

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS**  
**REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN HEALTH AND MEDICAL SCIENCES**

**February 2010**

**Prepared by:**

**John W. Kendall (Chair)**  
Oregon Health and Science University

**Thomas Robinson**  
University of Kentucky

**Vernice Ferguson**  
University of Pennsylvania

**Wilsie S. Bishop**  
East Tennessee State University

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

## **Health and Medical Sciences**

### **INTRODUCTION**

A review panel consisting of Dr. John Kendal, Chair, Oregon Health and Science University; Dr. Thomas Robinson, University of Kentucky; Dr. Vernice Ferguson, University of Pennsylvania; and Dr. Wilsie S. Bishop, East Tennessee State University met in Baton Rouge on February 17-19, 2010, for the purpose of evaluating forty-three (43) Health and Medical Sciences proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) forty-three (43) Health and Medical Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2009-10 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2006-07 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Health and Medical Sciences.

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

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional funding becomes available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the panel did not recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 70. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

For many proposals in Table I, only partial awards were recommended. The partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. The review panel was acutely aware that the funds available in this competition were less than in any Health and Medical Sciences competition in the past decade, and therefore the review was rigorously competitive and budgets were analyzed with extreme scrutiny in order to fund as many proposals as possible. A number of proposals that were reviewed favorably by the panel were placed in Table II out of sheer necessity. Resubmission is encouraged for those proposals rated relatively high if additional funds do not become available. First-year requests totaling \$4,353,666 were submitted to the Health and Medical Sciences review panel. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$1,044,510.

**Table I**  
**Highly Recommended for Funding**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>1st Yr Funds Requested</b>	<b>1st Yr Funds Recommended</b>	<b>2nd Yr Funds Requested</b>	<b>2nd Yr Funds Recommended</b>
1	97	034H/M-10	UL-L	\$95,656	\$75,000		
2	96	031H/M-10	SLU	\$96,485	\$75,000	\$43,157	\$30,000
3	95.5	043H/M-10	UNO	\$127,196	\$121,303		
4	94.5	042H/M-10	UL-M	\$50,320	\$50,320		
5	94	017H/M-10	LSUHSC-NO	\$330,000	\$170,000		
6	93.5	036H/M-10	UL-M	\$32,400	\$32,400		
7	93.25	027H/M-10	Nicholls	\$85,688	\$75,000		
8	93	012H/M-10	LSU-S	\$22,900	\$22,900		
9	92.5	008H/M-10	LSU-A	\$212,978	\$106,000		
10	91	039H/M-10	UL-M	\$135,817	\$135,817		
11	90.5	023H/M-10	McNeese	\$18,280	\$10,000	\$0	\$0
12	90	007H/M-10	LSU-AG	\$137,942	\$117,000		
13	89.5	010H/M-10	LSU-BR	\$53,770	\$53,770		
<b>Totals:</b>				<b>\$1,399,432</b>	<b>\$1,044,510</b>	<b>\$43,157</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>

**Table II**  
**Recommended for Funding if Additional Funds Become Available**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>1st Yr Funds Requested</b>	<b>1st Yr Funds Recommended</b>	<b>2nd Yr Funds Requested</b>	<b>2nd Yr Funds Recommended</b>
14	89.25	016H/M-10	LSUHSC-NO	\$100,758	\$38,000		
15	89	011H/M-10	LSU-BR	\$192,695	\$192,695		
16	88.5	003H/M-10	Delgado	\$341,759	\$114,000		
17	88	040H/M-10	UL-M	\$19,784	\$19,784		
18	87.5	020H/M-10	LaTech	\$24,520	\$19,000		
19	87.25	005H/M-10	Dillard	\$50,565	\$38,000		
20	87	004H/M-10	Dillard	\$114,982	\$57,000		
21	86.75	022H/M-10	LaTech	\$99,175	\$50,000		
22	86.5	014H/M-10	LSU-S	\$8,605	\$6,000		
23	85.5	018H/M-10	LSUHSC-NO	\$284,447	\$135,000		
24	84.5	021H/M-10	LaTech	\$108,236	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
25	84	024H/M-10	Nicholls	\$38,279	\$20,000		
26	83.5	013H/M-10	LSU-S	\$37,800	\$37,800	\$37,800	\$37,800
26	83.5	032H/M-10	SLU	\$34,000	\$34,000		
28	83	033H/M-10	SUBR	\$54,669	\$44,669		
28	83	006H/M-10	Dillard	\$39,000	\$33,000		
30	82	002H/M-10	BPCC	\$34,661	\$20,000		
31	80	019H/M-10	LaTech	\$64,000	\$32,000		
31	80	028H/M-10	Nicholls	\$54,800	\$30,000		
33	79.5	025H/M-10	Nicholls	\$102,038	\$12,000		
34	79	009H/M-10	LSU-A	\$159,185	\$100,000		
34	79	030H/M-10	Nunez	\$157,861	\$50,000		
36	76.5	026H/M-10	Nicholls	\$279,137	\$100,000		
37	75	015H/M-10	LSUHSC-NO	\$80,486	\$40,000		
<b>Totals:</b>				<b>\$2,481,442</b>	<b>\$1,272,948</b>	<b>\$37,800</b>	<b>\$37,800</b>

