

# **Board of Regents Support Fund, FY 2013-14**

## **Review of Proposals Submitted to the Undergraduate Enhancement Program**

### **Final Report of Consultants**

**February-March 2014**

Submitted by:

**Richard W. Robinett, Ph.D., Chair**

Department of Physics  
Penn State University

\*

**Karen A. Myers, M.S.**

Department of Management and  
Director, Center for Teaching Excellence  
Fisher College, Boston

\*

**Alexandru Biris, Ph.D.**

Applied Science  
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

\*

**John D. King, Ph.D.**

Department of Mathematics  
Georgia Perimeter College, Atlanta

\*

**Gail Dickinson, Ph.D.**

Science Education  
Texas State University, San Marcos

**FY 2013-14 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
REVIEW OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED UNDER THE  
UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAM**

**Introduction**

An Undergraduate Enhancement Subprogram proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Richard W. Robinett, physics (chair), Penn State University; Ms. Karen Myers, business, Fisher College (Boston); Dr. Alexandru Biris, chemistry, University of Arkansas at Little Rock; Dr. John King, mathematics, Georgia Perimeter College (Atlanta); and Dr. Gail Dickinson, education, Texas State University San Marcos, met several times via e-mail exchanges and Skype conference calls between February 1, 2014 and March 9, 2014 to evaluate forty-two (42) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Undergraduate Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The following materials were transmitted to the panel prior to the review: a) the forty-two (42) proposals to be evaluated and their individual rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2013-14 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) a copy of the previous relevant (2010-11) Undergraduate Enhancement review panel final report. Prior to the review consultants read and evaluated each proposal according to the guidelines in the RFP. Each panelist assigned a preliminary rating to each proposal before the meetings took place. Preliminary composite scores were then computed and facilitated discussion among panel members. After thorough assessment of each proposal's merits, the panel established a rank order for all proposals and recommended monetary levels for awards according to the established criteria. Recommendations were made consistent with the limits of available funding as determined by the Board of Regents.

Final composite scores assigned to the proposals ranged from 94 to 42 out of a maximum of 100. The panel did not recommend funding for those proposals receiving scores of less than 70.

Requests for first-year funds in the FY 2013-14 Undergraduate Enhancement Program totaled \$2,381,540. A total of \$1,023,000 in first-year monies was recommended for expenditure for proposals with composite scores between 94 and 71.

This report contains two tables that rank all proposals. Table I presents a rank-order list of the twenty-four (24) proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. The eighteen (18) proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. 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.

It is important for applicants to note that the panel was disappointed that, for the most part, proposals submitted were of lesser quality than in previous years. Panelists noted that several applicants this year did not carefully follow the guidelines promulgated in the FY 2013-14 RFP.

For example, a proposal that requests support for one-time summer travel outside the U.S. for several faculty and students, without a pledge of institutional match, does not align with the Enhancement Program's goal, which is "the enhancement of the quality of academic, research and agricultural departments or units..." Likewise, proposals that request funding for student scholarships are not appropriate. The Enhancement Program was never intended to enhance faculty or staff salaries or provide stipends for overload work. Such requests are routinely denied.

**Advice from the 2014 Undergraduate Enhancement Review Panel to Applicants for Program Funding**

1. The panel uniformly looks for proposals that have an immediate, broad, and long-term impact on the educational mission of the institution, including research involving students where that is appropriate. In general, proposals that demonstrate that they would improve the educational experience of a large number of students and over an extended period of time were viewed far more favorably than those which would assist only a handful of students for a couple of semesters or one summer. In this report, that phenomenon is referred to as "impact."
2. The panel noted several instances where spelling, grammatical, typographical, and other formatting errors were routinely included, and so we remind applicants to thoroughly review proposals with an eye towards readability, completeness, and formatting that makes sense. Having someone else read them is an excellent idea.
3. Detailed, preferably quantitative information on how the impact of the recommended program funds will be assessed is always valuable information for any review panel.

**TABLE I**  
**Undergraduate Enhancement Program, FY 2013-14**  
**Proposals Highly Recommended for Funding**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	1st YR. FUNDS REQUESTED	1st YR. FUNDS RECOMMENDED	2nd YR. FUNDS REQUESTED	2nd YR. FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	94	031UG-14	Northwestern	\$16,673	\$16,673		
2	93	024UG-14	NIC	\$93,000	\$93,000		
3	92	019UG-14	LSUS	\$58,335	\$58,335		
4	91	032UG-14	Northwestern	\$14,561	\$14,561		
5	90	022UG-14	NIC	\$87,179	\$43,600		
6	89	035UG-14	SLU	\$32,676	\$32,676		
7	88	036UG-14	SUNO	\$6,066	\$6,066	\$20,254	\$0
8	87	004UG-14	Dillard	\$69,290	\$69,290		
9	86	015UG-14	LSUA	\$40,785	\$40,785		
10	84	041UG-14	SUNO	\$23,561	\$23,561	\$0	\$0
11	83	030UG-14	Northwestern	\$61,608	\$30,000		
12	82	006UG-14	Dillard	\$75,000	\$47,000		
13	81.5	002UG-14	Centenary	\$42,344	\$27,474		
14	81	021UG-14	Loyola	\$53,784	\$30,000		
15	80	011UG-14	LA College	\$71,953	\$71,293		
16	79	017UG-14	LSUS	\$125,164	\$60,000		
17	78.5	014UG-14	LSUA	\$52,900	\$49,300		
18	78	023UG-14	NIC	\$235,162	\$100,000		
19	76	037UG-14	SUNO	\$117,174	\$50,000		
20	75	012UG-14	LA College	\$64,247	\$34,000		
21	74	034UG-14	SLU	\$65,673	\$31,636		
22	73	033UG-14	OLOLC	\$89,750	\$44,250		
23	72	029UG-14	Northwestern	\$42,898	\$32,000		
24	71	025UG-14	NIC	\$22,000	\$17,500		
				\$1,561,783	\$1,023,000	\$20,254	\$0

**TABLE II**  
**Undergraduate Enhancement Program, FY 2013-14**  
**Proposals Not Recommended for Funding**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	1st YR. FUNDS REQUESTED	1st YR. FUNDS RECOMMENDED	2nd YR. FUNDS REQUESTED	2nd YR. FUNDS RECOMMENDED
25	69	001UG-14	Centenary	\$29,903	\$0		
25	69	016UG-14	LSUS	\$47,583	\$0		
27	68.5	040UG-14	SUNO	\$106,669	\$0	\$0	\$0
28	68	005UG-14	Dillard	\$76,000	\$0		
28	68	020UG-14	Loyola	\$38,432	\$0		
30	67	028UG-14	Northwestern	\$23,850	\$0		
31	66	039UG-14	SUNO	\$32,400	\$0	\$25,400	\$0
32	65	008UG-14	Dillard	\$45,381	\$0		
32	65	013UG-14	LSUA	\$18,924	\$0		
32	65	038UG-14	SUNO	\$36,000	\$0	\$36,000	\$0
35	64	009UG-14	Dillard	\$55,699	\$0		
36	63	003UG-14	Dillard	\$33,031	\$0		
36	63	010UG-14	Dillard	\$62,250	\$0	\$37,200	\$0
36	63	027UG-14	Northwestern	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000	\$0
36	63	042UG-14	SUNO	\$39,150	\$0	\$27,750	\$0
40	61	018UG-14	LSUS	\$52,485	\$0		
41	57	026UG-14	Northwestern	\$12,000	\$0	\$12,000	\$0
42	42	007UG-14	Dillard	\$70,000	\$0		
				\$819,757	\$0	\$178,350	\$0

