

FY 2012-13 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND REVIEW OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER THE UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAM

Introduction

The Undergraduate Enhancement Subprogram proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Suzanne E. Beal, Professor of English, Frederick Community College, Frederick, Maryland; and Dr. Christine Hohmann, Associate Professor of Biology, Morgan State University, Baltimore, Maryland, met December 20-21, 2012 to evaluate thirty-three (33) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Undergraduate Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund. Requests for first-year funds totaled \$2,401,729.

The following materials were made available to the review panel prior to the review: a) the thirty-three (33) Undergraduate proposals to be evaluated, with their individual rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2012-13 Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2009 Undergraduate Enhancement panel final report. Prior to the review each panel member read the materials, assessed the proposals, and tentatively completed the rating forms. During the meeting the panel discussed each proposal and transformed its tentative ratings into a composite rating. Reviewers then prepared comprehensive rankings and drafted this final report. Each proposal was reviewed in detail, and the panel believes that all proposals received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria set forth in the RFP.

This report contains three tables that rank and categorize all proposals into three groups. Table I presents a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Table II is a list of proposals that are recommended for funding if additional funds become available. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. Of the thirty-three (33) eligible proposals, twenty-one (21) were highly recommended for full or partial funding, three (3) were recommended for funding if it becomes available, and nine (9) were not recommended for funding. The panel recommended first-year funds totaling \$1,584,838 for proposals with a composite score between 74 and 94. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. 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.

The panel noted that, for the most part, proposals recommended for funding were of high quality and represented initiatives that will allow higher education institutions to offer state-of-the-art programs to their students. Several projects originated from nationally recognized educational organizations. A number of the proposals not recommended for funding dealt with potentially worthy initiatives, but the applications themselves were found lacking in data, organization, or measurable evaluation criteria.

Lastly, the panel very much appreciates the opportunity to participate in this program that is so important to the quality of undergraduate education in Louisiana.

General Recommendation

The panel recommends that the rating form in the RFP be modified so that points are assigned to the evaluation portion to insure that student performance outcomes are an important consideration.

UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

**TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FUNDS REQUESTED	FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	94	007UG-13	LSU EUNICE	\$117,124	\$117,124
2	93	026UG-13	SOUTHEASTERN	\$92,032	\$92,032
3	92	029UG-13	SOUTHEASTERN	\$88,775	\$88,775
4	91	003UG-13	DILLARD	\$91,000	\$91,000
5	90	013UG-13	NICHOLLS	\$90,858	\$90,858
6	89	032UG-13	XAVIER	\$24,290	\$24,290
7	88	033UG-13	XAVIER	\$26,459	\$26,459
8	87	017UG-13	NICHOLLS	\$68,194	\$68,194
9	86	002UG-13	DILLARD	\$34,376	\$34,376
10	85	015UG-13	NICHOLLS	\$143,532	\$143,532
11	84	014UG-13	NICHOLLS	\$21,828	\$21,828
12	83	020UG-13	NORTHWESTERN	\$56,477	\$56,477
13	82	016UG-13	NICHOLLS	\$31,990	\$31,990
14	81	024UG-13	NORTHWESTERN	\$95,000	\$95,000
15	80	023UG-13	NORTHWESTERN	\$67,407	\$60,105
16	79	005UG-13	DILLARD	\$116,311	\$116,311
17	78	018UG-13	NICHOLLS	\$73,813	\$73,813
18	77	011UG-13	MCNEESE	\$72,324	\$72,324
19	76	025UG-13	NUNEZ	\$149,110	\$138,778
20	75	030UG-13	SOUTHEASTERN	\$103,421	\$103,421
21	74	027UG-13	SOUTHEASTERN	\$38,151	\$38,151
				\$1,602,472	\$1,584,838

**TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FUNDS REQUESTED	FUNDS RECOMMENDED
22	73	012UG-13	MCNEESE	\$66,719	\$66,719
23	72	010UG-13	MCNEESE	\$60,145	\$60,145
24	71	001UG-13	CENTENARY	\$69,957	\$69,957
				\$196,821	\$196,821

**TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FUNDS REQUESTED	FUNDS RECOMMENDED
25	67	021UG-13	NORTHWESTERN	\$109,979	\$0
26	62	028UG-13	SOUTHEASTERN	\$13,811	\$0
27	61	022UG-13	NORTHWESTERN	\$108,890	\$0
28	60	009UG-13	LSU S	\$61,590	\$0
29	58	008UG-13	LSU S	\$94,392	\$0
30	54	019UG-13	NICHOLLS	\$14,700	\$0
31	51	004UG-13	DILLARD	\$83,757	\$0
32	44	006UG-13	LSU A	\$92,136	\$0
33	37	031UG-13	SUNO	\$23,181	\$0
				\$602,436	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001UG-13

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Spectrophotometers for Success: Improving STEM Skills of Pre-Medical and Pre-Allied Health Students in a Biological Curriculum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cristina Caldari-Farren

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 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 0 (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 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 18 points)
B.3 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (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:

71

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$69,957 (if additional funds
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$69,957 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.)