**Table III  
Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Score	#	School	1st Yr Funds Requested	1st Yr Funds Recommended	2nd YR Requested	2nd Yr Recommended
38	69.75	041H/M-10	UL-M	\$40,500	\$0		
39	69.5	001H/M-10	BPCC	\$104,740	\$0		
40	69	029H/M-10	Nicholls	\$66,972	\$0		
40	69	035H/M-10	UL-L	\$40,214	\$0		
40	69	037H/M-10	UL-M	\$149,689	\$0		
43	64	038H/M-10	UL-M	\$70,677	\$0		
<b>Totals:</b>				<b>\$472,792</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Incorporating Regulatory Mandates into Health Sciences Programs at Bossier Parish Community College and Southern University at Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carolyn Burroughs

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1    12    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    15    (of 20 points)  
 B.3   12.5   (of 25 points)  
 B.4     5     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     2     (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     3     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 69.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount:   \$104,740    
 Recommended Amount:       \$0      

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

The proposal seeks funds to assist in incorporating two regulatory mandates into curricula by providing professional development to faculty and creating a transition plan for student learning. This proposal suffers from the Principal Investigator attempting to place 2 separate projects under one title. It also attempts to bring in another institution (SUSLA) as a partner with little or no justification for it. There is also a citation of support for nursing coursework that is unrelated. The plan is not written well or articulated, especially in the Health Information Technology piece. The section on eminence is poorly written and weak. Section B6 contains nothing related to the impact on paramedic faculty. It is not a compelling proposal. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Response to Healthcare Needs in Louisiana: Preparing Students for Positions as Occupational Therapy Assistants

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Barbara Custer

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

H. Total Score: 

82
----

 (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 12 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (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 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$34,661  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$20,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

This proposal asking for start-up equipment for an occupational therapy assistant program is rather average. The program is not yet approved by the Board of Regents and any funding for this proposal must be contingent on formal approval. The evaluation process is poorly described and the focus is on relatively basic material. The proposed objectives are not consistent with the budget. It is not clear why ten video cameras were requested or if the objectives could be accomplished with less. Partial funding is recommended if funding becomes available with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: EMS Enhancement to Underserved Regions

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharmaine Hughes

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 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 11.5 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$341,759  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$114,000

(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 proposal seeks to enhance efforts to expand pre-hospital education programs to underserved areas in Louisiana. It is a good proposal but very expensive. It is generally well written and clear. The applicant wishes to expand the accredited EMS programs to two additional campuses and two selected high schools in Region 1. Such an expansion will fill expected vacancies within the next three years, which would add 270 jobs. The need is well described and the project has a good conceptual framework. However, the evaluation section is only one sentence and needs to be more expansive. Many of the current instructors at the training facilities have not attended college other than to obtain their paramedic certificate. The faculty section only contains a bio from the Principal Investigator. Partial funds are recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Classroom and Research Enrichment Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: LeDon Bean

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_ (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 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 15 (of 15 points)  
B.3 16 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 \_\_\_\_\_ (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$114,982  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$57,000

(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 proposal seeks funds to acquire equipment for neuroscience instruction and research. Granting this request would greatly enhance the program through a neuroscience curriculum and related research similar to top schools in the nation. The Principal Investigator is new to Dillard and is anxious to enhance the University's capacity for timely teaching and research. However, the proposal is in need of proof-reading; spell check is not enough. Partial funding is recommended if additional funds become available with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Nursing Skills Laboratory: Childbirth Simulation Project (CSP)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charlotte Hurst

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

H. Total Score: 87.25 (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 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$50,565  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$38,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