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001UG-14

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Introduction of Microwave Assisted Organic Reactions to the  
Organic Chemistry Curriculum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Brownholland

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

69
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$29,903</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal requests funding for the acquisition and implementation in laboratory settings of a microwave-assisted organic chemistry set-up. This approach would speed up the kinetics of various chemical reactions and therefore have a positive impact on the number and quality of organic chemistry courses at Centenary College. The proposal has some merit, but its impact is limited due to the small number of students. Also, the impact on faculty development section, with arguments that relate to education and, possibly, to research, is not very well described. Because of these reasons the panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002UG-14

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Statistics Track at Centenary College of Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Deborah Shepherd

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)  
C.2 2 (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 6.5 (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 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 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

81.5
------

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$42,344</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$27,474</u>

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

This well-written proposal's goals and work plan are clearly described, but two important pieces of information are not provided: the number of students who usually take the actuarial exam and the number projected to take the proposed course. Resources will be used efficiently by converting a conference room into a computer classroom. The panel agrees that arranging for the short course taught by BPP Professional Education and Training Company will help students gain appropriate expertise. Inviting guest speakers (actuaries and statisticians) exposes many students to professionals in the current industry. It appears that none of the principal investigators have experience with the actuarial exam except the PI. Because the RFP states that BoRSF funds may not be requested for support of faculty and support staff without compelling reasons and except under unusual circumstances, the panel disallows \$11,600 for personnel. Despite some weaknesses, the panel believes that the proposed course and activities will indeed enhance the program. The panel recommends partial funding of \$27,474, excluding personnel support and with other reductions at the PI's discretion. The pledged institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003UG-14

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Instruction and Research Synergy [IRS] in Chemistry  
through Molecular Modeling and Visualization

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lovell Agwaramgbo

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 14 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

63
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$33,031  
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 for the enhancement of instruction and research at Dillard University through molecular modeling and visualization. In particular, 10 computers and computational/visualization software are requested. However, while the proposed project has some merit, it is not as compelling as other proposals. The impact on faculty development is not clearly described. There is no clear discussion of any real collaborative efforts with industry or how these kinds of relationships could be developed. The panel does not recommend funding.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004UG-14

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Business Instruction: Business Experiential  
Learning Labs [Project BELL]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alicia Cooper

## 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 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 19 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

87
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$69,290</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$69,290</u>

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

This is a straightforward request for funding needed equipment submitted by three Dillard Co-PIs. At Dillard University sixty percent of the student body is African-American, and the vast majority are Louisiana residents. These students would benefit greatly if they learned using updated hardware and software. Moreover, updating the equipment with the addition of 45 desktop computers for two classrooms and software for creating simulation marketing and business plans would enhance Dillard's AACSB standing and that of Project BELL (Business Experiential Learning Lab). It would also more closely align the university with other public-private institutions. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005UG-14

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Undergraduate Actuarial Sciences, Phase V  
[UAS-V]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hong Dai

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 10 points)  
B.2 12 (of 20 points)  
B.3 7 (of 8 points)  
B.4 7 (of 8 points)  
B.5 5 (of 8 points)  
B.6 4 (of 8 points)  
B.7 3 (of 4 points)

## E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

F. Total Score: 

68
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$76,000  
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$0

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

The proposal describes in excessive detail each of the previous four phases of this ongoing project and the students involved. The proposal in general contains an extensive amount of grammatical and spelling errors. The work plan is not clearly written -- it is jumbled and confusing. The timeline of activities should have been presented sequentially, not by objective. Additionally, the objectives of the project seem overly ambitious and not likely to be achievable in one year. However, the completion of the first four phases is admirable and the qualifications of the investigators are impressive. The panel does not recommend funding for Phase V.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 006UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Dillard University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancement of PreMathematics Institute [EPMI-II]

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Peter Frempong-Mireku

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u>          </u>
A.2		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1	<u>7</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>18</u>	(of 20 points)
B.3	<u>6</u>	(of 8 points)
B.4	<u>6</u>	(of 8 points)
B.5	<u>6</u>	(of 8 points)
B.6	<u>6</u>	(of 8 points)
B.7	<u>3</u>	(of 4 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No           

**F. Total Score:** 82 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$75,000</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$47,000</u>

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

The applicant presents a good idea for implementing a summer program to better prepare incoming freshmen to become more successful in math and, perhaps, to increase the number of mathematics majors. The rationale provides data documenting the need for the program nationally, but no statistics are provided for Louisiana or for Dillard. The panel questions if there will be enough time to recruit students for the summer 2014 program. The proposal states that recruitment will begin in April with the program to be held in late June, but how is it possible to recruit students when the PIs will not receive funding until possibly July 2014? Other questions remain: Are all students expected to take College Algebra, Trig, and Foundations of Mathematics during the summer institute? Will all students be expected to be at the same level when they enter the program? The evaluation section is not very well developed. It needs to be elaborated upon with more detail, measureable activities, and benchmarks. A 2.0 GPA is not high enough for this type of intensive summer program for potential math majors. Despite these concerns, the project meets a real need and addresses a real problem at Dillard. However, paying student scholarships with BoR funds is disallowed and the \$1,000 for faculty travel to conferences is disallowed. There is not enough detail regarding what the faculty stipends are for, so that amount is also disallowed. The panel recommends partial funding of \$47,000 without monies for scholarships, faculty travel or salaries.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007UG-14

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Academic Support and Retention for First-Year Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nia Haydel

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 0 (of 12 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 10 (of 20 points)  
B.3 4 (of 8 points)  
B.4 4 (of 8 points)  
B.5 4 (of 8 points)  
B.6 3 (of 8 points)  
B.6 1 (of 4 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 2 (For NS/NE)

## E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No                     

F. Total Score: 42 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$70,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The applicant specifies several activities requiring summer funding for faculty and staff involved with the Center for First Year Experience and more funding for the supplemental instruction (SI) program. It is unclear what the funds would be used for. The beginning sections imply that the funds will support summer planning and/or SI. In the goals and objectives section, service learning is added but there is no rationale for it. The goals section introduces a redesigned new student orientation. It would be helpful if the case for these additional aspects was developed in the rationale. The panel is curious why objective 1 only seeks to decrease withdrawals and failures by 10% when the impact section states that these measures were previously decreased by 30%. How many courses will implement SI and how many students and SI leaders are in each course? If there is no institutional support for SI, why would the faculty train additional SI leaders in June 2015? What will happen to these initiatives in 2015 when the funding runs out? The only initiative that is self-sustaining is the service-learning component. There is no real explanation of the impact of revising the orientation program. The work plan lacks assignment of individuals responsible for activities. While this project has laudable goals and it seems that SI would benefit Dillard students greatly, this project is not sustainable since there is no institutional commitment to continuing either the supplemental instruction or the summer salaries for orientation/summer student support. Given the limited lasting impact, the panel does not recommend the project for funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008UG-14

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhance Instruction, Learning and Research with the Bank-Scope  
Business Research [BBRD]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mohammed Hussain

## 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. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)  
C.2 0 (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 9 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 2 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 5 points)  
B.6 2 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

65
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$45,381  
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.)