Centenary College wants to purchase 14 UV-Vis Thermo Scientific Evolution 60S spectrophotometers, which are slated for use in eight different pre-med and pre-allied health courses serving approximately 130 students per year. The rationale for the spectrophotometers is that they are needed for inquiry-based learning in the courses. The PI states that the new equipment will replace spectrophotometers that were borrowed from the Department of Chemistry in the past and that are no longer adequate in number or serviceability (they are breaking down). The proposed equipment is also slated for faculty-led student research projects. One major problem with the work plan is that the evaluation component is minimal and very subjective because it is based only on interpreting the results of student lab reports and exams. The proposed evaluation is insufficiently developed to demonstrate actual enhancement of the curricula because the plan lacks measurable outcomes. Despite this flaw, the review panel recommends full funding if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002UG-13

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Terra Cotta Universal Resource Faculty (T.U.R.F.)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Barnes

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 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 18 points)
 B.3 18 (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: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$34,376
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$34,376

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

This proposal requests support to significantly enhance the ceramics offerings at Dillard University through the purchase of 20 electronically controlled wheels and a triple phase high-firing kiln, as well as funding for a series of workshops by a local artist. The equipment would dramatically increase the capacity of the ceramics program and the quality of the offerings. The proposal makes an effective argument for the request. The arts are important to the economy of Louisiana and Dillard has a well-respected yet underfunded program. Ceramics is a popular art offering that with more and better equipment could be substantially expanded. Because of the clarity of the need as expressed in the proposal, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003UG-13

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Histology Laboratory Experience to Facilitate Teaching and Research in Multiple Health Science Related Courses at Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Julie Basu Ray

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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 8 (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (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 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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$91,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$91,000

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.)

Dillard's Department of Biological Sciences lost the capability of teaching hands-on histology to its Public Health Sciences, Biology and Nursing majors after Hurricane Katrina. Now the PI wants to equip the histology lab with all equipment needed to fix, process, section, stain, view and document paraffin-embedded tissue. The requested equipment would enable the University to establish inquiry-based laboratory exercises that better prepare students for careers and graduate school. This is an exceedingly well-written proposal with a strong rationale that will benefit student learning, as well as limited faculty research that also involves students. The PI is well equipped to implement the enhanced histology course. The proposal's only negative is that the proposed evaluations would have benefitted from a more measurable approach with more baseline data and specific goals. Nevertheless, the review panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004UG-13

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Environmental Studies Through the Young Scholars Environmental Initiative (YSEI)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ruby Broadway

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes x No
A.2 2 (of 5 points)
A.3 2 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)
B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 23 points)
B.3 11 (of 25 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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 6 (For NS/NE)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
F.1 Yes x No

F. Total Score: 51 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$83,757
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 principal investigator requests funding for a summer environmental science experience for pre-freshman and rising sophomore students. This application includes provisions for equipment and supplies used for field and classroom instructions, as well as student stipends and some modest teacher support and travel funds. Generally, such a summer program is meritorious and well conceived. However, Dillard does not currently have an established environmental sciences major, and students would be unable to deepen their interest in this area if they remain enrolled at Dillard. There is mention of an NSF-funded (LAMP) program with an environmental focus, but it is unclear how the two initiatives would interface to retain students in environmental sciences. In addition, this appears to be a one-time initiative limited to one cohort of students. Thus, the overall impact of the Young Scholars Environmental Initiative on building institutional capacity is questionable. Finally, expected student outcomes are described only in general terms, without any clear methods for measuring them. For these reasons the panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005UG-13

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Instrumentation for the Enhancement of the Laboratory Experiences
in Environmental Health

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bernard Singleton

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 0 (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 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (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 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$116,311
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$116,311

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 equipment to be integrated into inquiry-based learning experiences in the lab sections of seven existing courses that serve approximately 1,300 students annually. The proposed initiative is scientifically creative since students will sample the microbial environment in rehabilitated buildings in previously flooded sections of New Orleans and analyze samples in the labs. The work plan cogently outlines the overall flow of the project, but it is unclear how the plan would map onto the labs of specific courses. The initiative provides an appropriate underpinning for Dillard's plans to expand further into Environmental Health Studies while reshaping its Biology curriculum. The project's pilot research approach as described in the proposal has already borne fruit in generating outstanding, nationally recognized student research performance and has impacted Dillard's minority student population in highly significant ways in terms of career development. It would have been helpful if the PIs had constructed an evaluation plan that was focused more on measurable outcomes. The faculty have the requisite qualifications for implementing this project and the small size of the department will facilitate its success. Regardless of the project's merits, the PIs should take note that the proposal's formatting is inconsistent. Numerous typos severely detracted from the otherwise innovative nature of the proposal. Nonetheless, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006UG-13

INSTITUTION: LSU Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Realism in the LSUA Nursing Simulation Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cathy Cormier

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 0 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 0 (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 56 Points)

B.1 0 (of 5 points)
 B.2 5 (of 18 points)
 B.3 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 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 x No

G. Total Score: 44 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$92,136
 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.)

LSU Alexandria requests funds to acquire an educational electronic health record (EHR) system to better simulate patient care in clinical labs. The nationwide implementation of EHR systems is a mandate of the Institute of Medicine and government agencies. The Nursing Department at LSU A serves roughly 650 undergraduate students and is the largest department at this institution. Accredited in 2011 for five years, the program boasts a 100% licensure completion rate in spring 2012. While the acquisition of an EHR system is well justified, the actual budget and timeline expand the request into equipping two entirely new adult simulation rooms, while the budget and its justification do not mention the EHR system in the itemization. This is a very confusing and a strange change of objectives in midstream if additional simulators are indeed needed. In addition to this confusion, there are weaknesses in the evaluation plan; i.e., the PI should have described the anticipated effects of the initiative on student learning outcomes/goals, not just opinion surveys. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007UG-13

INSTITUTION: LSU Eunice

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: DMS Collaborative: LSU Eunice, NSU Shreveport, and Willis-Knighton Shreveport

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dorothy McDonald

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 2 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 10 (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (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: 94 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$117,124
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$117,124

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.)

