REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

ARTS

MARCH 2013

Prepared by:

Dr. Gregory Blakey (Chair)
University of Central Arkansas

Ms. Virginia Rougon Chavis
University of Mississippi

Dr. Robert Thompson
Georgia State University

2012-13 Board of Regents Support Fund
Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement
Arts

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. Gregory Blakey, University of Central Arkansas, chair; Ms. Virginia Rougon Chavis, University of Mississippi; and Dr. Robert Thompson, Georgia State University, convened by conference telephone call on March 15, 2013, for the purpose of evaluating seventeen (17) Arts 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) seventeen (17) Arts 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 2012-13 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) a copy of the 2009-10 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Arts.

Prior to the review, reviewers independently evaluated and annotated each of the seventeen proposals and shared their written responses via email. During the conference call, each proposal was fully discussed by the review panel. 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 86.

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 due to budgetary limitations. Partial funding levels were determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a recommended amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling $2,458,870 were submitted to the Arts review panel. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling $450,000.

TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	95	01ARTS-13	LSU-BR	$336,549	$120,000		
2	94	10ARTS-13	Loyola	$170,044	$75,000		
3	89	15ARTS-13	UL-L	$89,725	$60,000		
4	88	14ARTS-13	Tulane	$281,170	$120,000		
5	87	09ARTS-13	LaTech	$117,759	$75,000		
TOTALS:				**$995,247**	**$450,000**	**$0**	**$0**

TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
6	86.5	11ARTS-13	Nicholls	$120,072	$54,012		
7	86	07ARTS-13	LaTech	$127,674	$70,000		
TOTALS:				**$247,746**	**$124,012**	**$0**	**$0**

TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
8	82	05ARTS-13	LSU-BR	$254,821	$0		
9	81	16ARTS-13	UL-L	$196,225	$0		
10	79	17ARTS-13	UNO	$127,738	$0		
11	75	03ARTS-13	LSU-BR	$77,120	$0		
12	73	08ARTS-13	LaTech	$119,142	$0		
13	73	13ARTS-13	SU-NO	$68,253	$0	$25,575	$0
14	71	04ARTS-13	LSU-BR	$58,087	$0		
15	62	12ARTS-13	Northwestern	$170,476	$0		
16	55	02ARTS-13	LSU-BR	$67,382	$0		
17	22	06ARTS-13	LaTech	$76,633	$0		
TOTALS:				**$1,215,877**	**$0**	**$25,575**	**$0**

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01ART-13

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrated Digital Environment for Artists (IDEA)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynne Baggett

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		5	(of 5 points)	
B.2		17	(of 18 points)	
B.3		18	(of 20 points)	
B.4		5	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		6	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $336,549
Recommended Amount: $120,000

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 richly detailed proposal requests digital design equipment to augment studio spaces and labs to be utilized by several different programs in a creative attempt to integrate them. It is complete and well argued, and presents a plan for the future of digital design based on existing programmatic trends. This enhancement will help the University to continue to be a leader in this area. The project is very ambitious and will, more than likely, take time to develop. The authors leverage existing resources, units and collaborations such as the AVATAR program. The objectives are clearly presented. The notion of shared spaces fits with the current national trend of building a hub that brings together both creative and technically astute individuals. This context clearly moves beyond the traditionally cloistered activities in the arts where organizational divisions can bring unintended impediments to collaboration and exploration. The request is extremely large compared to available funds, but partial funding of $120,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match, which is minimal, may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02ART-13

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Music Education and Performance over Networks

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Beck

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	2	(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	0	(of 2 points)
E.2a		(For S/E)
or		(of 10 points)
E.2b	3	(For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	12	(of 18 points)
B.3	10	(of 20 points)
B.4	3	(of 5 points)
B.5	1	(of 2 points)
B.6	3	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes		No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	6	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 55 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount:	$67,382
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 from the School of Music seeks video equipment to enhance distance education and K-12 outreach for pre-service teachers. The authors do not clearly establish that there is a high need for this area of study. The argument that the current technology is inadequate is weakly developed. The project would impact a very narrow range of students and academic majors. Though it is estimated that enrollment will double, no plan for accomplishing this is described. The work plan is poorly developed and the impact on the curriculum is unclear. The quality of the writing is inconsistent. The authors provide a detailed description of the requested equipment, but not of how it will be used to accomplish project goals and objectives. A plan for security and maintenance is not provided. Personnel includes technology and music experts but no one specifically assigned to adopt and refine the curriculum. A path to achieving eminence is not established. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03ART-13