This proposal seeks to enhance a nursing skills laboratory with the acquisition of equipment such as a full body pregnancy simulator. This simulator will enhance the overall quality of maternal newborn health nursing by increasing the student's knowledge of clinical performance. In this post-Katrina environment there are fewer ambulatory or acute care teaching sites for student learning. It is to be noted that Louisiana ranks 49th in the nation as the second-to-last healthy state. Weaknesses include Section C.1 with not enough focus on the specific request. The budget numbers listed were not consistent with the request. It would also have been valuable to show how the faculty and students will be taught care of the simulator. Partial funding is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nursing Enhancement of Curriculum and Instruction (NECI)  
Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charlotte Hurst

**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: 83 (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 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 Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$39,000  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$33,000

(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 proposal seeks to enhance student learning through the acquisition of classroom equipment such as smart boards. The goals of this project are quite diffuse and it is difficult to discern exactly how the smart boards will do all that is projected. The narrative does not establish the relationship between the equipment and the enhancement plan. The project could help produce well-educated nurses but does not clearly demonstrate how these ends will be derived from the equipment. There are two composite budget pages. The total requested on one is \$39,000 and the total on the other is \$33,000. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007H/M-10

INSTITUTION: LSU Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Electrophysiology Techniques to Facilitate Both Teaching and Research in Multiple Departments of the LSU Ag Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jolene Zheng

**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 10 (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 3 (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 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$137,942  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$117,000

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

This is a well-justified proposal that seeks to acquire a sophisticated instrument for measuring neuronal activity that will have many applications at the LSU Ag Center. It will benefit the research of several faculty members of multiple disciplines and will introduce students at all levels to a very useful and productive research tool. The application had many misused (not misspelled) words, e.g. revered when reversed was intended, and closer proof-reading is suggested. Also, the many abbreviations may not be familiar to all readers, and spelling them out upon first use would dramatically speed things up for reviewers. The budget is generally appropriate, though over \$18,000 is requested for "Supplies" which consists of a long list of non-itemized pieces of equipment including a desktop computer. Partial funding is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008H/M-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSUA Nursing Simulation Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robbie Dugas

**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:** 92.5 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$212,978  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$106,000

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

The proposal emphasizes a need for a larger and more enhanced simulation laboratory for nursing student instruction. This is a solid application, though the amount requested is excessive relative to the available funds in this year's competition. The faculty appears to be well prepared. The applicants have endeavored successfully to get outside support and funding. Partial funding is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009H/M-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding LSU-Alexandria's CLT Program to LSU-Eunice

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sheryl Herring

**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)

H. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 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 6 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$159,185  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$100,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

This proposal has a worthy goal of equipping an instructional unit to enhance the education of Clinical Laboratory Technicians (CLTs). A local and national shortage of CLTs exists and is forecast for the future. The choices of equipment are rational and well-described. However, in many places the proposal is difficult to read, such as the project summary which suffers from punctuation problems. The budget is appropriate with respect to new items of equipment but is difficult to understand with respect to the institutional matching support. It also would have be helpful if more than one faculty member could be identified. No additional funding sources are specifically identified in the narrative, yet in the budget pages nearly \$37,000 is itemized in the "Joint Private/Other Match" category. The budget also contains approximately \$20,000 for supplies which appear to be a recurring need unsustainable by a grant. These could be considered a responsibility of the institution to provide. Partial funding is recommended if funding becomes available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010H/M-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Videostroboscopy: Teaching, Training, and Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Melda Kunduk

## 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 14.5 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$53,770  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$53,770

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

This proposal seeks to acquire a vital piece of equipment, a digital videostroboscope and associated adjunctive tools, for the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. The Principal Investigator is experienced and makes excellent arguments for the use of the equipment for both education and research. Citing specific projects of more than one faculty member would have helped. Identifying additional funding from external sources would have also helped. Economic and cultural development are not properly addressed. However, the budget is carefully described and appropriate. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 011H/M-10

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Compact High Resolution Field Emission SEM and 3D Digital  
Microscope

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Varshni Singh

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

**H. Total Score:** 89 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$192,695  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$192,695

(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 proposal seeks to obtain a compact high resolution field emission SEM & 3D microscope. The acquisition of up-to-date equipment is a laudable goal that should serve several researchers and their students very well. The goals are succinct, measureable, and appropriate. The application itself is very difficult to read and should had been extensively proof-read. Some sections are highly repetitive. The budget was difficult to find and was not located in the proper place. Further, in the equipment request it was stated that justification of the specific pieces would be found elsewhere, but the justification could not be located by the reviewers. On balance, however, the project is worthy of funding and full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012H/M-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Fluorescence Spectrophotometry for Undergraduate Molecular/Cellular Laboratory Courses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: M. Cran Lucas