Several institutions in central and northern Louisiana request funds to establish the DMS Collaborative composed of LSU Eunice, NSU Shreveport, and the Willis-Knighton Health System in Shreveport, the latter a multisite certificate training program for sonographers. This project was initiated through a Rapid Response grant at LSU Eunice to "demonstrate the feasibility of broadcasting lectures to a remote area, with clinical and laboratory training being provided ... through partnerships". The applicants convinced the panel that the projection of the State's future need for sonographers could be met with the help of this new initiative. The proposal provides a creative solution to two critical problems: 1) the limited size of the LSU Eunice program as a consequence of clinical training slots available in the area, and 2) the need for additional training in the Shreveport area without the added cost of establishing a new program there. LSU Shreveport's College of Nursing and Allied Health is well placed with its programs in nursing and radiology to generate interest in acquisition of the sonography certification, and Willis-Knighton will provide the requisite clinical training capacity. The work plan is appropriately detailed and each site's principals are well qualified. All aspects of the proposal are well documented with support letters and quotes. The reviewers recommend full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008UG-13

INSTITUTION: LSU Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enrichment and Advancement of Digital Media Arts Instruction and Student Learning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Urska Cvek

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

G. Total Score: 58 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$94,392
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 requests funds to enhance the infrastructure of the LSU Shreveport Digital Media program by adding a computer classroom and enhancing technology capabilities. The panel notes that digital media has been identified as an economic engine of the State of Louisiana and that students need access to state-of-the-art equipment to graduate ready for employment. The request for equipment upgrades is reasonable, but the proposal as written does not make a sufficiently cogent argument for the specific equipment and software requested. The proposal is filled with educational jargon, generalized comments about economic development, and vague references to skills needed. The panel does not recommend funding at this time but urges the PI to redesign this request with greater clarity and to describe specific links between the equipment requested, the students to be served, and the learning outcomes to be achieved.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009UG-13

INSTITUTION: LSU Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Biomedical Sciences at LSUS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Urska Cvek

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No
 A.2 2 (of 5 points)
 A.3 2 (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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 23 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 6 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes x No

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

F. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$61,590
 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.)

Three LSU Shreveport PIs want to enhance the Biomedical Sciences program by focusing on integrating computational knowledge and approaches into Biology and Biomedical education. The proposed goals are three: 1) to develop a lecture series, 2) to develop an undergraduate research training program, and 3) to enhance LSU S's electronic library resources. The applicants are accomplished senior computer scientists and a geneticist with computational interests. Biomedical Computing and Informatics are currently very important topics in medicine and technology. Better preparing students for relevant careers in these fields is an important objective. Goals 2 and 3 seem well justified in generating increased interest in Computational Biology/Informatics research in the student population. Integrating the students with graduate students in learning communities has proven effective previously. The panel's primary concern about project goals is the missing piece: it is unclear how the applicants intend to build capacity for a new program at LSU S. Goal 1, the lecture series, is the most expensive single budget item and not well supported by evidence-based research from other models. The PIs might be better served taking their research students to a national conference in the field. A further weakness of the proposal is that the evaluation plan is minimal. The applicants should have demonstrated clearly and quantitatively that the initiative would enhance student interest, student choice of major/career goals and faculty research interests, effectiveness and collaborations. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010UG-13

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Fidelity and Safe Practice with Technology in an Undergraduate Nursing Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kimberly Conway-Pennick

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No _____
 A.2 3 (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 1 (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 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 18 points)
 B.3 9 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 72 (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: <u>\$60,145</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount: <u>\$60,145</u> (if additional funds become available)	<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

McNeese's undergraduate Nursing program faculty request three Medication Dispensing Systems for clinical training of students. This recently accredited program serves more than 1,000 students seeking their A.A. and B.S. degrees. The dispensing systems will be used in patient simulation laboratories to increase realism in clinical laboratory exercises that are meant to fully simulate cases in a hospital setting. Currently, students draw medications in these exercises without the unit's electronic feedback and extra security. Even though the proposal is well written and the performance measures are good, the chief rationales for adding the equipment to the current lab exercises appear to be to have better student "buy in" into their learning experiences and for McNeese to be better able to compete with other institutions in Louisiana for the best students. Both reasons for requesting scarce State resources do not seem as compelling to the panel as needs expressed in other applications. The reviewers recommend full funding for this project if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011UG-13

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nutrition and Wellness Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Debra Hollingsworth

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 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 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 18 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (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 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$72,324
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$72,324

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.)

Establishing a nutrition and wellness lab for the newly reconstituted undergraduate B.S. major in nutrition and food science, located in the School of Agriculture, is the purpose of this proposal. McNeese is the only institution in the State to offer dietetic internships with a combined M.S. in health and human performance (nutrition and wellness concentration), and more than half of program graduates work locally. It is unclear how many majors the programs train, but students from other majors could also benefit because they cross register into the enhanced program. The twin goals of the proposal--to enhance the technology infrastructure to enable real-life lab experiences that better prepare students for careers, and to simultaneously enable faculty and student research capabilities--are well placed. Plans include using the equipment to facilitate studies that directly benefit the local community. The proposal has measurable objectives and a comprehensive evaluation plan. Administrative support letters are included, but there is no indication of how the program plans to pay for supplies in future. It would have been helpful if the PIs had described the capabilities of each piece of equipment quoted and the specific lab exercises that the instrumentation will support. While the PI and Co-PI are experienced dietitians and educators, it is unclear whether they have the necessary training to apply the equipment for research purposes. The panel recommends full funding nevertheless.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012UG-13

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Church Music Concentration Through Equipment Augmentation, Ensemble Creation and Faculty Training

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bryan Proksch

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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 18 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (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 _____ 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 **Requested Amount:** \$66,719 (if additional funds
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$66,719 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.)

