

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN THE  
SPECIAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY CATEGORY**

**March 2017**

**Prepared by:**

**Jeff Dean (Chair)**  
Professor, Biochemistry  
Mississippi State University

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS  
REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
FY 2016-17**

**Introduction**

Sixteen (16) Multidisciplinary Enhancement proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents staff for review by the panel chair, Dr. Jeff Dean, Department Head of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, Entomology, and Plant Pathology at Mississippi State University. The proposals were divided into the root disciplines eligible for this year's competition (Business, Chemistry, Education, Mathematics, and Physics & Astronomy) and distributed to four (4) subject-area reviewers.

Prior the review, Dr. Dean received the following materials: sixteen (16) proposals submitted along with the appropriately numbered rating forms; complete review and analysis by community college consultant Dr. Katherine Boswell, Education Policy Associates of the one (1) proposal submitted by a two-year institution; a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators, submitting institutions, funds requested, etc.; the FY 2016-17 Traditional Enhancement Program Request for Proposals (RFP); and a copy of the FY 2015-16 Multidisciplinary Enhancement Report.

The subject-area reviewers electronically submitted their evaluations of individual proposals by February 24, 2017 to Dr. Dean for further review. The reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP. After careful consideration and communication with subject-area reviewers, the proposals were ranked and funding recommendations were made.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table II lists proposals recommended for funding if additional funds become available. Table III contains a rank-order list of proposals not recommended for funding. 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.

**MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT, FY 2016-17**

**SUBJECT-AREA REVIEWERS**

Kris Byron, Business

Georgia State University

Todd Hudnall, Chemistry

Texas State University

Patricia Hewitt, Education

University of Tennessee-Martin

Alexey Petrov, Physics & Astronomy

Wayne State University

**TABLE I**  
**PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Discipline	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	97	02MUL-17	LSUAM	Physics	\$166,395	\$166,395		
2	96	14MUL-17	ULL	Education	\$127,320	\$120,000		
3	92	05MUL-17	LSUE	Physics	\$167,029	\$100,000		
4	91	01MUL-17	LSUAM	Business	\$219,800	\$130,000	\$23,000	\$0
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$680,544</b>	<b>\$516,395</b>	<b>\$23,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>

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

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Discipline	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
5	88	04MUL-17	LSUAM	Chemistry	\$152,091	\$152,091		
6	87	03MUL-17	LSUAM	Physics	\$88,270	\$88,270		
7	83	16MUL-17	UNO	Chemistry	\$106,730	\$106,730		
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$347,091</b>	<b>\$347,091</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**TABLE III**  
**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Discipline	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
8	82	11MUL-17	ULL	Chemistry	\$258,425	\$0		
9	81	13MUL-17	ULL	Chemistry	\$201,890	\$0		
10	80	15MUL-17	ULL	Chemistry	\$199,816	\$0	\$0	\$0
11	79	08MUL-17	SLU	Education	\$69,782	\$0		
12	78	06MUL-17	Nicholls	Chemistry	\$140,000	\$0		
13	76	12MUL-17	ULL	Education	\$50,429	\$0		
14	74	10MUL-17	SUNO	Business	\$85,100	\$0	\$64,056	\$0
15	65	09MUL-17	SUBR	Physics	\$200,588	\$0		
16	63	07MUL-17	NSU	Business	\$78,926	\$0		
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$1,284,956</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$64,056</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:**

**01MUL-17**

**ROOT DISCIPLINE:**

**Business**

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana State University and A&M College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancing and Expanding Entrepreneurship in Creative Industries  
Using the Fully Automated Knitting Production System

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Ye-Sho Chen

## 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 9 (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 4 (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 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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$219,800</u>	<u>\$23,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$130,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks equipment used to design and create clothing. It is multidisciplinary in that it combines the efforts of the textile/fashion and entrepreneurship programs. The idea is compelling, and the proposal is integrative. The goals and objectives could have been more concrete and tied to the enhancement. The impact on faculty development could have been better described. However, the impact is clear, and a reduced-scale project would improve both programs. Partial funding of \$130,000 is recommended in year one for the knitting machine and one work station. No funding is recommended in year two. Funding for travel and the graduate student is not recommended. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

02MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Physics/Astronomy

INSTITUTION:

Louisiana State University and A & M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL:

High-Resolution Raman System for Multidisciplinary Research at  
LSU

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:

Manas Ranjan Gartia

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>6</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>3</u>	(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>10</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>21</u>	(of 21 points)
B.3	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>3</u>	(of 5 points)
B.6	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>12</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u>                    </u>
-----	-----	----------	----	-----------------------------

G. Total Score:

97

(of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$166,395

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$166,395

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

This proposal seeks to acquire a confocal Raman microscope for the collaboration of researchers from across multiple departments. This is a well-written multidisciplinary proposal with clearly stated goals and a strong work plan to achieve them. The PIs have previous experience working with Raman spectroscopy. The impact of the instrument on research activities and education on the various departments is clearly described. The procedures for installation and future maintenance of the microscope are carefully conceived. The institutional match is substantial. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

03MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Physics/Astronomy

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A & M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Spark Plasma Sintering System for Multidisciplinary  
Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Fengyuan Lu

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (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: 87 (of 100 points)

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

## SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$88,270

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$88,270

(if additional funds become available)

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

Researchers from Louisiana State and Grambling State Universities seek to acquire a spark plasma sintering (SPS) system. The project is truly multidisciplinary and would benefit researchers and students from Engineering, Physics, and Geology. There is currently no on-site access to SPS systems in Louisiana, which impacts both research and education. A strong case is made for the research aspect of the proposal, though it contains several typographical errors. The PIs are clearly experienced in their research fields and will find the system beneficial for their research projects. The educational aspect is not as clearly presented. The number of students taking the relevant courses as well as the PI's involvement in those courses are not full explained. The project evaluation component is underdeveloped. Full funding is recommended if funds become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

04MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Chemistry

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A & M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of an Atomic Force Microscope to Enhance the  
Nanosciences at Louisiana State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kevin McPeak

## 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. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>5</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>3</u>	(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>9</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>18</u>	(of 21 points)
B.3	<u>4.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u>4.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>3</u>	(of 5 points)
B.6	<u>4.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	<u>3.5</u>	(of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>12</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u>                    </u>
-----	-----	----------	----	-----------------------------

G. Total Score: 

88
----

 (of 100 points)

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

## SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$152,091

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$152,091

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal seeks to acquire an Atomic Force Microscope (AFM) for the shared instrumentation facility (SIF) at LSU. The number of AFMs at LSU is not referenced, only that the SIF does not have one. The impact of the AFM on existing SIF equipment is clearly indicated. Measurable objectives are clearly defined and the presented timeline is realistic. Details are lacking on the ability of the AFM to attract and retain high-quality students. Support from multiple local businesses that would utilize the proposed instrument is indicated in the form of supplementary letters. Ultimately, the fees obtained by the LSU team and SIF from these industrial entities would help offset maintenance costs. The requested amount of funding is appropriate. Full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

05MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Physics/Astronomy

INSTITUTION:

Louisiana State University at Eunice

TITLE OF PROPOSAL:

Department of Physical Science Upgrade for the Educational  
Enhancement and Recruitment of STEM Scholars

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:

Michael Scanlan

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>6</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>3</u>	(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>12</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u>                    </u>
-----	-----	----------	----	-----------------------------

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:

\$167,029

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$100,000

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

The Division of Sciences and Mathematics at LSU Eunice seeks to update lab equipment. The requested equipment will serve several disciplines, with primary users in Physics, Chemistry, and Geology. The project will have a sustainable impact on numerous courses. The work plan and the description of the enhancement are highly detailed. The proposal has an underdeveloped assessment component and would benefit from more quantitative data. A portion of the requested equipment may be considered superfluous, such as the H25 Humanoid Robot for community outreach and recruitment. Partial funding of \$100,000 is recommended with no support for the robot, and all other reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 06MUL-17  
**ROOT DISCIPLINE:** Chemistry