## 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: 

93
----

 (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 20 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$22,900  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$22,900

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

The applicant requests funds for the purchase of a computer-driven fluorescent spectrophotometer. With this equipment new laboratory exercises with fluorescence will be added to the laboratory curriculum in molecular/cellular biology and biotechnology. This will be a large step forward for the teaching program and student preparation, especially with the advances in the Human Genome Project. There is a strong cooperative relationship with the LSU Health Sciences Center in Shreveport. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013H/M-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Biomedical Science Student Research Opportunities

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tara Williams-Hart

**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. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 16 (of 20 points)  
 B.3 20 (of 25 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 3.5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 83.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
	Requested Amount:	<u>\$37,800</u>	<u>\$37,800</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$37,800</u>	<u>\$37,800</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 non-equipment proposal to stimulate research involvement of college undergraduates and high school students with the long-term goal of stimulating their academic aspirations. It is heavy on paying stipends for students and student mentors. It is a well-intentioned proposal but not compelling in this very competitive competition in a limited funding year. The goals section is unclear and too wordy. The research examples are sketchy. The evaluation section is not clear and crisp. It is a modest request, however, and full funding is recommended if additional funding becomes available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014H/M-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Tobacco Prevention, Cessation, and Control Science Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Timothy Winter

**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 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)

H. Total Score: 86.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$8,605  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$6,000

(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 proposal seeks to provide 900 students per year with enhanced tobacco prevention instruction by increasing experiential learning opportunities with the use of portable and innovative technology. Through this program standardized approaches can be improved and faculty utilized more efficiently. It is generally well written. While it will effectively impact the curriculum, its impact will not reach much beyond the institution nor will it work to achieve eminence. The requested funding for travel is questionable. Partial funding is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 17.5 (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 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 015H/M-10

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana State University Health and Sciences Center-New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Automated Medication Delivery Simulation System to Enhance  
Safety Training for Student Nurses

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Nancy Buccola

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)  
 E.2a \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
 or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
 E.2b 5 (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 12 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 14 (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 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$80,486  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$40,000

(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 proposal to establish an automated medication delivery simulation system for education outside the clinical milieu. The goals focus on obtaining equipment to build confidence in medication administration in student nurses, and the project thus provides opportunity for instruction away from the clinical setting. Section A3 is only one sentence and the objectives section is weak. The proposal could be improved with more focus on the issues of patient safety and the transfer of skills from the proposed AMD system to others, as well as a better description of why it is essential to learn off site. Nonetheless, the program is desirable and funding of one unit is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSU School of Medicine Gynecologic Surgical Simulator

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rodney Hoxsey

## 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: 

89.25
-------

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 13.25 (of 15 points)  
B.3 20 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$100,758  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$38,000

(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 very good proposal to improve and expand the ob/gyn simulation program for training of surgical residents as well as students in simulated operations and deliveries. Only minor weaknesses in some of the descriptions were noted. One of the pieces of equipment is requested to augment/replace a four-year-old machine that is still operational. While the requested budget is appropriate the budget might be reduced by not funding this particular piece of equipment. Reduced funding is recommended if additional funding becomes available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Southeast Louisiana shRNA Screening Facility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jay Kolls

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 16 (of 20 points)  
 B.3 23 (of 25 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**G. Total Score:** 94 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**      \$330,000  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**      \$170,000

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

This is a superbly presented proposal to set up a genetics research operation with libraries of genetic material and one piece of equipment. It will serve a large group of well-funded researchers. There are no major weaknesses. The budget is very large compared to the available funds in this year's competition, but it is structured in a way that will allow it to still be very effective with reduced funding. It should be noted that while it is not "primarily" an equipment proposal, the single piece of equipment costs \$90,000. Therefore the panel recommends funding for the equipment, and one of the three \$80,000 shRNA libraries. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing a Center for CAD/CAM Dentistry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heeje Lee

**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 8.5 (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 14 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$284,447  
 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 is a good proposal that will catapult the Dental School's offerings in education and treatment to a new level. CAD/CAM dentistry offers a new means of restoration and, as stated, this program would be the first in the nation among dental schools. Only minor shortcomings were noted. The main deterrent is the size of the budget. The identification of additional funding from external sources would have helped. The panel recommends partial funding for the SensAble scanner if additional funds become available. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Driven Health & Family Educators