McNeese recently added a Church Music concentration, one of only two in the State, to its Music major. The University has created and nurtured partnerships with local congregations. While McNeese has sufficient resources to offer the concentration and to meet accreditation standards, a BoRSF award would substantially augment existing resources and allow the program to offer enhanced organ training, a handbell choir and contemporary worship courses. The PI makes a compelling case for the benefits that would accrue from the additional resources and clearly the proposal has much external support. However, less forthcoming is the discussion of the fledgling program's current state, such as the number of students and recruitment strategies that are in place. It is assumed that enrollment will increase substantially if the new equipment is purchased. Because resources are very limited, the panel recommends full funding if it becomes available and encourages the PI to request future support as the concentration demonstrates enrollment growth and employment success among its graduates.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013UG-13

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Environmental Science Instrumentation Core Facility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raj Boopathy

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 18 points)
 B.3 19 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (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: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$90,858
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$90,858

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.)

Biology Department faculty at Nicholls want to better equip the environmental (predominantly water) analysis concentration in the field and the lab. The proposed equipment purchases are slated for use in 12 different classes in the Environmental Sciences training program for both B.S. and M.S. students. The PIs provide a very strong rationale for how the equipment will not only benefit student preparation in this field of research of high importance for Louisiana, but also the local community directly, by providing environmental analysis through research projects. The PI and one Co-PI are very accomplished researchers in environmental analysis, which instills confidence that the graduate and upper-level undergraduate students' training goals will be met. One weakness of the proposal is that the proposed evaluations are subjective; the PIs should have provided quantitative baselines and target goals. A more detailed discussion of the proposed placement of the equipment in a central Environmental Core lab would have helped the panel understand how large undergraduate classes would benefit from its use. Despite minor drawbacks, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015UG-13

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of BSN Nursing Curriculum with SOCC (Simulation Of Critical Care) Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amanda Eymard

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 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 9 (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 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (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: 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$143,532
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$143,532

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.)

Nicholls' Department of Nursing serves about 900 majors, with about 350 nurses in clinical semesters. The department's personnel resources are appropriate to this project. The PIs state that more than 90% of Nursing program graduates stay in the region. The problem is that only one simulator is currently operational. The proposed new equipment will provide students with a safer learning environment in which to practice critical care before encountering it in a hospital situation, thereby enhancing the graduates' ability to transition directly into more specialized work environments. An added goal is to encourage faculty to develop more interactive curricula. The proposal is well justified and the implementation and evaluation plans are reasonable. Two regional medical facilities have committed \$38,000 in matching funds, but the proposal contains no letters that speak of this pledge. The proposal would have been clearer if the PIs had explained how the evaluation plan would measure improvements in student graduation rates and licensure completion. The panel recommends full funding. Documentation and assurances relative to the private sector match should be provided during contract negotiations.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016UG-13

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Printshop Safety and Enhancement Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ross Jahnke

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 6 (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 12 (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 _____ No x

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$31,990
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$31,990

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

This well-constructed proposal is designed to enhance the growing printmaking concentration in Nicholls' Art Department by securing additional state-of-the-art equipment and improving the safety of the print shop. The project has four goals: 1) to make the space in the room ADA 405.3.1-compliant; 2) to make the equipment throughout the print shop more functional and appropriate to the task for which it is used; 3) to improve the quality, scope, and scale of the student artwork; and 4) to increase the maximum size of lithographic plate and screen printing to 22"x 30". Printmaking courses are required in the Art and Art Education majors, and this project will help maintain NASAD accreditation. It is the PI's ambition to create a self-supporting fine arts press, a goal made feasible by the interest of local artists. The project also is supported with institutional funds and a private donation, and the PI has substantial expertise to effectively implement the project. However, as with many other proposals, the evaluation plan does not include measurable student achievement goals/outcomes. Despite this flaw, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017UG-13

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nursing and Dietetics: Collaborative, Interprofessional Inclusive
Nutritional Assessment of the Older Adult Using High Fidelity
Simulation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rebecca Lyons

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 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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (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: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$68,194
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$68,194

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 is a collaborative application between Nicholls' Departments of Nursing and Allied Health Sciences (dietetics) with the goal of fostering "collaborative, interprofessional assessment to increase confidence in communication and patient care planning." Specifically, students in DIET305, lifecycle nutrition, and NURS225 will use simulation equipment to jointly diagnose a simulated geriatric individual and design his or her patient care. The proposed partnership is an innovative approach to teaching that the panel believes should be encouraged. The PI and Co-PI are well qualified for this approach and should publish their experiences with this model as part of their own professional development. Unfortunately, the performance measures as described in the proposal are very subjective. They should have been formulated in a more measurable manner; e.g., student assessments, pre/post surveys, etc. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding for the project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018UG-13

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Geomatics Program Enhancement with State-of-the-Art Surveying Equipment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sudhagar Nagarajan

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 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (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:

78

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$73,813
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$73,813

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 emerging field of Geomatics includes both traditional surveying and newer technologically sophisticated mapping fields. This straightforward proposal's PI seeks funds to acquire two additional robotic total stations so that students can work on these instruments individually. Louisiana's only Geomatics program was approved at Nicholls in 2004 and currently enrolls 64 majors, exceeding original estimates. The multidisciplinary program boasts excellent collaborations with government, local industry and other University departments. For example, a mapping certificate is planned for the graduate program in Marine and Environmental Biology. In addition, several local industries have contributed cash and equipment to the program, and many collaborative mapping initiatives are planned. While this enhancement will strengthen the program, the need for the total number of stations is not as clearly demonstrated as is their desirability. However, given industrial and governmental support, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019UG-13

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Human Anatomy and Physiology Lab for Nursing
and Allied Health Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Enmin Zou

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No x
 A.2 3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3 (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 5 (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 18 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (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 5 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score: 54 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$14,700
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.)