Joint faculty and student research teams seek eminence through the creation and presentation at conferences of "scholarly" research papers. The topics to be researched were not provided; they will be chosen later. The PIs could find the requested software through useful online resources, through ancillaries from textbook publishers, and by connecting with other college and university libraries to enable outcomes without the requested database management system. The review panel does not recommend funding this project. Projects that have little foreseeable long-term potential to enhance the department or unit, which is the primary goal of the program, are not as compelling as projects that will enhance a department or unit for several years.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009UG-14

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing International Education, Entrepreneurship, and Economic Development

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Richard Igwike

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 10 (of 20 points)  
B.3 5 (of 8 points)  
B.4 5 (of 8 points)  
B.5 6 (of 8 points)  
B.6 6 (of 8 points)  
B.7 2 (of 4 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

F. Total Score: 

64
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$55,699</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal requests \$55,699 to sponsor approximately ten students (ninety percent of whom would need travel funding) in a structured, two-week-long, study-abroad program in Ghana during spring break and/or the first two weeks in June. The goals include exporting products made in Louisiana to West Africa and importing West African products into Louisiana and the U.S. The travel complements the Global Business course for first-generation college students. Previous trips indicate that students such as these cannot afford the travel. Although the project goals are admirable, the RFP states that BoRSF funds may not be requested for faculty or support staff without compelling reasons and in unusual circumstances. The review panel does not recommend funding. Projects such as this, focused on a single cohort of students and without concrete plans to sustain activities beyond grant funding, have little long-term potential to enhance the department or unit, which is the primary goal of the program.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 010UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Dillard University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Developing Global Trade Skills through Problem-based Learning [PBL]

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Michael Taku

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 13 (of 20 points)  
B.3 4 (of 8 points)  
B.4 5 (of 8 points)  
B.5 4 (of 8 points)  
B.6 4 (of 8 points)  
B.7 2 (of 4 points)

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**F. Total Score:** 63 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$62,250</u>	<u>\$37,200</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

In an effort to change lecture-based global trade education, PIs seek problem-based learning software to enable students to enhance their oral and written work through the use of narrative tools. By purchasing subscriptions to databases and market analysis tools, the PIs believe that there would be increased inquiry and skills-based learning with cooperative activities. Part of the funds requested (\$30,000) is for faculty summer salaries to revise syllabi, including learning outcomes, and to create projects to align them with national and trade statistics. The RFP states that BoRSF funds may not be requested for faculty or support staff without compelling reasons and except in unusual circumstances. This proposal does not seem to reflect a high priority of the institution. The need for the project is questionable since many useful online resources and ancillaries from textbook publishers are freely available. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Chemistry Curriculum Enhancement Through the Addition of a New  
Computer Applications Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Elliott

## 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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)

E.2a 7 (For S/E)

or (of 10 points)

E.2b                      (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)

B.2 17 (of 21 points)

B.3 4 (of 5 points)

B.4 4 (of 5 points)

B.5 4 (of 5 points)

B.6 4 (of 5 points)

B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

80
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$71,953</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$71,293</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 Louisiana College applicant requests funds to enhance the chemistry curricula through the acquisition of a computer applications classroom. The case for the need of such equipment and the positive impact that the funds would have on the educational quality of the College is clearly made and very convincing. The equipment will most definitely impact a large number of courses. The panel recommends almost full funding of \$71,293 with reductions to be made at the PI's discretion.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Business Curriculum Enhancement through the Addition of a New  
Computer Applications Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Adena LeJeune

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. 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 4 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

75
----

 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$64,247</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$34,000</u>

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

This proposal is a request for funding for a new computer classroom and a Smart classroom for an ACBSP institution that currently has 97 business majors. They all share a five-seat, antiquated computer lab with history and political science students. The 15 workstations requested seem reasonable for use in four accounting courses and a small business management course. However, the request for summer funding to outfit the lab is not recommended since the RFP clearly discourages funding stipends for faculty and support staff. The panel recommends partial funding of \$34,000. After disallowance of summer support, the PIs should have discretion to identify further budget reductions. The panel suggests reducing funds for either the computer applications classroom or the Smart classroom.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University at Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Organic Chemistry Laboratory Improvements: Increasing Efficiency  
and Updating Equipment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Anne Chevalier

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_ No X

G. Total Score: 

65
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$18,924  
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 for updating chemistry equipment at LSUA. Although the panel sees the need for such an update, the explanation regarding how the equipment requested will impact the quality and preparation of students as well as the overall work plan of the proposal were not well described. The proposal also does not make very clear how the acquisition of the gas chromatographs would impact local industry. The review panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University at Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Students' Mathematical Success Through Tutoring and Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tanya Lueder

## 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 0 (of 2 points)  
E.2a \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
E.2b 8.5 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 19 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 78.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$52,900  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$49,300

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

The proposal includes a compelling rationale for updating LSUA's computer lab and for providing better tutoring for the students. The need for the desktops and worktables is addressed, but the rationale for purchasing 24 additional chairs costing \$3,600 is unclear. The proposal's evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence section should have been expanded and elaborated. The effect of faculty development and the evaluation sections are likewise inadequate. Both sections should have been more clearly elaborated upon and replete with specific details. There was no narrative for the relationship with industrial sponsors section, thus no points could be given there. Despite these shortcomings and given the clear need for this enhancement, the panel recommends funding of \$49,300 (eliminating \$3,600 for the additional chairs), with full maintenance of the institutional match.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University at Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advancement of Chemistry Labs at LSUA

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katie Whitaker

## 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 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 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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:	<u>\$40,785</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$40,785</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.)

Funding is requested for the acquisition of a much-needed DSC and a DI unit at LSUA. The panel found that the argument for such a purchase was clearly made. The project will likely have a major impact on the quality of students. Thus the panel recommends funding at the requested amount of \$40,785.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University in Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Applied Mathematics and Statistics Enhancement for  
Bioinformatics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Urska Cvek

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 10 points)  
B.2 10 (of 20 points)  
B.3 4 (of 8 points)  
B.4 6 (of 8 points)  
B.5 6 (of 8 points)  
B.6 6 (of 8 points)  
B.7 3 (of 4 points)

## E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No           

F. Total Score: 

69
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$47,583</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal is well written despite the fact that the rationale did not include specifics about the purpose of or need for the project. The goals section was too lengthy and the work plan not fully developed. Much of the goals section should have been included in the work plan. The rationale for the PI's summer salary was inadequate. Additionally, the RFP states that BoRSF funds may not be requested for faculty or support staff without compelling reasons and except in unusual circumstances. While the proposed project has some merit it is not as compelling as other proposals, and the panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University in Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSUS Business WiFi Upgrade

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Karen James

## 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 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 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 16 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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:	<u>\$125,164</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$60,000</u>

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

This proposal from LSUS requests funding to replace antiquated hardware and outdated wireless access with new laptops and upgraded wireless access to enable faculty to create a "flipped classroom" in the Business Education building. Pedagogically sound and recommended for the current generation of college-age students, this strategy enables students to use in-class time for critical-thinking exercises, application activities, simulations and other activities to improve student outcomes. The PI plans to train faculty on flipped-training methodology. The existing wireless network cannot accommodate student use for proper education of this type. New equipment will enable access to the Internet with smartphones and tablets, and use of YouTube and Moodle, as well as textbook publishers' coursemates. Due to the limited amount of funds, the panel recommends partial funding of \$60,000, giving discretion to the PI to determine how best to make reductions. The institutional match should be fully maintained for the equipment, software, and supplies categories (A, B, and C).