**INSTITUTION:** Nicholls State University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancing Chemical Analysis through the Acquisition of a Liquid Chromatograph Mass Spectrometer [LC-MS]

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Darcey Wayment

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>4</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>1</u>	(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 56 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>10</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u>                    </u>
-----	-----	----------	----	-----------------------------

**G. Total Score:** 78 (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>\$140,000</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<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 acquire a Liquid Chromatograph Ion-Trap Mass Spectrometer system (LC-MS). While the capabilities of the instrument are clearly identified, the section regarding the current situation does not specifically delineate which departments, curricula, or research teams will be augmented. The metrics to assess the measurables are not sufficient, and it is unclear how the discussed documents will be used to measure the success of the proposed objectives. No timelines for achieving the measurables are described. The impact of the proposed instrument on the curriculum appears to be substantial. However, no details regarding the time spent using the instrument for each class are provided. Without this data, it is unclear if the courses (24 different courses, with more than 250 students serviced) will actually benefit from the instrument. For example, how much instrument time will each class require, and when will they require it? How much time is left for research use? There is no discussion regarding the specifics of the training and maintenance that will be necessary. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

07MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Business

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LIFT: Leadership and Innovation Foundation Training

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marcia Hardy

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes n/a 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:

\$78,926

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 hardware and software to equip a computer lab to enhance student leadership and other skills. It also proposes the use of this lab in a number of courses and proposes the creation of numerous case studies. Details are lacking on what this project entails and how it will be implemented. The proposal does not clearly discuss how the lab will promote leadership skills. The case studies are not well explained and seem overly ambitious, and it is not clear how the lab will help the faculty create them. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08MUL-17  
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Education

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: SOLUTIONS Virtual Reality Hub: A Collaborative Approach to  
Educating the Whole Child

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Colleen Klein-Ezell

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## 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 2 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (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 12 (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: \$69,782  
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 seeks to incorporate virtual reality into pre-service teacher instruction. It does not appear to meet the criteria of the Multidisciplinary competition. There is no mention of tangible contributions from faculty in departments outside Education. Though a well-written and worthy project, funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

09MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Physics/Astronomy

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Raman Equipment to Enhance Undergraduate Student Training

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shizhong Yang

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)  
C.2 0 (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 9 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

65
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$200,588

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

(if additional funds become available)

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

The Departments of Physics and Chemistry seek to acquire a Raman spectroscopy system. It would benefit both research and educational activities, though fewer details are provided to support the educational component. The goals and objectives are not clearly articulated. No enrollment information for relevant classes where Raman spectroscopy methods could be taught is provided. The writing lacks editing and the proposal is poorly cited. No details on who will manage the system after installation are provided. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

10MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Business

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement Plan to Provide Student Learning Tools to Retain  
New Freshmen and Continuing Sophomore CBA Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Igwe Udeh

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 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 7 (of 10 points)  
B.2 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 5 (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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$85,100</u>	<u>\$64,056*</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

\*Note that the RFP limits year 2 requests to \$50,000.

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

The College of Business Administration (CBA) at SUNO seeks to acquire laptops, internet access cards, and textbook licenses to enhance undergraduate instruction. The stated rationale is that this equipment will help students to complete college. A compelling argument is not made for measurable impact on retention. The evidence provided for students lacking access to this technology is anecdotal. The security procedures for student use are not adequately described. It is not clear how the project is multidisciplinary or who would benefit outside the CBA. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE: Chemistry

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Chemical Imaging Microscopy System Consist of  
FTIR / Raman Spectro-microscope for Advancement in Chemical,  
Biological, and Materials Science Research and Teaching

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dilip Depan

## 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 0 (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 3.5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3.5 (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 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$258,425