Enhancing Nicholls' Anatomy and Physiology (A&P) laboratory for Nursing and Allied Health students is the primary goal of this proposal. The PIs want to purchase two Biopac animal physiology EKG systems and requisite computer support, to be housed in the Biology Department and used for instructional purposes in a two-semester A&P class that serves a sizable number (4-9 sections, simultaneously) of Biology majors and Allied Health students, particularly Nursing majors. The equipment would significantly enhance students' ability to perform relevant physiology lab exercises in the class. However, the work plan lacks meaningful ways to evaluate the impact of the new equipment on student learning and performance. The impact on faculty development and capacity building is equally unclear. It would have been helpful had the applicants explained how acquisition of the equipment would enhance inquiry-based learning in Anatomy and Physiology. Including the syllabi in their current, unenhanced form did not shed light on the problem. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020UG-13

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: NSU Art Classrooms Upgrade

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Clyde Downs

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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 18 points)
 B.3 18 (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: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$56,477
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$56,477

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 purpose of the proposed project at Northwestern State University is to enhance three art classrooms for printmaking, painting and drawing. The existing classrooms formerly housed NSU's Industrial Technology program. The University will remodel the classrooms with operating funds and the proposal requests BoRSF monies to purchase much-needed equipment. Currently there is no presentation technology in the classrooms and much of the equipment found there is substandard. The PI does an effective job of documenting the limitations of the present space, but, as the panel noted in other proposals, the evaluation plan needs to be strengthened with measurable objectives that indicate student outcomes. Given the urgency of the need for this equipment, however, the panel recommends full funding of \$56,477.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021UG-13

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Biological Chemistry Labs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zafer Hatahet

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No x
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 1 (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 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (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 x No

G. Total Score:

67

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$109,979
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 proposed budget request includes several research-grade equipment purchases and a large fund for supplies. The PI's goals, such as better integration of molecular biology and biochemistry labs and enhancement of the technology content of biological chemistry and other student labs, are well conceived and could greatly benefit the biomedical- and biotechnology-focused majors at NSU. The lab design for the BIOL4351 and 4361 biological chemistry course sequence is extremely ambitious. Another goal is to provide better infrastructure for faculty-directed student research projects, a reasonable objective since it is well established that real-life research experiences enhance student learning and are essential for students who pursue Ph.D. programs. However, it would have helped the panel to know what the size of the anticipated class would be in order to understand if the design is realistic. The proposal does not specify which faculty and how many undergraduates might benefit. Charging consumable supplies to the grant implies that it is unclear how the courses will be sustained in future. More important, there is no plan to assess the impact of either the course enhancement or the student research component. As the PI notes, if faculty want to build up externally funded research in the future, they must make outcome assessments and demonstrate research results and impacts. Lastly, the PI should have justified why the specific high-end equipment models were requested rather than less expensive alternatives. Because of the lack of clarity and sustainability, the panel does not recommend funding the project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022UG-13

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of a Mouse Facility at Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zafer Hatahet

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No x
 A.2 3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3 (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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

G. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$108,890
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.)

A faculty member from the NSU's Biological and Physical Sciences wants to enhance a very small mouse facility. Although enhancement of the new (2010) facility is a substantial part of the proposal, several major lab equipment requests are also essential for teaching labs in general. NSU lab instructors do not appear to have lab support, which makes the purchase of an industrial-sized dishwasher justified. The PI states that the mice have supported faculty research efforts and student lab experiments; increasing the colony size would facilitate additional teaching experiments and research. The department currently supports the training of 570 pre-Allied Health Science and Veterinary Technology majors. The PI claims to have ten students currently engaged in such projects but does not provide evidence of his or their research productivity (e.g., regional conference presentations). No letters from other faculty are included, so it is unclear if there is any departmental "buy-in". No evaluation criteria are included; e.g., benchmarks of increased faculty/student research engagement or evaluation of student performance/attitudes in enhanced laboratory sections. While the equipment requests can be justified for one year, food and bedding for mice must be borne by other sources to be sustainable. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023UG-13

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Group Piano Instruction with Electronic Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: J. Mark Thompson

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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 18 points)
B.3 12 (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:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,407
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$60,105

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 purpose of this straightforward and well-written request is to upgrade the 12-year-old piano lab in which the four courses that comprise the core of Northwestern's Music major are offered. Currently there are 178 Music majors and approximately 302 students taking courses in the lab. The equipment has outlived its usefulness for instructional purposes, although the pianos will be repurposed for individual lessons. The PI clearly delineates the role of group piano in the program, documents why the lab needs upgrading, and effectively describes the impact on curricula, students and faculty. The proposal is somewhat less successful in articulating performance measures. The panel found some comments regarding accreditation concerns to be confusing. The desktop and laptop computers listed in section C of the justification (request of \$7,302) are not critical to the program and not recommended for funding. Despite minor reservations, the panel recommends partial funding of \$60,105 for all line items except the computers. The institutional match should be fully maintained nevertheless.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024UG-13

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Moving to the Digital Age of Veterinary Radiology--Acquisition of
New Technology for Educating Veterinary Technicians

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brenda Woodard

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 1 (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 6 (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 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 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

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

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.)