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University in Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Centrifugation Technology in Biochemistry  
Laboratories

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elahe Mahdavian

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. 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 4 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 12 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

61
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY      Requested Amount: \$52,485  
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 applicants request funds to purchase a high-speed refrigerated centrifuge for LSUS's biochemistry laboratories. The instrumentation would be used in a number of biochemistry and cell biology laboratories and courses. The PI describes the centrifuge as state of the art in terms of its capabilities. Although the arguments are good, the impact of the instrumentation on students would be limited in comparison to a much larger campus, making the proposal somewhat less compelling (page 7 of the proposal states that 75 students per year will benefit from funding this proposal). The proposal requests a fairly substantial amount of funding for one piece of top-of-the-line equipment. The panel does not recommend funding the project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019UG-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University in Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Electrochemical Laboratory Courses at LSUS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Yu

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 19 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 5 (of 5 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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:	<u>\$58,335</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$58,335</u>

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

This is a compelling proposal to enhance the electrochemistry laboratories and courses at LSUS. The proposal is very clearly written and the need for such equipment is well explained. The acquisition of the electrochemistry set-up will very positively impact many LSUS students who are exposed to courses in chemistry, biology, and biochemistry. Thus the panel recommends full funding of this well-described project.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020UG-14

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Flash Chromatography: Expanded Learning Experiences in Undergraduate Chemistry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kurt Birdwhistell

## 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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 14 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

68
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$38,432  
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.)

Two Loyola University faculty members request funds to purchase a new flash chromatography system. Although the need for such an instrument exists, the section outlining how the instrument will impact a large number of students and faculty is not clear. The applicant made a good case for the two faculty members who will be the prime beneficiaries of the instrument, but more information on broader impacts would have been helpful. The evaluation plan and the impact on local industry sections are not well described. The panel does not recommend funding the project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021UG-14

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Introducing Modern Research Topics to Introductory Physics  
Courses through Course Modules, Demonstrations, and Laboratory  
Experiments

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Armin Kargol

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

81
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$53,784</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$30,000</u>

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

The goals of this proposal are: 1) to develop course modules to integrate cutting-edge research into many introductory courses (including team-teaching approaches using local faculty expertise); 2) to develop a new Introduction to Science and Engineering course, which is designed to attract/retain more students to STEM fields; and 3) to update/restructure existing laboratory sections for major and non-major Physics courses. While the first two goals are meritorious, the equipment requested for both components (primarily lecture demonstration equipment) the panel does not consider to be high priority since many useful online resources are available for illustrating physical processes, all of which are free. Examples are materials at MERLOT (<http://physics.merlot.org/>). Several Physics Education Research studies suggest that lecture demonstrations are among the least effective pedagogical tools and often can confuse students more than enlighten them. The panel encourages faculty to include relevant modern science research topics at the appropriate level. The third goal is well thought out, will have an impact on a large number of students, and likely have a lasting impact on almost every introductory course (for majors and non-majors). Funding of \$30,000 for 24 computers and related ancillary hardware components—items 20 through 24—is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022UG-14

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Assisted Reading Interventions [TARI]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Vavasour

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 20 points)  
B.3 6 (of 8 points)  
B.4 5 (of 8 points)  
B.5 8 (of 8 points)  
B.6 5 (of 8 points)  
B.7 3 (of 4 points)

## 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: 

90
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$87,179</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$43,600</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.)

Several College of Education faculty seek to expand the number of iPads for sophomores and juniors in the elementary education programs. The PI makes a good case for incorporating iPads into the reading course, but it is unclear what the other teacher preparation programs will do with the second set of iPads. Also unclear is whether the reading course is required for all students, which also raises questions as to how many students will have access to and use the requested technology. The proposal's objectives and performance measures do not align with the goals. Goal 2 focuses on improving reading performance of K-5 students, but the objectives under this goal focus on pre-service teachers' skills. Since the performance measures for goal 2 align with the objectives that are not aligned, the performance measures assess the objectives but not the goal. The pre- and post-QRI5 is the measure of goal 2 but is listed as a culminating project. Have the juniors and seniors in Reading 402 taken the sophomore technology course? If so, what will pairing sophomore technology students with reading students add to the project? It appears that the technology students have a very limited role in this project. The work plan (p. 7) states that the PIs will select the apps, but on p. 4 it states that Reading 402 students will do so. What roles will Drs. Stall, Jones, and Odyne have since they are not included in the work plan? Given the lack of rationale for the second set of iPads, partial funding of \$43,600 is recommended for purchase of one-half of the iPads. The pledged match may be reduced to \$4,500.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023UG-14

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Online and Distance Learning Environments Using  
Interactive Technologies: Addressing the Demands and Mandates for  
Web-Based and Computer-Mediated Course Delivery

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rene Viosca

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 16 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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:	<u>\$235,162</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$100,000</u>

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

Several College of Business Administration faculty seek funds to develop an online Bachelor of Science in Business Administration degree program, and Traditional MBA and Executive MBA hybrid (online and in-class) programs. Funds are also sought to enhance a current minor in Business Administration that is taught online "to contribute to economic development and increase the reputation and recognition for the institution." With lecture-capture software, students would have greater learning flexibility. Funding would also provide for creation of a recording studio in which to use Adobe's Captiva and would equip several classrooms with video recording technology. Due to the limitations on the Enhancement funds during this funding cycle, the panel recommends partial funding of \$100,000 for the ambitious project and the PI should have discretion as to how best to make budget reductions. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024UG-14

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Chemistry Curriculum through the Acquisition  
of a Gas Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometer

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Darcey Wayment

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

A.2 5 (of 5 points)

A.3 5 (of 5 points)

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)

C.2 1 (of 1 point)

C.3 3 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)

E.2a 8 (For S/E)

or (of 10 points)

E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)

B.2 18 (of 21 points)

B.3 5 (of 5 points)

B.4 5 (of 5 points)

B.5 5 (of 5 points)

B.6 5 (of 5 points)

B.7 5 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

93
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$93,000</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$93,000</u>