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heather Haberman

**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)

H. Total Score: 80 (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 12 (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 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$64,000  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$32,000

(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 generally well developed proposal to equip human ecology students with portable computer equipment in order to enhance interactions and learning. The equipment will also enhance the research skills of the faculty. Minor weaknesses were found throughout the application that generally were related to a lack of specifics. For example, the faculty expertise is described in general terms and could have been better illustrated. Additional funding from outside sources would have also helped in the score. All in all, however, this is a deserving proposal. The budget is appropriate in terms of types of equipment requested, but no justification was given for why exactly 100 computers are needed. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for Enhancing Students' Knowledge and Skills for Teaching Diabetes Self Management

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yeonsoo Kim

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 87.5 (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 15 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2.5 (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: \$24,520  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$19,000

(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 need for equipment for dietetics education, especially with respect to diabetes, is well described and the equipment choices are excellent. Minor weaknesses include the failure to describe how disposable supplies (e. g., test strips) will be replaced without grant funding. Commentary on achieving eminence of the faculty in addition to the well-presented case for the students would have helped. A stronger case for student and faculty research could have been made. It is also regrettable that additional external funding sources were not identified. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 021H/M09

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Multi-institutional Collaboration of Academic Transition to  
ICD-10-CM/PCS

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Michelle Martin

**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:** 84.5 (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 15 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 4.5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

	<b>YEAR 1</b>	<b>YEAR 2</b>
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>		
<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$108,236</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>\$0</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 very detailed proposal to introduce the new medical coding system at two institutions. The new system represents a huge change in health information management and it is culturally and economically very important that personnel be well trained to carry out these complex duties. Virtually the entire focus is on introducing and providing education for the ICD-10 system and comparatively little on highly academic functions such as research. Economic development and cultural impact was not directly addressed. The score could also have been raised by attracting external additional funding. The budget is appropriate for the functions described, but recommended for reduction because of the limited academic involvement. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator, with the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Audiology Program at Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sheryl Shoemaker

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**H. Total Score:** 86.75 (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 16 (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 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2.75 (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: \$99,175  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$50,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

This is a proposal to purchase electrophysiological equipment to assist speech pathologists in evaluating individuals with balance disorders and other disorders of the central nervous system. The section on need is well done. The plan is organized and clear. The eminence section is weak. Overall the proposal is strong and deserving. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023H/M-10

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementation of a Flexible RN-BSN Articulation Model

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Virginia Warner

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 16 (of 20 points)  
 B.3 21.5 (of 25 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 5 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 2 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

**G. Total Score:** 90.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$18,280</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposep program is very progressive and the panel approves of the idea of doing chemistry and nursing together. The information concerning the role, expertise and timing of the consultant to support faculty efforts to develop courses is not well presented. The panel was concerned that the five letters of support appeared to contain identical text. While the proposal is deserving the panel feels the programs could be developed at nearly half the cost and recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Nutrition Skills Laboratory Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Simone Camel

**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 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: 84 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$38,279  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$20,000

(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 proposal seeks funds to acquire equipment to enhance a nutrition skills laboratory. The case for enhancing the department was not well made, although there appears to be a real need for the curriculum materials requested. The first two goals are clearly stated, but the last two are broad and not clarified by the implementation plan. The benchmarks are broad and not specific to student learning. The performance measures relate to acquiring equipment and developing a survey. The project will not catapult the department into eminence, but will provide basic equipment to support the program and its accreditation standards. There was no discussion of faculty/student training or on care and maintenance of the equipment. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Dietetics and Food Studies Laboratory Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Simone Camel

## 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 5 (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 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12.5 (of 15 points)  
B.3 15 (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 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$102,038  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$12,000

(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 request for what can be considered basic equipment, supplies, updating and renovation for a teaching laboratory. The enhancement is sorely needed but it seems that much of it should be an institutional responsibility. Some items requested are not allowed by the RFP. Parts of the proposal closely resemble another submission by the Principal Investigator. The goals are not clearly stated. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 026H/M-10

**INSTITUTION:** Nicholls State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancement of BSN Nursing Curriculum with an Interactive  
Patient Simulation and Safety Center

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Jeanne Hamner

**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 1 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**H. Total Score:** 76.5 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 15 (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 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$279,137  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$100,000

