NO	TE: Prop	posals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)				
	of 100 points						
			SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS				
Re	quested Amount \$		Recommended Amount \$				
CC	OMMENTS:						
to d	isclose, divulge, publish, file	patent appli	ation, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I fucation on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written pewledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.				
Rev	riewer's Name and Institution						
Rev	iewer's Signature:						
	G			(Form 6.11, rev 2009)			

Proposal Number:		Principal Investigator:Page 1 of 3				
RATING FOR	M FOR T	S SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2009-10 RADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS AN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)				
that panel. Review this form and the processideration. Guidelines should not be	gram guidel interpreted t	hould represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of ines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under o exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain res. Attach additional pages, as necessary.				
A. THE CURRENT SITUATION	ONTota	d of 10 points				
YESNO	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 PL	THE ENHANCEMENT PLANTotal of 62 points					
of 5 pts.	В.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?				

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

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

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?

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 eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?

undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?

\_ of 25 pts.

\_\_ of 5 pts.

\_\_ of 2 pts.

\_\_ of 5 pts.

B.3

B.4

B.5

B.6

of the proposed project?

Proposal Number:		Principal Investigator:			
		Page 2 of 3			
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 ST	FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISETotal 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 CUL	TURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACTTotal 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	<u>For non-science/non-engineering proposals only:</u> To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?			
COMMENTS:					
E. ADDITIONAL FUN	NDING S	OURCESTotal of 4 points			
of 4 pts. COMMENTS:	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 SUPPO	RT FUN	D AWARDSNo points assigned			
YESNO F	.1 I	f the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?			
COMMENTS:					
G. TOTAL SCOR	E (NOT)	E: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)			
of 100	points				

Proposal Number:	Principal Investigator:			
•		Page 3 of 3		
	SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS			
Requested Amount:\$	Recommended Amount:\$			
COMMENTS:				
I agree to maintain in confidence any information to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent applicat	on, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal ion on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written edge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.	l; I further agree not		
Reviewer's Name and Institution:				
Reviewer's Signature:	_Date:			

(Form 6.12, rev.2009)