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Remote Audio Recording for Research, Teaching and Creative Activity in Music

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Beck

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		4	(of 5 points)	
B.2		10	(of 18 points)	
B.3		9	(of 20 points)	
B.4		2	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		6	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $77,120
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 to establish a "distributed" recording studio for research and education. Recording over distributed networks is rapidly becoming an area of substantial development in the field of audio production and post-production. The project objectives could be tied to particular goals in a more efficient manner that would make them easier to measure. The curriculum development described in the work plan needs to begin much earlier in the described timeline. It should drive the equipment purchases and always connect back to clearly stated objectives. A concern was expressed about acoustical and logistical adequacies of remote locations. The section on establishing eminence is poorly argued. The installation and testing should involve faculty or staff members and not be dependent upon graduate students. The project appears to primarily focus on faculty research and activity rather than educational outcomes. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04ART-13

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSU Piano Pedagogy and Group Piano Practice and Distance Technology Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pamela Pike

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	2	(of 5 points)
B.2	10	(of 18 points)
B.3	15	(of 20 points)
B.4	3	(of 5 points)
B.5	0	(of 2 points)
B.6	3	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes		No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 71 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $58,087
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 from the School of Music requests equipment to upgrade a piano lab. The strength of the involved faculty is evident and the equipment would provide real enhancement. However, the proposal, as written, is not compelling. The current situation is not explained well. The goals and objectives are not clearly described and, therefore, it is difficult to comprehend the intent and time line of the work plan. The section detailing a path to eminence appears to focus more on the PI's work than educational benefits. The number of impacted students appears to be limited. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **05ART-13**

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Film and Digital Media Production and Post-Production Technology to Support and Expand Curricula in the Department of Theatre

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kristin Sosnowsky

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	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	8	(For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		4	(of 5 points)	
B.2		15	(of 18 points)	
B.3		17	(of 20 points)	
B.4		5	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		4	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $254,821
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 from the Department of Theatre seeks to add technology resources for film and video production. A clear needs statement is not provided. The description of past movie production in the narrative appears to contain some hyperbole. There may be opportunities for shared resources on campus that are underutilized. The work plan is vague and does not speak to what is to be accomplished, how it will be achieved, and how the outcomes will be measured. The project appears to be concerned principally with skills acquisition related to future employment, to the exclusion of aesthetic development and other educational outcomes. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06ART-13

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LaTech School of Art App Lab Grant

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jerry Berg

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	No	N/A
A.2	0	(of 5 points)	
A.3	0	(of 5 points)	

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	0	(of 5 points)
B.2	0	(of 18 points)
B.3	0	(of 20 points)
B.4	0	(of 5 points)
B.5	0	(of 2 points)
B.6	0	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes	No N/A

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	No N/A

G. Total Score: 22 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $76,633
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 from the School of Art requests equipment for the development of a new Macintosh computer lab dedicated to developing applications for mobile devices. The bulk of the proposal appears to be missing. The summary describes a new academic track for web and application design, but, with no narrative, the need for a computer lab dedicated only to building apps is not established. It is not clear in the material provided why the software and some additional items could not be purchased and used in an existing computer lab. The proposed concept is unique and intriguing, but the application is incomplete. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07ART-13

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Technologies for Art and Product Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Maggio

A. The Current Situatior
(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 Cultura Development and Impac
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plar
(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertis
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Award
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $127,674

Recommended Amount $70,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal from the School of Art to upgrade technology for art and production design education would provide a significant addition to existing resources. A strong argument is made for updating equipment to industry standards and improving safety. The proposal is generally well written, though the goals and objectives lack structure. While the goals, such as increasing enrollment and maintaining eminence, are clearly stated, they will be difficult to accomplish without more focused objectives. There is an assumption that students will be attracted to enhanced technology, but no plan is described to build recruitment efforts or increase enrollment. The panel is concerned that the coursework creation appears very late in the work plan's time line. Partial funding of $70,000 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08ART-13

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Stage Management at Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cherrie Sciro

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	x	No	
A.2		2	(of 5 points)	
A.3		0	(of 5 points)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 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	7	(For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	No	x

G. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount:	$119,142
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 from the School of Performing Arts and the Theatre Department seeks to acquire a stage management console system. Though the need for infrastructure upgrades is well established, the need for this particular interface is not. It is difficult to make a compelling argument that a stage manager's station is necessary tool to prepare students for contemporary professional work. Though this system would be convenient for the one stage manager using the unit, with a single unit it is not clear what will be available when more than one performance space is being utilized. It is not clear that an item reserved for main-stage and roadhouse shows would be an effective recruiting tool. Details are not provided on the number of stage management program majors or the number of students who would benefit from the request for this interface versus a more typical infrastructure upgrade. The request appears to be for refurbishment of the house light and communication systems with a digital interface addition rather than for educational enhancement. Given the age of the facility, no doubt the systems listed need replacement. The panel invites the authors to rewrite the proposal with a focus on more obvious infrastructure upgrades, especially those tied to curricular enhancement. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09ART-13

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creation of a Digital Multi-Media Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Randall Sorensen

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		3	(of 5 points)	
B.2		16	(of 18 points)	
B.3		17	(of 20 points)	
B.4		5	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		6	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $117,759
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.)

The Department of Music seeks equipment to create a digital multi-media lab and establish a smart classroom. The current departmental resources are woefully inadequate and this proposal, while relatively modest in dimensions, would have a large impact on the quality of music education. The authors present a compelling balance between pedagogical imperatives and realistic research. The project would assist in responding to recommendations made by the department's accrediting agency. The pedagogical goals lacked details and the section describing necessary curricular changes is poorly developed. However, this project would significantly move the department forward and make undergraduates more competitive in the professional market and for graduate study. Partial funding of $75,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **10ART-13**

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expansion and Upgrade of Loyola University New Orleans Recording Studios

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sanford Hinderlie

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$170,044
	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 proposal from the Department of Music Industry Studies requests equipment to enhance two recently built recording studios. It builds upon a strong base of previous BoRSF support. The program appears to be well established and the University has shown a strong commitment to upgrading and expanding infrastructure. Evidence is provided of significant programmatic success with student outcomes. The goals as originally stated in the narrative are unfocused and the objectives not measurable. The goals do become more clear in the work plan, but the objectives still lack a clear way to gauge success. Webcasting is prominent in the work plan but not the rationale, and it is unclear what specific role it will play. The enhancements are necessary to keep the department competitive academically and in terms of recruitment and retention in a field that modernizes at a rapid pace. The budget is large compared to available funds in this competition, but is efficiently structured. Partial funding of $75,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **11ART-13**

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Technological Scope of Graphic Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Trisha Dubina

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	0	(of 1 point)
C.3	1	(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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	5	(of 5 points)
B.2	15	(of 18 points)
B.3	17.5	(of 20 points)
B.4	5	(of 5 points)
B.5	2	(of 2 points)
B.6	4	(of 6 points)
B.7 Yes	x	No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 86.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $120,072

Recommended Amount: $54,012
(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 Art Department proposes to enhance hardware in a graphics design lab by replacing nine-year-old computers in the photography and printmaking areas. The proposal is well written overall and the work plan is nicely organized. A strong argument is made for fostering an attitude of social responsibility in students by improving the depth and scope of service learning initiatives. There is significant student impact, as 50% of program graduates are graphic design students. Although the faculty expertise is not as diverse as larger programs, it appears that existing faculty are developing the program in the right direction. The enhancements would respond to recommendations made by the department's accrediting agency. The proposal would have been stronger if other programs and disciplines were incorporated. The equipment is an upgrade but it is not clear what other resources were explored or why this particular equipment was chosen. A plan for storage and security is not provided. Partial funding of $54,012 is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12ART-13

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Theatrical Lighting Technology Industry Standardization

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Pharris

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	0	(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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		5	(of 5 points)	
B.2		8	(of 18 points)	
B.3		2	(of 20 points)	
B.4		5	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		3	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes		No	x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 62 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$170,476
	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 Department of Theatre/Dance seeks to upgrade theatre lighting technology. The current lighting is at least 20 years out of date and the instrumentation described has no upgrade or repair parts available. The proposal would have been improved by developing curricular and co-curricular ties to the equipment rather than describing the effect on use by on-campus and off-campus groups. The work plan is a list of hardware that should have been organized to relate to educational outcomes. One strength of the proposal is that the requested items are appropriate and utilitarian, with no mention of higher-end intelligent instruments. A stronger argument needs to be made for economic and cultural development. It is not clear if this facility is the recognized venue for cultural events in the area, or what educational uses the equipment will have. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **13ART-13**