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

This proposal requests funding to purchase a GC-MS for the separation/identification of various organic compounds at Nicholls State University. The work plan as well as plans to integrate the instrument into a many biology and chemistry department courses and research activities are very well described. Additionally, the instrument will impact a very large number of chemistry and biology faculty's teaching and research activities and will have a significant positive impact on the quality of undergraduate and graduate students' education (407 students are expected to use the GC/MA per year). Despite the relatively large cost of this request, the proposal has strong merit and the panel recommends full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025UG-14

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Eyes on Astronomy at Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kaisa Young

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 2 (of 5 points)  
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_ No X

G. Total Score: 

71
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$22,000</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$17,500</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 requests funding to purchase two telescopes to be used in a large, introductory-level (general education type) astronomy course, but which could also be used for outreach events at other times. The impact of the instrument seems rather large, covering several hundred students each year and perhaps an even larger number of members of the public at "public science" events. Due to the limited amount of funds this year, the panel recommends partial funding of \$17,500 for purchase of the Stellarvue Refractor Telescope and corresponding Celestron Equatorial Mount. The institutional match for support of the telescope purchase (\$1,100, or roughly half of the pledged \$2,200) should be maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 026UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Northwestern State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Music Education Speaker Series

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Sharon Joy

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u>          </u>
A.2		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>4</u>	(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	<u>2</u>	(of 2 points)
D.2a	<u>          </u>	(For S/E)
or	<u>          </u>	(of 10 points)
D.2b	<u>6</u>	(For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1	<u>6</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>9</u>	(of 20 points)
B.3	<u>4</u>	(of 8 points)
B.4	<u>4</u>	(of 8 points)
B.5	<u>3</u>	(of 8 points)
B.6	<u>4</u>	(of 8 points)
B.7	<u>1</u>	(of 4 points)

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes            No X

**F. Total Score:** 57 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$12,000</u>	<u>\$12,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to bring distinguished music education speakers to the University for a speaker series. The proposal has more goals than objectives (usually it is the other way around). There should be objectives for each goal; e.g., one can measure the impact of the speaker series on retention of faculty and students. One can also measure what percentage of students and faculty participate in the series. If the goal is to include non-music education students as stated in the rationale, how many and in what capacity will they participate? The evaluation plan is also sparse. Head counts and critical reviews only measure limited aspects of the program. Other evidence such as syllabi and class assignments from instructors utilizing the speaker series would provide insight into how the resource was used. Even feedback from the speakers themselves about what they observed on campus would provide a different evaluative lens. While its goals are laudable, this program would have almost no long-term impact. It could have some impact if the speakers were recorded and if the recordings were integrated into course activities. Students could produce some of these materials as course assignments (e.g., How would you apply what you learned from Speaker 1?). As it stands, there is no benefit to the University or to Louisiana after the grant period ends. The proposal is not recommended for funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 027UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Northwestern State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** School of Business Distinguished Speakers' Series

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Margaret Kilcoyne

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

**D. Economic and/or Cultural**

**Development and Impact**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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 66 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
 B.2 12 (of 20 points)  
 B.3 4 (of 8 points)  
 B.4 4 (of 8 points)  
 B.5 5 (of 8 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 8 points)  
 B.7 3 (of 4 points)

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**F. Total Score:** 63 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

Two Northwestern faculty members request \$80,000 over two years to fund a Distinguished Global Business Speakers Series in order to provide links among business, industry and academia. The proposed speakers would help the Business School maintain AACSB accreditation since its course offerings and curricula would be current and relevant, and aligned with the needs of business and industry. Though the goals are lofty, the proposed evaluation plan is poor. A "satisfaction" survey by students and faculty following the speakers' presentations is not of much merit in the long term. There is no mention of the institution or local businesses funding the series in future years and no institutional match for this project. All funds requested will support eight speakers' honoraria and travel expenses. Since the panel does consider this project to have limited long-term benefit and since it is less compelling than other proposals, no funding is recommended.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 028UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Northwestern State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** PREP-Program Redesign of Educator Preparation

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Kimberley McAlister

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u>        </u>
A.2		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 6 (of 12 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1	<u>6</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>10</u>	(of 20 points)
B.3	<u>6</u>	(of 8 points)
B.4	<u>7</u>	(of 8 points)
B.5	<u>8</u>	(of 8 points)
B.6	<u>3</u>	(of 8 points)
B.7	<u>2</u>	(of 4 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes          No X

**F. Total Score:** 67 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:**

<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$23,850</u>
<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

The goal of this proposal is to transform NSU's current alternative certification program to an online format that addresses national standards and targets local school needs. The proposed changes to five education courses address other needs as well, particularly the delivery of instruction to students who work full time teaching or in another vocation. The rationale, however, is unclear whether the changes to the instructional modules would be substantive. A survey of current alternative certification students as to how many would prefer more online offerings would have strengthened the rationale. The evaluation plan is lacking in detail as well. Are there external criteria by which the team will evaluate the success of the redesign? Will an advisory panel of external experts evaluate the program? The only external evaluation is from local school personnel through an online survey. Almost twenty percent of the budget is allocated for faculty development. Interestingly, this initiative is not included in the work plan and the budget does not specify how training will be targeted other than vague references to faculty attendance at technology conferences. Given the significant amount of travel funds, the outcomes of attending the conferences should have been included in the objectives and work plan. The panel's main concern, however, is that none of the team has appropriate expertise in instructional technologies and online learning. Since the bulk of course redesign will take place before funding, how will the team compensate for the lack of relevant expertise? The panel wonders why no faculty members with expertise in instructional technology are included when there are four faculty listed in the EDLT with such expertise. If, as stated, most of the project's work plan will be completed before the contract begins, why is funding needed? No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029UG-14

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Physics Labs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Chris McMullen

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

72
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$42,898</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$32,000</u>

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

This proposal requests funding for equipment purchases to revamp Northwestern's introductory-level mechanics laboratory to incorporate "physics at the amusement park"-type concepts in a tangible way. This is an interesting theme-based approach to connecting several pedagogically challenging concepts in introductory mechanics in a way that might be accessible to students. However, while the proposed project has some merit, it is not as compelling as other proposals. Nevertheless, the panel recommends partial funding of \$32,000 with reductions to the budget made at the PI's discretion.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030UG-14

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: School of Business Lecture Capture System Enhancement Grant

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Begona Perez-Mira

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. 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 10 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 17 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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:	<u>\$61,608</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$30,000</u>

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

The stated purpose of this proposal is to enable faculty currently teaching different sections of the same course, both face-to-face and online, to use "lecture capture" technology in a Smart classroom to record lectures. Since two Smart classrooms with lecture-capture software currently exist, partial funding would enable some updates and facilitate the ability of students to revisit classroom lectures for clarification and edification. Due to the severe limitations on Enhancement Program funds available during this cycle, partial funding of \$30,000 is recommended. The PI has discretion to reduce the budget.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031UG-14

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mobile Applications Development Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jack Russell

## 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 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 10 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)  
B.2 19 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 5 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

94
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$16,673</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$16,673</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 modest request to equip and update a mobile applications hands-on development lab with 15 Mac laptops, one MacBook Pro and Apple TV. The addition of state-of-the-art equipment would enable students in the CIS program to share a lab with the College of Business students and thus greatly improve student outcomes for all students. Funding would also enable the faculty and students to create and use the first mobile applications development curriculum at the undergraduate level. Full funding of \$16,673 is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032UG-14