(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 proposal seeks to create an enhanced simulation lab for nursing students. Simulation is becoming a standard need for basic instruction. The requested beds and bedside furniture are not essential to the project since beds exist in the current lab. The equipment maintenance plan is unclear. The faculty will need significant in-service training, for which the plan is not fully developed. The institutional match was low compared to the size of the request. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Molecular Technologies for Environmental and  
Public Health Microbiology Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marilyn Kilgen

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 93.25 (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 20 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 3.25 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$85,688  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$75,000

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

This is a very well-justified proposal to acquire modern polymerase chain reaction equipment to continue and amplify work that has been of tremendous benefit to shellfish industries around the world. The researchers will benefit most from these acquisitions but the improvements will also be translated into better education for students at all levels. The principal weakness is that no external additional funding was garnered, especially from the industries that have benefited most from the program. The budget is appropriate, but due to the financial restraints of this year's competition partial funding is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator and the institutional match maintained in full.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Molecular Genetics Opportunities for Health Science Majors

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rajkumar Nathaniel

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 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 12 (of 15 points)  
B.3 15 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 1 (of 2 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$54,800  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$30,000

(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 proposal to improve equipment for undergraduate education in biology that should result in better opportunities for graduates aspiring to graduate education and employment. A better description of the equipment's potential use for research would have strengthened the application. The work plan is weak on evaluation. Acquisition of additional funds from external sources would have also improved the score. The budget is appropriate, but because of limited funds available only partial funding is recommended if funds become available. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 029H/M-10

**INSTITUTION:** Nicholls State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancing the Athletic Training Program at Nicholls State University

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Celestine Weuve

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$66,972  
**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 is a basic teaching equipment request for an athletic training program. The needs section is not well expressed other than stating that the applicant wants the equipment for the program. The section on enhancement is rather oblique. The work plan is a chart, so it is short on detail, particularly in the evaluation section. There is no compelling argument made on eminence. The other categories are satisfactory. The goals and objectives are concise and can be measured. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Health and Medical Science in the Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)  
 E.2a 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 12 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$157,861  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

The proposal is a basic teaching laboratory equipment request. The applicants state that there are no resources available at the institution to buy this kind of equipment. If awarded, it will bring the quality of teaching to an appropriate level. The work plan does not include benchmarks, personnel information or evaluation plans. It is weak on what the project will do to enhance eminence. Partial funding is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Developing a Multimedia Simulation to Enhance eLearning for Graduate Nursing Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ann Carruth

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

G. Total Score: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
		<u>\$96,485</u>	<u>\$43,157</u>
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$75,000</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>

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

This is a fine proposal to provide students with eLearning at several schools of nursing. The program will add several elements for greater diversity of learning resources and make courses more readily available to the students. No major shortcomings were identified. The absence of outside funding was the proposal's main deficiency. The budget is appropriate. Indeed, the proposed budget has been justified in exceptional detail, providing confidence that the program can be carried out as described. However, due to the limited funds available partial funding is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032H/M-10

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Body Composition and Osteoporosis Awareness: Using Dual Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (DXA) to Educate Students About Health Risks

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bovorn Sirikul

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

**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: \$34,000  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$34,000

(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 to enhance student experiences and faculty research in kinesiology through the acquisition of an instrument to measure bone density and fat quantity. It complements existing equipment and will add to the teaching tools in a strong program. Weaknesses included a lack of specificity in areas such as radiation safety and the potential for the program to achieve eminence. Additional funds from external sources would have also helped. Full funding is recommended if funds become available.

**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 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0.5 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033H/M-10

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Enhanced Curriculum for Food, Nutrition and Dietetics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bernestine McGee

**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 0 (of 2 points)  
 E.2a 4 (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 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 15 (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 Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$54,669  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$44,669

(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 application to expand teaching methodologies for students in dietetics and human nutrition. The plan calls for basic computer-based equipment to foster both student interest and to diversify teaching methods. The choices of equipment are logical and the applications are well laid out. Weaknesses in areas such as additional funding sources and promotion of economic development and/or cultural resources detracted from the score. Additionally, the application needed proof-reading since missing or incorrect words made it sometimes difficult to read. However, the proposal is basic but sound. Partial funding is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Eye Tracking Enhancement for Communicative Disorders  
Instruction and Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ryan Nelson

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

H. Total Score: 

97
----

 (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 19 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$95,656  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$75,000