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Arts-based Program Enhancement: Creating New Pedagogical Tools for the MA for Museum Studies and the Center for African and African-American Studies (CAAAS) Programs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Riep

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)	

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)

B.1		4	(of 5 points)	
B.2		19	(of 23 points)	
B.3		12	(of 25 points)	
B.4		2	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		6	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

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	5	(For NS/NE)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1	Yes	x	No	

F. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$68,253	$25,575
	Recommended Amount:	$0	$0

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

This proposal seeks support for developing pedagogical tools for a master's program in Museum Studies and the Center for African and African-American Studies. It is very wordy and difficult to follow, though charts are provided that do help organize the work plan. A compelling argument is made for need. Though the work plan includes creating and posting web content, there is no evidence of personnel with expertise in video and film editing. This is a laudable project and the potential impact, as described, is high. However, the connection to Arts study as defined in this competition is tenuous. The project appears to have a stronger tie to Humanities. If this project is submitted again, the panel suggests anchoring the narrative in student learning outcomes and faculty scholarship specifically related to Arts disciplines. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **14ART-13**

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Center for Designing, Composing and Recording Digital Audio for Film, Video and Multimedia

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Blue

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		5	(of 5 points)	
B.2		16	(of 18 points)	
B.3		18	(of 20 points)	
B.4		3	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		4	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	8	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$281,170
	Recommended Amount:	$120,000

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 proposal seeks to establish an audio post-production facility to enhance instruction in digital media production and integrate study in several disciplines. A fully featured post-production facility is a requirement of a highly functioning program in film, video and media. The requested equipment is appropriate and all industry standard. The project is highly interdisciplinary with broad impact. The goals are clearly stated but the objectives are unfocused and not easily measurable. The project contains a strong service learning component. Curriculum development and the incorporation of new technology appear very late in the work plan's timeline. The requested amount is high relative to available funds. There is no institutional match. Partial funding of $120,000 is recommended for the AVID core technologies. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **15ART-13**

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Studio Enhancement for Silkscreen and Lithographic Printing Technology for the Printmaking Classroom and Marais Press

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian Kelly

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		5	(of 5 points)	
B.2		16	(of 18 points)	
B.3		15	(of 20 points)	
B.4		5	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		6	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	10	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No	

G. Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$89,725
	Recommended Amount:	$60,000

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 Department of Visual Arts seeks updated equipment for a computer imaging lab utilized by the printmaking program. The proposal is generally well written and the needs are clearly outlined. The requested equipment is a natural addition for the contemporary and less toxic printmaking practices of silkscreen and lithography and the enhancement would be substantial. The listed goals, while comprehensive, lack objectives and it is not clear from the work plan how this project will affect student outcomes. The evaluation section offers a comprehensive list of measures, but they need to be tied to the goals. While this equipment could be a significant addition to drawing and painting, graphic design, digital arts and possibly journalism, English, business and advertising, those programs were not listed as beneficiaries. A strong argument is made for enhancing eminence. Partial funding of $60,000 is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match, which consists solely of indirect costs, may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: **16ART-13**

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Études de Louisiana: Technology and Equipment Enhancement for the Center for Louisiana Studies

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jennifer Ritter Guidry

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		2	(of 5 points)
B.2		15	(of 18 points)
B.3		16	(of 20 points)
B.4		5	(of 5 points)
B.5		2	(of 2 points)
B.6		4	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes	x	No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	12	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	x	No

G. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	**Requested Amount:**	$196,225
	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 Center for Louisiana Studies seeks to upgrade computers and field research equipment along with physical and digital archival storage. A compelling argument is made for the importance of preserving and protecting valuable artifacts. The scope of activities is intriguing. The crux of the project involves digitizing material in a form that enhances protection and allows students easier access. However, the number of students impacted is limited, the plan for disseminating information to students is not well developed, and the connection to student learning outcomes is poor. The list of requested equipment is not tied directly to goals and objectives. The position of the Center within the University is not clearly established in the narrative. This is important work, but the project may be more appropriate for the Humanities competition. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17ART-13

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: MusicPATH Lab and Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian Seeger

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		2	(of 5 points)	
B.2		12	(of 18 points)	
B.3		20	(of 20 points)	
B.4		5	(of 5 points)	
B.5		2	(of 2 points)	
B.6		6	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	x	No	

