

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	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	\$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

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Abdalla Darwish

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instruction and Research in the Electrical Engineering Program at Dillard University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

68

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$95,291
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$0

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

This proposal describes 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Todd Shupe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Bio-Based Processing Facilities at the
Louisiana Forest Products Development Center

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 90.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14.5 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	\$126,068	\$0
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	\$126,068	\$0

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

This is 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Steve C.S. Cai

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquiring a Distributed Fiber Optic Sensing System for
Enhancement of Research and Education Related to Civil
Infrastructures

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$135,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$135,000 (if additional funds
become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kerry Dooley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Residual Gas Analyzer for Advanced Materials Development

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

69

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$60,277
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$0

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

The 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mostafa Elseifi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading the X-Ray Computed Tomography System to Promote Progress and Innovation in Civil Engineering

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11.5 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

80.5

 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jost Goettert

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Optical Lithography Capabilities for CAMD Cleanroom

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 15 points)
B.3 10.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

67.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$200,760
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$0

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

This project 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sherif Ishak

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Driving Simulator to Study Human Behavior and Improve Traffic Operation and Safety in Louisiana

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

90

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$182,060</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$182,060</u>

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

This is 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Orhan Kizilkaya

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Photoemission System for Chemical and Environmental
Sciences at CAMD

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 80.2 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12.2 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$191,484
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$191,484 (if additional funds
 become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Koppelman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Power-Aware Cluster Testbed for Developing Energy-Efficient Data-Staging, Communication, and Computation Strategies for Scientific and Commerical Workloads

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 68.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13.2 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10.3 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$149,323
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$0

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

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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Xin Li

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Real Time Autonomous Intelligent Robot for Pipeline Inspection

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 17.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

83.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$60,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$60,000 (if additional funds become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ayman Okeil

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Strong Reaction Floor for Large-Scale Testing of Infrastructure Systems

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$125,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$125,000 (if additional funds become available)

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

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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Emy Roider

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integration of State-of-the-Art Technologies in Construction
Visualization and Control within Construction Management
Education

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$136,426
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$136,426 (if additional funds
become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: George Voyiadjis

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing LSU Structural Materials and Systems Lab to Meet Infrastructure Research Demands

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 79.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14.5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$193,943
 Recommended Amount: \$193,943 (if additional funds become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ying Wang

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Solar Cell Tester for Full Characterization of Solar Cells with High Precision

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

77

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$82,750
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$82,750 (if additional funds become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. Woods

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Optical Probe for Acoustic Devices

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$41,447</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$0</u>

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

The 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Boucher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: SMT Component Placement System for Undergraduate Student Training

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

85.3

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 16.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$26,564</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$26,564</u>

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

This is a 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Emre Celebi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computational Infrastructure Enhancement

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12.5 (of 15 points)
 B.3 12 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 77.5 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Erez Allouche

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of LTU Structural Testing Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a 2.5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

65.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$126,257
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alan Chiu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Biomedical Instrumentation Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 16.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

H. Total Score:

87.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$24,512
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$24,512

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

This is 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Despina Davis

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Energy-Dispersive X-Ray Fluorescence Analyzer (EDXRF)-
An Enhancement of Graduate and Undergraduate Education
Through Practical Research Training

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 68.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 7 (of 15 points)
B.3 11.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$59,975
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$0

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

The 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Davis Harbour

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Microcontroller Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14.2 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

H. Total Score: 81.2 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Aziz Saber

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Performance Materials Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 15 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

67

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$86,439
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$0

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

This proposal would 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rastko Selmic

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Control Systems Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$65,700
 Recommended Amount: \$65,700 (if additional funds become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jay Wang

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Geotechnical Engineering Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10.5 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 75.5 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shengnian Wang

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Chemical Engineering Courses with PIV and
microPIV Analysis

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.5 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

85.5

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,057
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$70,057

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

This is a very strong proposal 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nazimuddin Wasiuddin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Superpave Gyrotory Compactor for Highway Engineering
Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$33,926</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$33,926</u>

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

This is 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nikos Kiritsis

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Second Phase of a Model Chemical Plant for Teaching and Training

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 81.7 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12.7 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Balaji Ramachandran

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Terrestrial Laser Scanning Systems for Multi-Institutional Teaching and Research Enhancement

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 86.7 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15.7 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$121,130</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$121,130</u>

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029ENGA-10

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$86,925</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$86,925</u>

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030ENGA-10

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hak-chul Shin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of High Speed Monitoring System

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 63 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$79,500
 Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Noshir Pesika

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of an Atomic Force Microscope (AFM)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

H. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cherif Aissi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Embedded Control System Laboratory for Undergraduate Instruction and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.5 (of 15 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

76.5

 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Carroll

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Structural Engineering Laboratory Initiation Program

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$113,218</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$113,218</u>

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Daniel Gang

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Mercury Monitoring System to Enhance
Environmental Engineering Research and Education

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Emad Habib

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Rainfall Field Laboratory for Enhancement of Hydrologic Engineering Education and Research Resources

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 88.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$74,128
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$74,128

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

This is 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Miao Jin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Real Time 3D Scanner for Geometry Processing Lab

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____

A.2 5 (of 5 points)

A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)

C.2 1 (of 1 point)

C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)

E.2a 6 (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)

B.2 11 (of 15 points)

B.3 13 (of 20 points)

B.4 4 (of 5 points)

B.5 2 (of 2 points)

B.6 4 (of 5 points)

B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

76

 (of 100 points)

(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)

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

This is 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Renuka Jindal

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of RF and Noise Measurement Laboratory for
Devices, Circuits and Systems Characterization in the Multi-
Gigahertz Regime for Wireless and Lightwave Communications

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 89.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 2.5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$64,372</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$64,372</u>

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

This is a 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ahmed Khattab

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Thermo Analysis-Infrared Spectrometer Coupled System for Materials Characterization

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 66.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)
 B.3 9.5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$128,780</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$0</u>

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

The 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gholam Massiha

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Mobile Tablet PC Technology-Based Instruction Delivery System into Electronics Engineering Technology Courses

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 13 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

78

 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. Devesh Misra

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Thermal Analysis System to Enhance Polymer Science and Engineering Teaching and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

85.2

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12.2 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$152,675
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$152,675

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

This is 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zhongqi Pan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: 40-Gbit/s Bit-Error-Rate Test Set for Telecommunications Program at EECE Department

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11.5 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

82.5

 (of 100 points)

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

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

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

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

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 12.5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

H. Total Score: 74.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$15,082
 Recommended Amount: \$15,082 (if additional funds become available)

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Huimin Chen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Multimedia Based Peer Instruction Environment for
Information Fusion and Distance Learning

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 78.5 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4.5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$105,008</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u>\$105,008</u>	<u>\$15,000</u>
(if additional funds become available)			

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

This 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 044ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Norma Mattei

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Laboratories of the University of New Orleans Civil and Environmental Department

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$298,249
 Recommended Amount: \$298,249 (if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 045ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ashok Puri

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Automated Real-Time Image Monitoring and Control Equipment for Physical Measurement of Optical Processes

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

65

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,289
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$0

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

This proposal 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 046ENGA-10

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Weilie Zhou

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Three-Zone Tube Furnace for Nanowire
Heterostructure Synthesis and Engineering

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

79

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards:

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$48,294
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount \$48,294 (if additional funds
become available)

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

This 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 Requested		
							Year 1 -----	Year2 -----	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	Ishak,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 Gyrotory 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

* 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**

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

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____ Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____ Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

=====

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____