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

This is a very interesting proposal to purchase eye movement tracking equipment for speech pathology. This is an extremely well justified and well written proposal that will serve instruction and research in the field. The need, objective and impact on the program are very well written. The work plan contains all categories and is well organized. The plan will indeed impact students with improved teaching and will recruit and retain students in the program. Faculty research will also be improved and funding should allow the faculty to attain eminence. The evaluation plan is skimpy. Partial funding is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Spectroscopy and Cell Culture Techniques in Chemistry Laboratories for Health and Medical Pre-Professional Instruction

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wu Xu

## 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 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)

H. Total Score: 

69
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 13 (of 15 points)  
B.3 10 (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 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$40,214  
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 is a proposal to purchase basic chemistry laboratory equipment to primarily benefit the education of pre-professionals. It will also serve to benefit the conduct of research by the faculty. In point of fact, the equipment is so basic for a chemistry laboratory that it is surprising that it has not already been provided by the University. The primary deficiency of the application is that it is difficult to read because of the numerous grammatical and spelling errors. For example, there were five errors in the Project Summary that opens the proposal. The application would have been helped by careful, independent proof-reading. Additional funding from external sources would have also improved the score. The budget calls for two low temperature freezers but specific justification for two is not provided. Funding is not recommended.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Clinical Competence in the Radiologic Technology  
Laboratory Through Integration of Best Practices Equipment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brett Bennett

**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 2.5 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 93.5 (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 20 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$32,400  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$32,400

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 to enhance a teaching laboratory is direct and to the point. Moreover, there are no spelling or grammatical errors detected, a common flaw throughout this competition. Minor point deductions were taken in several categories, but overall it is an excellent proposal that will benefit students and faculty in radiological technology by allowing them to develop skills using the latest equipment. The only point that was not clear to the panel is how this single piece of equipment can be employed to teach many levels of students and be also available to an array of faculty that would be using it for research. There is also a lack of additional funding sources. The budget is all-or-none for the single piece of equipment that was carefully chosen and justified in comparison to alternative options. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ULM Human Performance Laboratory Ultrasonography Outreach Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian Coyne

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 0 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$149,689  
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 in general is too ambitious for the background of the Principal Investigator. The letters of support are oblique. It is generally well written but there are too many questions about the use of the equipment, the lack of trained personnel and medical surveillance. Additionally, it is not well justified as a teaching item. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Health Studies Curricula through an Electronic Health Record (EHR) and e-health Data Management Module

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jessica Dolecheck

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

64
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 10 (of 20 points)  
B.4 2 (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 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,677  
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 is a proposal to obtain computer equipment to create and implement a health information module in a health law course that is a service course. This is a conceptually weak and expensive program with very limited impact. The evaluation plan is poorly constructed and does not address all of the objectives. The section on economic and/or cultural development is also very weak. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of ULM College of Pharmacy NMR Spectrometry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Khalid El Sayed

## 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: 

91
----

 (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 14 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$135,817  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$135,817

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 well developed request to enhance instruction and research through the use of NMR spectrometry equipment. No major weaknesses were identified. The basic equipment is already in place, and updating it will add some valuable new capabilities, although it is unlikely that there will be a strong impact on recruitment and retention. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Documentation System for Enhancement of ULM  
Pharmaceutical Sciences Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Khalid El Sayed

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

H. Total Score: 

88
----

 (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 20 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$19,784  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$19,784

(If additional funding becomes 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 to acquire equipment that will be used for research and education in the College of Pharmacy. It will enhance the research of several faculty members and positively impact several courses of instruction. There are no major weaknesses and the budget is appropriate. The score would have been improved with more specificity on the promotion of economic benefit and also if an external source of additional funding could have been identified. Full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nursing Education Anywhere: A ULM Nursing Mobile  
Computing Initiative

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Glaze

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_  
 A.2 2.5 (of 5 points)  
 A.3 2.5 (of 5 points)

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 69.75 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 9.75 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 11 (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 9 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$40,500  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal fails to make the case that laptops in the clinical area will improve the quality of teaching. The basic premise of the project is to enhance convenience for the faculty. No plans are described for assuring creative, innovative teaching, faculty development, and pre-post testing to see what happens. The only enhancement is that the faculty would have laptops. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana-Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High-Pressure Homogenizer and Delivery Module for Manufacturing Lipid Nanoparticles as Precursors for Efficient and Targeted Cancer Therapy

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sami Nazzal

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

H. Total Score: 94.5 (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 20 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1.5 (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: \$50,320  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,320