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	6	(of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes		No	x

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $127,738
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 from the Music Department requests equipment to update a piano lab. Four goals are described clearly and extensively, though an objective is only provided for one of them. The proposal lacks a plan to achieve crossover into the film industry, collaboration between students and faculty, and expanded composition capabilities. The work plan does not clearly incorporate the requested equipment. Faculty expertise with the hardware and software is not clearly outlined and training and maintenance are not described. The installation appears to be dependant upon pro bono work from industry personnel. The request is an upgrade and would improve student outcomes, but is not state-of-the-art as described. Funding is not recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Arts for the FY 2012-13 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001ARTS-13	Baggett, Lynne	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	INTEGRATED DIGITAL ENVIRONMENT FOR ARTISTS (IDEA)	$336,549.00	$0.00	$336,549.00
002ARTS-13	Beck, Stephen	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Music Education & Performance over Networks	$67,382.00	$0.00	$67,382.00
003ARTS-13	Beck, Stephen	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Remote Audio Recording for Research, Teaching and Creative Activity in Music	$77,120.00	$0.00	$77,120.00
004ARTS-13	Pike, Pamela	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	LSU Piano Pedagogy and Group Piano Practice and Distance Technology Enhancement	$58,087.00	$0.00	$58,087.00
005ARTS-13	Sosnowsky, Kristin	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Enhancement of Film and Digital Media Production and Post-Production Technology to Support and Expand Curricula in the Department of Theatre	$254,821.00	$0.00	$254,821.00
006ARTS-13	Berg, Jerry	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	LaTech School of Art App Lab Grant	$76,633.00	$0.00	$76,633.00
007ARTS-13	Maggio, Michael	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Advanced Technologies for Art and Product Design	$127,674.00	$0.00	$127,674.00
008ARTS-13	Sciro, Cherrie	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Enhancing Stage Management at Louisiana Tech University	$119,142.00	$0.00	$119,142.00
009ARTS-13	Sorensen, Randall	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Creation of a Digital Multi-Media Studio	$117,759.00	$0.00	$117,759.00
010ARTS-13	Hinderlie, Sanford	Loyola University New Orleans	1	E	N	Expansion and Upgrade of Loyola University New Orleans Recording Studios	$170,044.00	$0.00	$170,044.00
011ARTS-13	Dubina, Trisha	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancing the Technological Scope of Graphic Design	$120,072.00	$0.00	$120,072.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
012ARTS-13	Pharris, Paul	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Theatrical Lighting Technology Industry Standardization	$170,476.00	$0.00	$170,476.00
013ARTS-13	Riep, David	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	2	NE	N	Arts-based Program Enhancement: Creating New Pedagogical Tools for the MA for Museum Studies and the Center for African and African-American Studies (CAAAS) Programs	$68,253.00	$25,575.00	$93,828.00
014ARTS-13	Blue, Mary	Tulane University	1	E	N	Center for Designing, Composing and Recording Digital Audio for Film, Video and Multimedia	$281,170.00	$0.00	$281,170.00
015ARTS-13	Kelly, Brian	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	STUDIO ENHANCEMENT FOR SILKSCREEN AND LITHOGRAPHIC PRINTING TECHNOLGY FOR THE PRINTMAKING CLASSROOM AND MARAIS PRESS	$89,725.00	$0.00	$89,725.00
016ARTS-13	Ritter Guidry, Jennifer	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Études de Louisiana: Technology and Equipment Enhancement for the Center for Louisiana Studies	$196,225.00	$0.00	$196,225.00
017ARTS-13	Seeger, Brian	University of New Orleans	1	E	N	MusicPATH Lab and Classroom	$127,738.00	$0.00	$127,738.00

*The RFP restricts second year funding requests to no more than $50,000.

Number of Proposals Submitted	17
Total Money Requested for First Year	$2,458,870.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	$25,575.00
Total Money Requested	$2,484,445.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2012-13

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 56 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 18 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 6 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 <u>For science/engineering proposals only:</u> 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 <u>For non-science/non-engineering proposals only:</u> To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

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

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:_____

(Form 6.11, rev 2012)

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2012-13
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 66 points

_____ of 5 pts.	B.1	Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?
_____ of 23 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 6 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?

C. 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?

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

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. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

F. 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:_____

(Form 6.12, rev.2012)