Veterinary Technology faculty at NSU need new technology for educating students. The requested equipment will be housed in the Department of Biological and Physical Sciences, which offers B.S. and A.A. degrees in the disciplines and serves 75-90 students. NSU's Vet Tech B.S. is the only accredited program in Louisiana. The instruments will replace outdated, film-based radiology equipment with digital equipment that program graduates will encounter in veterinary practices, which should substantially enhance student training. The distinct advantage of the proposed equipment is that it can also interface with existing equipment modalities; e.g., sonography and veterinary practice management software. The remote imaging stations can be integrated in classroom instruction for a variety of purposes. The proposal's work plan is detailed and specific-- three different classes in the program will be redesigned to accommodate the new technology--and performance measures are adequate. The review panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025UG-13

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creating Anatomy for EMT

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 1 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)
 C.2 0 (of 1 point)
 C.3 0 (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 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 18 points)
 B.3 16 (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: 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$149,110
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$138,778

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.)

A member of Nunez's Health and Natural Sciences faculty wants to enhance the Anatomy program for EMTs and Allied Health students. The department serves approximately 1,800 nursing, EMT, paramedic, CNA, and biotechnology students. The proposal's goal is to provide technological enhancements for students, to address the expressed need to remain competitive with other community colleges in the area. The goals of the requested enhancement are meritorious; that is, to improve student learning via real-world simulations, to stimulate critical thinking and to enhance retention, since the requested equipment will benefit all students in the Biology/Allied Health Sciences classes. The work plan, however, should have been presented in more detail, and the performance assessments are sketchy, with no description of how the various equipment items and supplies will be integrated in specific courses, let alone lab exercises with specific learning objectives. There is also no discussion regarding current resources and how the requested equipment and supplies will complement them. The PI mentions only that the project might reconstitute labs destroyed by Katrina. The reviewers recommend partial funding of \$138,778 for all items except the request for PI support, and full maintenance of the institutional match.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026UG-13

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Interactive and Environmental Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tasheka Arceneaux-Sutton

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 15 (of 18 points)
 B.3 16 (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 _____ No x

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$92,032
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$92,032

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.)

SLU wants to enhance the graphics design program by securing CNC equipment to support student work in interactive and environmental design, and to be used in other design courses. SLU's Graphics Design program has experienced healthy enrollment growth for several years; currently the concentration makes up over half the enrollment in the Art Department. Environmental design is one of the fastest growing areas and SLU is the only institution in Louisiana to offer it. Ninety-five percent of program graduates are employed in the field. Environmental design students do not have access to updated computer equipment to run current software. They utilize the sculpture studio to complete projects. SLU is matching this request by purchasing new Mac computers. The requested purchase of the new PRS Alpha 48 will alleviate the need for Graphic Design students to transport materials between lab and studio. Additionally, the equipment will provide all design students with state-of-the-art CNC instrumentation. This proposal provided clear evaluation criteria that include student performance outcomes, an important element of proposal evaluations that the reviewers strongly encourage. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027UG-13

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Music Media Piano Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kenneth Boulton

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (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 11 (of 18 points)
 B.3 11 (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: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$38,151
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$38,151

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.)

Upgrading SLU's piano lab by adding technology that converts electronic pianos into fully functional computer workstations is the goal of the project. According to the PI, the current piano lab is underutilized. A renovated piano lab will enhance the experience of current students, provide opportunities to develop new courses and attract more students to the Music Education program and the Community Music School. The description of the equipment, the plan for integrating it into the curriculum, and the performance evaluation measures are very clearly articulated. What concerns the panel is whether the proposed enhancement will have the desired effect on enrollment. The PI indicates that this project is part of a plan to attract and retain students, but does not articulate how that plan was developed or what data suggest that the proposed solution will result in greater enrollment. Increasing technology is not always the most effective program enhancement. Although the plan for integrating the equipment is well written and the rationale reasonable, more data on student enrollment and some external evidence that the computerized piano lab will be a major attraction for students would have made this proposal stronger. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028UG-13

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Exploring the History of Music for Film: A New Course

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kenneth Boulton

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 23 points)
B.3 10 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

F. Total Score:

62

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTS: Requested Amount: \$13,811
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.)

Funds are requested to implement a new course in film music by purchasing classroom technology and materials. In addition, funds are requested for two faculty to attend a conference on the subject. Certainly a case can be made for the emerging importance of film music in Musicology; however, this proposal does not clearly articulate an urgent need. Rather, the proposal states that technology and materials would "fit nicely" into the curriculum and that several students had expressed interest in it. More significantly, it seemed that the rationale was primarily guided by the general lack of existing technological resources in SLU's music classrooms. The PI has not made a compelling argument for the very extensive list of materials requested or for why conference attendance is critical to the project. The proposal would have been stronger with a rationale more clearly focused on the specific curricular role of the film course and more generally on the need for technology-enhanced classrooms. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029UG-13

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment and Technology Upgrades to Enhance Student Education
in Kinesiology and Health Studies

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 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 10 (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (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 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (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: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$88,775
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$88,775

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.)