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 to make solid liquid nanoparticles for use in delivery of drugs to patients. The new techniques will serve education and research in a way that will enhance the College of Pharmacy as an outstanding unit of ULM. Very minor weaknesses were noted, such as the absence of external sources of additional funding, but all in all it is a very promising proposal. The budget is appropriate. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043H/M-10

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Drug Discovery and Biomedical Innovation Using Molecular Simulations

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Mobley

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

95.5
------

 (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 20 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2.5 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$127,196  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$121,303

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 to acquire advanced computer facilities at several institutions to be used primarily for research but also for attracting graduate students. No major weaknesses were identified and the budget is appropriate. Additional external funding would have benefited the rating. More information on the expertise of the lead Principal Investigator would have also helped. Partial funding is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match should be maintained in full.



# **Appendix A**

## **Summary List of Proposals**







<a href="#">ENH-00004001-2009</a>	031H/M	Carruth, Ann	SLU	2 Years	Not Equipment	Developing a Multimedia Simulation to Enhance eLearning for Graduate Nursing Students	\$96,485	\$43,157	\$139,642
<a href="#">ENH-00004010-2009</a>	032H/M	Sirikul, Bovorn	SLU	1 Year	Equipment	Body Composition and Osteoporosis Awareness: Using Dual Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (DXA) to Educate Students About Health Risks	\$34,000	\$0	\$34,000
<a href="#">ENH-00004226-2009</a>	033H/M	McGee, Bernestine	Southern University-Baton Rouge	1 Year	Equipment	Technology Enhanced Curriculum for Food, Nutrition and Dietetics	\$54,669	\$0	\$54,669
<a href="#">ENH-00004095-2009</a>	034H/M	Nelson, Ryan	ULL	1 Year	Equipment	Eye Tracking Enhancement for Communicative Disorders Instruction and Research	\$95,656	\$0	\$95,656
<a href="#">ENH-00004071-2009</a>	035H/M	Xu, Wu	ULL	1 Year	Equipment	Enhancement of Spectroscopy and Cell Culture Techniques in Chemistry Laboratories for Health and Medical Pre-Professional Instruction	\$40,214	\$0	\$40,214
<a href="#">ENH-00004070-2009</a>	036H/M	Bennett, Brett	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	Improving Clinical Competence in the Radiologic Technology Laboratory Through Integration of Best Practices Equipment	\$32,400	\$0	\$32,400
<a href="#">ENH-00004161-2009</a>	037H/M	Coyne, Brian	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	ULM Human Performance Laboratory Ultrasonography Outreach Program	\$149,689	\$0	\$149,689
<a href="#">ENH-00004064-2009</a>	038H/M	Dolecheck, Jessica	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	Enhancing the Health Studies Curricula through an Electronic Health Record (EHR) and E-Health Data Management Module	\$70,677	\$0	\$70,677
<a href="#">ENH-00003959-2009</a>	039H/M	El Sayed, Khalid	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	Enhancement of ULM College of Pharmacy NMR Spectrometry	\$135,817	\$0	\$135,817
<a href="#">ENH-00003950-2009</a>	040H/M	El Sayed, Khalid	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	A Documentation System for Enhancement of ULM Pharmaceutical Sciences Research	\$19,784	\$0	\$19,784
<a href="#">ENH-00004020-2009</a>	041H/M	Glaze, Donna	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	Nursing Education Anywhere: A ULM Nursing Mobile Computing Initiative	\$40,500	\$0	\$40,500

<a href="#">ENH-00003958-2009</a>	042H/M	Nazzal, Sami	ULM	1 Year	Equipment	High-Pressure Homogenizer and Delivery Module for Manufacturing Lipid Nanoparticles as Precursors for Efficient and Targeted Cancer Therapy	\$50,320	\$0	\$50,320
<a href="#">ENH-00003982-2009</a>	043H/M	Mobley, David	UNO	1 Year	Equipment	Improving Drug Discovery and Biomedical Innovation Using Molecular Simulations	\$127,196	\$0	\$127,196

Total Number of Proposals submitted	43
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$ 4,353,666
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$80,957
Total Money Requested	\$4,434,623

# **Appendix B**

## **Rating Forms**

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

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

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



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

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

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

COMMENTS:

=====

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

No Points Given,  
But this is a required  
component

B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 12 pts

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

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts.

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

\_\_\_\_\_ of 4 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES\_\_ NO\_\_

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

COMMENTS:

=====

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

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

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