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Data and Communications Networking Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Thompson

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)  
B.2 19 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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:	<u>\$14,561</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$14,561</u>

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

This is a modest, reasonable proposal to equip a data and communications networking lab to develop real-world, hands-on experiences in networking and design through computer simulation, telecommunications and network courses. Although a computer lab environment exists, it lacks computing resources and equipment to develop hands-on lab experiences. This project will help to establish a "lock and key" lab with five lab assistants and tutors. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033UG-14

INSTITUTION: Our Lady of the Lake College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Chemistry Educational Experience for  
Undergraduates at Our Lady of the Lake College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zorabel LeJeune

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

73
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$89,750  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$44,250

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 for the acquisition and class implementation of several pieces of equipment are requested. The applicant cites the need for the equipment in terms of incorporation in the core chemistry curriculum but also to help with faculty-led student research. The overall impact on the educational mission of the college is not as clearly presented as it might have been, but a reasonable timeline is provided. The panel notes that there is a substantial institutional match, which seems to be in the form of "repurposed" classroom or lab space. It is unclear how the value of that institutional match was calculated -- what is clear is that the match is a strong commitment to appropriately house new equipment. That match, of course, must be fully maintained. The panel recommends partial funding of \$44,250, given budgetary constraints, for the following: the Atomic Absorption Spectrometer (\$26,000), the Vernier Lab quest 2 and accessories (\$16,050), the ultrasonic Bath (\$1,200) and Supplies (\$1,000).

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034UG-14

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Fundamental Equipment: UV, IR and Fluorescence Spectrometers to Enhance Undergraduate Education and Research at Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jean Fotie

## 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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 16 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

74
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$65,673</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$31,636</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 from an SLU investigator requests funds for purchasing several pieces of spectroscopy equipment to be used in chemistry courses and laboratories. The need for new equipment in the context of accreditation is cited, as is the impact on a large number of students (more than 200 per year). The institution seems to have an excellent record of student research leading to demonstrable outcomes (posters, talks, student presentations, etc.) and the equipment cited seems to be useful in a number of different core chemistry courses in the curricula. The application has a substantial institutional match (including training), which is a very positive aspect and should be maintained. Due to budgetary constraints, however, the panel recommends partial funding of \$31,636 for the following components: the FT-IR, one PC station, one printer, and one flat screen.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035UG-14

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Modernizing Undergraduate Electricity, Magnetism, and Optics  
Laboratories

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Parkinson

## 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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)

E.2a 8 (For S/E)

or (of 10 points)

E.2b                      (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)

B.2 20 (of 21 points)

B.3 4 (of 5 points)

B.4 4 (of 5 points)

B.5 4 (of 5 points)

B.6 4 (of 5 points)

B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## 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: 

89
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$32,676</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$32,676</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 requests equipment and software funds to upgrade the laboratory component of six courses, perhaps most important the two introductory-level electricity and magnetism (calculus-based and algebra/trig-based) classes, as well as one specialized acoustics course and three more advanced courses for majors. The proposal is relatively modest, has a very substantial institutional match, and will likely have a positive impact on many students. Full funding of \$32,676 is recommended.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 036UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University at New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Programming Training to Assist SUNO Students to Achieve Greater Success

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Zheng Chen

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
 B.2 19 (of 20 points)  
 B.3 7 (of 8 points)  
 B.4 7 (of 8 points)  
 B.5 7 (of 8 points)  
 B.6 7 (of 8 points)  
 B.7 3 (of 4 points)

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**F. Total Score:** 88 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$6,066</u>	<u>\$20,254</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$6,066</u>	<u>\$0</u>

This proposal is generally well written and the rationale and need for the project are clearly defined. However, the purpose for teaching students the specific software programs chosen by the PI should have been more clearly explained. Will the students use the software programs in certain classes and/or on certain projects? Do all faculty involved in the project have adequate knowledge of the programs to ensure that they will use the software in their classes for the benefit of students? The applicant mentions several different software programs, but probably the faculty should focus on a smaller number of programs to ensure better understanding and utilization. Will only the PI be able to adequately teach all software programs to all students and faculty? Other PIs or faculty should be involved to make project objectives more feasible. Additionally, the majority of the requested funds are for faculty summer salary and mentorships. The RFP clearly states that BoRSF funds may not be requested for faculty or support staff without compelling reasons and except in unusual circumstances. Nevertheless, the proposal has some merit. The panel suggests that the PIs request class release time for project management in lieu of summer salary. Therefore, only the request for software and supplies is recommended for funding (\$6,066) and the requested amount for summer salaries should be eliminated. The institutional match for equipment and supplies should be maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037UG-14

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Faculty Pedagogy, Students & Curricula Enhancements through  
Youth Entrepreneurship

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Adrine Harrell-Carter

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 17 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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:	<u>\$117,174</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$50,000</u>

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

The SUNO College of Business Administration seeks funds for a youth entrepreneurship and outreach small-business incubator. With that funding SUNO would establish a high school entrepreneurship institute for approximately 36 students, through three terms -- fall, spring and summer -- with six business owners speaking at each session. Partial funding of \$50,000 is recommended for refurbishing of the music studio and for the video editing portion of the project, but funds for student tuition are disallowed in accordance with the guidelines in the RFP.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 038UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University at New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Two Year College of Business [CoB] Enhancement Through  
Student-Supported Research-Based Business Development and  
Short- and Long-Term Economic Development

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Louis Mancuso

**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. 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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 13 (of 20 points)  
B.3 5 (of 8 points)  
B.4 4 (of 8 points)  
B.5 4 (of 8 points)  
B.6 3 (of 8 points)  
B.7 3 (of 4 points)

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**F. Total Score:** 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$36,000</u>	<u>\$36,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

Although this proposal presents a worthy endeavor -- to run an Early-Start Program to mentor high school students and connect the students to employment through research -- it is not as compelling as several other meritorious proposals submitted. Because of limited impact and questions of sustainability, the review panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 039UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University at New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancing Physics Curriculum Through Undergraduate Research  
in Electromagnetism

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Joe Omojola

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 14 (of 20 points)  
B.3 5 (of 8 points)  
B.4 5 (of 8 points)  
B.5 5 (of 8 points)  
B.6 5 (of 8 points)  
B.7 2 (of 4 points)

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**F. Total Score:** 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$32,400</u>	<u>\$25,400</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This is a request for funding "to provide opportunities for students in the area of magnetism using electromagnets to transport objects in space" by designing, building, and presumably experimenting with novel magnetic levitation mechanisms. The proposal seems directed at an incredibly narrow audience given that just a handful of students and faculty might be involved. Additionally, the proposed project seems to promise some immediate impact in that those who are involved might well benefit from the experience, but the long-term outcome for the institution is not at all clear to the panel. While this proposal contains some interesting ideas for engaging more advanced undergraduate Physics majors in engineering-type applications, it is not as compelling as other proposals. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 040UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University at New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Build Virtual Mathematics Teaching Classrooms in Cyber Space for  
Enhancing SUNO Students' Mathematics Learning Quality