SLU needs equipment and technology upgrades to enhance curricula for approximately 300 students in Kinesiology and Health Studies. The PI wants to upgrade body mass index (tissue composition) calculations, respiratory measurements and cardiac stress assessments to state-of-the-art equipment. More important, the project will increase the capacity of researchers and undergraduate/graduate students to serve the larger community. The functions and usefulness of the equipment are very well described, as are the objectives and goals for the enhancement, which include the creation of new courses involving use of the instrumentation. The work plan could have been more detailed regarding the latter aspect. Overall, the evaluation criteria are adequate, if somewhat lacking in baseline data. The panel is unclear how many additional students and faculty will be served by the instrumentation compared to current numbers. There is no doubt that current equipment is cumbersome and insufficient to support efficient problem-based learning, nor is it very useful in supporting community health assessments. The PI and co-PIs are very well suited to direct this project since they are research-active in relevant areas. The PI especially shows remarkable research productivity considering SLU's teaching-intensive environment. This factor instills confidence regarding the initiative's success and the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030UG-13

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Southeastern New Media+Animation and Bayou FX: An Effects Partnership

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Valentino

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 2 (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 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 18 points)
 B.3 12 (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 8 (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 **Requested Amount:** \$103,421
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$103,421

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 is a result of a unique partnership between Southeastern's New Media + Animation concentration and Bayou FX, a local animation studio working in film and television. Since its inception in 2003 the concentration has grown from four to 15 courses. The program trains students in 2D and 3D modeling and prepares them for employment in graphics settings. What is missing from the curriculum is motion picture industry training. The proposed partnership will provide access to professional training for faculty and students in current industry practices using the necessary technology. SLU is offering Bayou FX a reduced leasing agreement at its small business incubator, putting the business close to the New Media + Animation classroom. The proposal, which requests funds for state-of-the-art cameras and computer workstations to transform the curriculum, has several strengths: the program is flourishing; the proposal is a result of an industry partnership that enjoys campus support; and the project will provide faculty with opportunities to upgrade their skills. Nevertheless, the proposal succeeds or fails based on its partnership with Bayou FX, which was only recently established (2012). Despite that fact, the panel recommends full funding for this potentially important project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031UG-13

INSTITUTION: Southern University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Use of Tegrity Technology as a Pedagogical Tool for Student
Engagement and Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: LaTanya Brittentine

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No

F. Total Score: 37 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$23,181
 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.)

A Health Information Management Systems program (HIMS) faculty member at SUNO wants to purchase a Tegrity technology cloud-based lecture capture system, fully equipping one Smart classroom with the requisite technology and purchasing a one-year user agreement. The HIMS program is new on this HBCU campus, is not currently accredited and enrolls about 150 students. The rationale for Tegrity is that the online learning system would serve six different classes through four online, Blackboard-based HIMS courses that the PI claims would experience enhanced effectiveness, presumably from becoming more interactive. Unfortunately the proposal does not clearly explain how the technology would be used in distance learning courses or even if it is the best technology for that purpose. The panel's primary concerns are that there is no source identified for supporting the over \$15,000 annual licensing fees in years to come and that there is no institutional match. How will the system be sustainable and build capacity? Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032UG-13

INSTITUTION: Xavier University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Three Dimensional Studios

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ron Bechet

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 5 (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 (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 _____ No x

G. Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$24,290
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$24,290

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 is a modest request for funds to purchase a kiln, computer equipment and software to enhance Xavier's three-dimensional art studios. In 2011 the department moved to newly renovated spaces known as The Art Village. An award would allow faculty to teach 3D design using current technology, as well as replace and add electric kilns. The panel agrees that contemporary teaching methodology requires access to computer technology. While the department includes a computer classroom, the additional three computer stations will provide spaces for students to complete design projects. This is a clearly focused, well-written proposal. The argument for this enhancement is clearly articulated, the impact on the curricula significant and the request modest. The panel recommends full funding

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033UG-13

INSTITUTION: Xavier University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Sight and Sound: Music Recording in the 21st Century

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Juliana Haynes

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 5 (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 16 (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 _____ No x

G. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$26,459</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$26,459</u>

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

This proposal is a request to fund necessary equipment to create a professional-quality recording studio at Xavier University. Currently Xavier does not have a functional recording studio, the beginnings of which were destroyed in Hurricane Katrina. The former space was repurposed after the storm. However, the institution now wants to provide an opportunity for students who wish to pursue a career in the recording industry and the PI is also considering adding a concentration in the Business of Music, both of which necessitate a recording studio. The proposal is a strong one since music historically is important to the New Orleans economy and Xavier has long-standing connections to the local music industry. The equipment request is well justified and modest. The proposal would be even stronger with more student-centered measurable outcomes, but because of the proposal's considerable strengths, the panel recommends full funding.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