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Delin Tan

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)  
C.2 0.5 (of 1 point)  
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 14 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

**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:** 68.5 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested</b>		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Amount:</b>	<u>\$106,669</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	<b>Recommended</b>		
	<b>Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

The project's goal -- to create teaching video chips for students who miss class or need additional instruction -- is admirable. It is ambitious to build a database of 800 teaching video chips for five different math courses in such a short time. Although the proposal states that the video chips will be completed in the summer, that still is not enough time. The proposal indicates that an activity for next spring is to "completely design video chip content and quizzes for all 5 courses." It is not feasible or practical to complete this activity while also teaching. Why build a computer lab for students just to view the video chips? Couldn't they view the chips in the existing computer labs? Several websites address the concepts, such as the Khan Academy learning modules (<http://www.khanacademy.org>) that cover almost all aspects of math, from the lowest level concepts to calculus. The promotion of economic development and cultural resources, and evaluation sections are weak. Evaluation should include specifics and benchmarks with measurable objectives. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041UG-14

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Create a New Curriculum for Math 450 in the Field of Fingerprint Analysis with MATLAB

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Delin Tan

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 17 (of 20 points)  
B.3 8 (of 8 points)  
B.4 7 (of 8 points)  
B.5 6 (of 8 points)  
B.6 7 (of 8 points)  
B.7 3 (of 4 points)

## E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

F. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$23,561</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$23,561</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The premise of the proposal to develop a curriculum in the field of fingerprint analysis with MATLAB is a good idea. However, it does not seem necessary that this topic take up an entire course that is required for all mathematics majors. It could be a topic in the MATH 450 Special Topics course. If the students are to submit their fingerprints, there definitely needs to be a confidentiality agreement form completed and approved by the Institutional Review Board. There is no mention of this in the proposal. Additionally, it is not clear whether any of the faculty have experience analyzing fingerprints using MATLAB. The evaluation plan was somewhat vague. It needed more specifics, benchmarks, and measureable objectives. The panel nevertheless recommends full funding of \$23,561 in year 1. The panel has one stipulation: **SUNO's IRB must sign the agreement mentioned above and this official document must be presented to the BoR at the time of contract negotiations.** The institutional match for equipment and supplies should be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 042UG-14

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University at New Orleans

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Acquiring and Implementing the System Application Product [SAP]  
Course to Enhance Student Learning and Faculty Development at  
Southern University at New Orleans [SUNO]

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** YanJun Yu

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 10 (of 20 points)  
B.3 4 (of 8 points)  
B.4 4 (of 8 points)  
B.5 4 (of 8 points)  
B.6 3 (of 8 points)  
B.7 3 (of 4 points)

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**F. Total Score:** 63 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$39,150</u>	<u>\$27,750</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

Three PIs and Co-PIs seek summer funding to travel to conferences; additionally, they are requesting funds to purchase Ultrabooks and software for teaching the German SAP certification course. The RFP states that BoRSF funds may not be requested for faculty or support staff without compelling reasons and except in unusual circumstances. That is not the case in this proposal. Since the panel believes that the proposed project will have little long-term impact to the department or campus, it does not recommend funding.

# **Appendix A**

## **Summary List of Proposals**



**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Undergraduate Enhancement  
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Discipline	Duration	Equipment /Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
								Year 1	Year 2	Total
001UG-14	Dr. David Brownholland	Centenary College	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Introduction of Microwave Assisted Organic Reactions to the Organic Chemistry Curriculum	\$29,903.00	\$0.00	\$29,903.00
002UG-14	Dr. Deborah Shepherd	Centenary College	Mathematics	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of the Statistics Track at Centenary College of Louisiana	\$42,344.00	\$0.00	\$42,344.00
003UG-14	Dr. Lovell Agwaramgbo	Dillard University	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Instruction and Research Synergy [IRS] in Chemistry through Molecular Modeling and Visualization	\$33,031.00	\$0.00	\$33,031.00
004UG-14	Dr. Alicia Cooper	Dillard University	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Business Instruction: Business Experiential Learning Labs [Project BELL]	\$69,290.00	\$0.00	\$69,290.00
005UG-14	Dr. Hong Dai	Dillard University	Mathematics	1 Year	NE	Continuation	ENHANCEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE ACTUARIAL SCIENCES, PHASE-V [UAS-V]	\$76,000.00	\$0.00	\$76,000.00
006UG-14	Dr. Peter Frempong-Mireku	Dillard University	Mathematics	1 Year	NE	New Request	Enhancement of PreMathematics Institute [EPMI-II]	\$75,000.00	\$0.00	\$75,000.00
007UG-14	Dr. Nia Haydel	Dillard University	Education	1 Year	NE	New Request	Increasing Academic Support and Retention for First-Year Students	\$70,000.00	\$0.00	\$70,000.00
008UG-14	Dr. Mohammed Hussain	Dillard University	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhance Instruction, Learning and Research with the Bank-Scope Business Research [BBRD]	\$45,381.00	\$0.00	\$45,381.00
009UG-14	Dr. Richard Igwike	Dillard University	Business	1 Year	NE	New Request	Enhancing International Education, Entrepreneurship, and Economic Development	\$55,699.00	\$0.00	\$55,699.00
010UG-14	Dr. Michael Taku	Dillard University	Business	2 Years	NE	New Request	Developing Global Trade Skills through Problem-based Learning[PBL]	\$62,250.00	\$37,200.00	\$99,450.00
011UG-14	Dr. David Elliott	Louisiana College	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Chemistry Curriculum Enhancement Through the Addition of a New Computer Applications Classroom	\$71,953.00	\$0.00	\$71,953.00

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Undergraduate Enhancement  
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Discipline	Duration	Equipment /Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
								Year 1	Year 2	Total
012UG-14	Dr. Adena LeJeune	Louisiana College	Not Specified*	1 Year	E	New Request	Business curriculum enhancement through the addition of a new computer applications classroom	\$64,247.00	\$0.00	\$64,247.00
013UG-14	Ms. Anne Chevalier	Louisiana State University at Alexandria	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Organic Chemistry Laboratory Improvements: Increasing Efficiency and Updating Equipment	\$18,924.00	\$0.00	\$18,924.00
014UG-14	Mrs. Tanya Lueder	Louisiana State University at Alexandria	Mathematics	1 Year	E	New Request	Increasing Students' Mathematical Success Through Tutoring and Technology	\$52,900.00	\$0.00	\$52,900.00
015UG-14	Dr. Katie Whitaker	Louisiana State University at Alexandria	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Advancement of Chemistry Labs at LSUA	\$40,785.00	\$0.00	\$40,785.00
016UG-14	Dr. Urska Cvek	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	Mathematics	1 Year	NE	New Request	Applied mathematics and statistics enhancement for bioinformatics	\$47,583.00	\$0.00	\$47,583.00
017UG-14	Dr. Karen James	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	LSUS Business WiFi Upgrade	\$125,164.00	\$0.00	\$125,164.00
018UG-14	Prof. Elahe Mahdavian	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Centrifugation Technology in Biochemistry Laboratories	\$52,485.00	\$0.00	\$52,485.00
019UG-14	Dr. William Yu	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Electrochemical Laboratory Courses at LSUS	\$58,335.00	\$0.00	\$58,335.00
020UG-14	Prof. kurt Birdwhistell	Loyola University New Orleans	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Flash Chromatography: Expanded learning experiences in Undergraduate Chemistry	\$38,432.00	\$0.00	\$38,432.00
021UG-14	Prof. Armin Kargol	Loyola University New Orleans	Physics/Astronomy	1 Year	E	New Request	Introducing modern research topics to introductory physics courses through course modules, demonstrations, and laboratory experiments.	\$53,784.00	\$0.00	\$53,784.00
022UG-14	Dr. cynthia vavasseur	Nicholls State University	Education	1 Year	NE	New Request	Technology Assisted Reading Interventions [TARI]	\$87,179.00	\$0.00	\$87,179.00