**Proposals Submitted to the Undergraduate Enhancement Program
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
001UG-13	Caldari-Farren, Cristina	Centenary College	1	E	N	Spectrophotometers for Success: Improving STEM Skills of Pre-Medical and pre-Allied Health Students in a Biological Curriculum	\$69,957.00	\$0.00	\$69,957.00
002UG-13	Barnes, John	Dillard University	1	E	N	Terra cotta Universal Resource Faculty (T.U.R.F.)	\$34,376.00	\$0.00	\$34,376.00
003UG-13	Basu Ray, Julie	Dillard University	1	E	N	Enhancing Histology Laboratory Experience to Facilitate Teaching and Research in Multiple Health Science Related Courses at Dillard University.	\$91,000.00	\$0.00	\$91,000.00
004UG-13	Broadway, Ruby	Dillard University	1	NE	N	The Enhancement of Environmental Studies Through the Young Scholars Environmental Initiative (YSEI)	\$83,757.00	\$0.00	\$83,757.00
005UG-13	Singleton, Dr. Bernard	Dillard University	1	E	N	Instrumentation for the Enhancement of the Laboratory Experiences in Environmental Health	\$116,311.00	\$0.00	\$116,311.00
006UG-13	Cormier, Cathy	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria	1	E	N	Enhancing Realism in the LSUA Nursing Simulation Lab	\$92,136.00	\$0.00	\$92,136.00
007UG-13	McDonald, Dorothy	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice	1	E	N	DMS Collaborative: LSU Eunice, NSU Shreveport, and Willis-Knighton Shreveport	\$117,124.00	\$0.00	\$117,124.00
008UG-13	Cvek, Urska	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Enrichment and Advancement of Digital Media Arts Instruction and Student Learning	\$94,392.00	\$0.00	\$94,392.00
009UG-13	Cvek, Urska	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	NE	N	Enhancement of Biomedical Sciences at LSUS	\$61,590.00	\$0.00	\$61,590.00
010UG-13	Conway-Pennick, Kimberly	McNeese State University	2	E	N	Increasing Fidelity And Safe Practice With Technology In An Undergraduate Nursing Program	\$60,145.00	\$0.00	\$60,145.00
011UG-13	Hollingsworth, Debra	McNeese State University	1	E	N	Nutrition and Wellness Lab	\$72,324.00	\$0.00	\$72,324.00
012UG-13	Proksch, Bryan	McNeese State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Church Music Concentration through Equipment Augmentation, Ensemble Creation and Faculty Training	\$66,719.00	\$0.00	\$66,719.00
013UG-13	Boopathy, Raj	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Environmental Science Instrumentation Core Facility	\$90,858.00	\$0.00	\$90,858.00
014UG-13	Davis, Angele	Nicholls State University	1	NE	N	Implementing Innovative Teaching and Formative Evaluation Strategies (ITFES) in the Clinical Setting to Determine Student Outcomes: The ITFES Project	\$21,828.00	\$0.00	\$21,828.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
015UG-13	Eymard, Amanda	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of BSN Nursing Curriculum with SOCC (Simulation Of Critical Care) Project.	\$143,532.00	\$0.00	\$143,532.00
016UG-13	Jahnke, Ross	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Printshop Safety and Enhancement Project	\$31,990.00	\$0.00	\$31,990.00
017UG-13	Lyons, Rebecca	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Nursing and Dietetics: Collaborative, Interprofessional Inclusive Nutritional Assessment of the Older Adult using High Fidelity Simulation	\$68,194.00	\$0.00	\$68,194.00
018UG-13	Nagarajan, Sudhagar	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Geomatics program enhancement with state-of-the-art surveying equipments	\$73,813.00	\$0.00	\$73,813.00
019UG-13	Zou, Enmin	Nicholls State University	1	E	N	Enhancing Human Anatomy and Physiology Lab for Nursing and Allied Health Students	\$14,700.00	\$0.00	\$14,700.00
020UG-13	Downs, Clyde	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	NSU Art Classrooms Upgrade	\$56,477.00	\$0.00	\$56,477.00
021UG-13	Hatahet, Zafer	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of biological chemistry labs	\$109,979.00	\$0.00	\$109,979.00
022UG-13	Hatahet, Zafer	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Establishment of a mouse facility at Northwestern State University	\$108,890.00	\$0.00	\$108,890.00
023UG-13	Thompson, J. Mark	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Group Piano Instruction with Electronic Technology	\$67,407.00	\$0.00	\$67,407.00
024UG-13	Woodard, Brenda	Northwestern State University	1	E	N	Moving to the Digital Age of Veterinary Radiology -- Acquisition of New Technology for Educating Veterinary Technicians	\$95,000.00	\$0.00	\$95,000.00
025UG-13	Waddell, Stephen	Nunez Community College	1	E	N	Creating Anatomy for EMT	\$149,110.00	\$0.00	\$149,110.00
026UG-13	Arceneaux-Sutton, Tasheka	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Interactive and Environmental Design	\$92,032.00	\$0.00	\$92,032.00
027UG-13	Boulton, Kenneth	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Enhancement of Music Media Piano Lab	\$38,151.00	\$0.00	\$38,151.00
028UG-13	Boulton, Kenneth	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	NE	N	Exploring the History of Music for Film: A New Course	\$13,811.00	\$0.00	\$13,811.00
029UG-13	Sirikul, Bovorn	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Equipment and technology upgrades to enhance student education in kinesiology and health studies	\$88,775.00	\$0.00	\$88,775.00
030UG-13	Valentino, John	Southeastern Louisiana University	1	E	N	Southeastern New Media+Animation and Bayou FX: An Effects Partnership	\$103,421.00	\$0.00	\$103,421.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
031UG-13	Brittentine, LaTanya	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	1	NE	N	Use of Tegrity Technology as a Pedagogical Tool for Student Engagement and Enhancement	\$23,181.00	\$0.00	\$23,181.00
032UG-13	Bechet, Ron	Xavier University	1	E	N	"Enhancement of the Three Dimensional Studios"	\$24,290.00	\$0.00	\$24,290.00
033UG-13	Haynes, Juliana	Xavier University	1	E	N	Sight and Sound: Music Recording in the 21st Century	\$26,459.00	\$0.00	\$26,459.00

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

Total Number of Proposals submitted	33
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,401,729.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$0.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,401,729.00

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 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. 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: _____

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: _____
Page 3 of 3

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: _____