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Undergraduate Enhancement  
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Discipline	Duration	Equipment /Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
								Year 1	Year 2	Total
023UG-14	Dr. Rene Viosca	Nicholls State University	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Online and Distance Learning Environments Using Interactive Technologies: Addressing the Demands and Mandates for Web-Based and Computer-Mediated Course Delivery	\$235,162.00	\$0.00	\$235,162.00
024UG-14	Dr. Darcey Wayment	Nicholls State University	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing the Chemistry Curriculum through the Acquisition of a Gas Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometer	\$93,000.00	\$0.00	\$93,000.00
025UG-14	Dr. Kaisa Young	Nicholls State University	Physics/Astronomy	1 Year	E	New Request	Eyes On Astronomy at Nicholls State University	\$22,000.00	\$0.00	\$22,000.00
026UG-14	Dr. Sharon Joy	Northwestern State University	Education	2 Years	NE	New Request	Music Education Speaker Series	\$12,000.00	\$12,000.00	\$24,000.00
027UG-14	Dr. Margaret Kilcoyne	Northwestern State University	Business	2 Years	NE	New Request	School of Business Distinguished Speakers' Series	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00	\$80,000.00
028UG-14	Dr. Kimberly McAlister	Northwestern State University	Education	1 Year	NE	New Request	PREP-Program Redesign of Educator Preparation	\$23,850.00	\$0.00	\$23,850.00
029UG-14	Dr. Chris McMullen	Northwestern State University	Physics/Astronomy	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Physics Labs	\$42,898.00	\$0.00	\$42,898.00
030UG-14	Dr. Begona Perez-Mira	Northwestern State University	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	School of Business Lecture Capture System Enhancement Grant	\$61,608.00	\$0.00	\$61,608.00
031UG-14	Dr. Jack Russell	Northwestern State University	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	Mobile Applications Development Laboratory	\$16,673.00	\$0.00	\$16,673.00
032UG-14	Dr. Mark Thompson	Northwestern State University	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	Data and Communications Networking Laboratory	\$14,561.00	\$0.00	\$14,561.00
033UG-14	Dr. Zorabel LeJeune	Our Lady of the Lake College	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	ENHANCEMENT OF CHEMISTRY EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE FOR UNDERGRADUATES AT OUR LADY OF THE LAKE COLLEGE	\$89,750.00	\$0.00	\$89,750.00
034UG-14	Dr. Jean Fotie	Southeastern Louisiana University	Chemistry	1 Year	E	New Request	Acquisition of Fundamental Equipment: UV, IR and Fluorescence Spectrometers to Enhance Undergraduate Education and Research at Southeastern Louisiana University	\$65,673.00	\$0.00	\$65,673.00

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Undergraduate Enhancement  
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Discipline	Duration	Equipment /Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
								Year 1	Year 2	Total
035UG-14	Dr. William Parkinson	Southeastern Louisiana University	Physics/Astronomy	1 Year	E	New Request	Modernizing Undergraduate Electricity, Magnetism, and Optics Laboratories	\$32,676.00	\$0.00	\$32,676.00
036UG-14	Dr. zheng chen	Southern University at New Orleans	Mathematics	2 Years	NE	New Request	Programming Training to Assist SUNO Students to Achieve Greater Success	\$6,066.00	\$20,254.00	\$26,320.00
037UG-14	Dr. Adrine Harrell-Carter	Southern University at New Orleans	Business	1 Year	E	New Request	Faculty Pedagogy, Students & Curricula Enhancements through Youth Entrepreneurship	\$117,174.00	\$0.00	\$117,174.00
038UG-14	Dr. Louis Mancuso	Southern University at New Orleans	Business	2 Years	NE	New Request	Two Year College of Business [CoB] Enhancement Through Student-Supported Research-Based Business Development and Short- and Long-Term Economic Development	\$36,000.00	\$36,000.00	\$72,000.00
039UG-14	Dr. Joe Omojola	Southern University at New Orleans	Physics/Astronomy	2 Years	NE	New Request	Enhancing Physics Curriculum Through Undergraduate Research in Electromagnetism	\$32,400.00	\$25,400.00	\$57,800.00
040UG-14	Dr. Delin Tan	Southern University at New Orleans	Mathematics	2 Years	E	New Request	Build virtual Mathematics teaching classrooms in cyber space for enhancing SUNO students' Mathematics learning quality	\$106,669.00	\$0.00	\$106,669.00
041UG-14	Dr. Delin Tan	Southern University at New Orleans	Mathematics	2 Years	NE	New Request	Create a new curriculum for Math 450 in the field of Fingerprint Analysis with MATLAB	\$23,561.00	\$0.00	\$23,561.00
042UG-14	Dr. Yanjun Yu	Southern University at New Orleans	Business	2 Years	NE	New Request	Acquiring and Implementing the System Application Product [SAP] Course to Enhance Student Learning and Faculty Development at Southern University at New Orleans [SUNO]	\$39,150.00	\$27,750.00	\$66,900.00

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

Total Number of Proposals submitted	42
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,381,540.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$198,604.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,580,144.00

# **Appendix B**

## **Rating Forms**

## BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2013-14

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.

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points**

- YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_      A.1      Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the 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)/unit(s) and/or curricula?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.3      To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—56 points**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      B.1      Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 21 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 and a schedule of// activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      B.3      To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/ 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/or quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      B.5      To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      B.6      To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      B.7      To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

**C. EQUIPMENT—10 points**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 6 pts.      C.1      To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan activities and the type of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department(s)/units(s)? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 1 pt.      C.2      Is there a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of the equipment?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 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?

**D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points**

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

**E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—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 college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      E.2      To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

**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?

**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 \$\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

(Form 6.11, rev 2013)

## BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2013-14

**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.

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points**

- YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.1      Has the applicant adequately described the institution and department(s)/unit(s) that will benefit from the 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)/unit(s) and/or curricula?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      A.3      To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s)/unit(s)?

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—66 points**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      B.1      Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 20 pts.      B.2      Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity and a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 8 pts.      B.3      To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/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 8 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)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 8 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 8 pts.      B.6      To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 4 pts.      B.7      To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

**C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points**

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

**D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—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, or another college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.      D.2      To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?



**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?

**F. 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 \$\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

(Form 6.12, rev 2013)