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 seeks to acquire a chemical imaging microscopy system. It will impact a large number of faculty and students across a number of departments. The rationale is strong and the work plan is detailed with a reasonable timeline. The goals are vague and not fully connected to the work plan. The proposal does not clearly indicate how the instruments will improve the recruitment of quality students. The project evaluation section does not provide actual metrics that will be used to assess the impact of the instrument proposed. It is not made clear what other instruments with Fourier transform infra-red (FTIR) or Raman capabilities are on the ULL campus and, therefore, it may be possible that the purchase of two separate instruments is not justified. The quotations provided for the requested instruments total \$27,000 more than the requested amount. The request is high relative to available funds. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

12MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Education

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LA-CUE: Language and Content for University Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michelle Haj-Broussard

## 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 7 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 17 (of 20 points)  
B.3 7 (of 8 points)  
B.4 6 (of 8 points)  
B.5 4 (of 8 points)  
B.6 5 (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: 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount:

\$50,429

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 seeks to establish dual-enrollment online education content courses for language immersion students. The faculty is qualified to prepare these courses. Existing courses will be modified for delivery in this format. The description of each department's role in this proposal lacks details. The project would help students continue their education in language-immersion-style presentations and possibly improve recruitment. Multiple departments participate but the actual enhancement for each one is not clear. Funding is not recommended.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13MUL-17  
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Chemistry

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Time-Resolved Planar Laser Induced Fluorescence [PLIF] to Foster Energy Frontier Research Rooted in Chemistry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lulin Jiang

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 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 3 (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: \$201,890  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks a high-spatial-resolution time-resolved Planar Laser Induced Fluorescence (PLIF) to enhance interdisciplinary energy research and instruction across Chemistry and Mechanical Engineering. The goals are clearly stated and the objectives are measurable. The work plan, specifically the description of the impacted research activities of the PIs, lacks details. The argument for propelling ULL to a high level of eminence is confusing. The evaluation plan is terse and did not specifically state what metrics would be used. No maintenance plan is provided and upkeep costs are not discussed. No plan for training users is provided. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE: Education

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Empowering through Knowledge: Exploring Social, Economic, and Environmental Sustainability in Louisiana through Oral History and Virtual Reality

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heather Stone

## 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 9 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)  
B.2 20 (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 3 (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: 

96
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$127,320</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$120,000</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 Departments of Curriculum & Instruction and Mechanical Engineering propose a partnership in order to enhance instruction for teacher candidates. The rationale is strong. The work plan is clearly described and supported by research. The link to a previous BoRSF award is evident. This proposal will deepen the relationship between departments and enhance curricula and pedagogy in both. The evaluation plan, which incorporates student surveys, could be broadened and strengthened. The proposal is, otherwise, very strong. Partial funding of \$120,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. There is no institutional match.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 15MUL-17  
**ROOT DISCIPLINE:** Chemistry

**INSTITUTION:** University of Louisiana at Lafayette

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Acquisition of a Mass Spectrometer to Enhance Undergraduate Research and Teaching through a Platform of Interdisciplinary, Multilevel and Collaborative Efforts

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Wu Xu

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>5</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>2</u>	(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>8.5</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>17</u>	(of 21 points)
B.3	<u>3.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u>3.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>2.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.6	<u>3.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	<u>3.5</u>	(of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>12</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-----------	----------------

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u>                    </u>
-----	-----	----------	----	-----------------------------

**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:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$199,816</u>	<u>\$0</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.)

The Departments of Biology, Chemistry, and Chemical Engineering seek to incorporate mass spectrometry into curricula and research. The proposal exceeds the 15-page limit for the narrative with an additional 22 pages of figures provided as support. There are 20 co-PIs listed, which is a concern in terms of ensuring that all objectives are achieved and measured for each one. The proposal states that ULL has no MALDI-TOF instrumentation, but does not indicate how it would enhance the units and curricula. The work plan is exceptionally well written, and very elaborate. No information is provided on how the equipment will enhance student recruiting. The assessment plan is strong. The proposed housing and use of the instrument do not seem to be suitable for longevity of the instrument. Some aspects of the proposal are compelling, but the text, overall, appears not to be in compliance. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

16MUL-17

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Chemistry

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Cost Effective Helium Recovery System for Low Temperature  
Magnetic, Electronic and Thermal Measurements

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Wiley

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## E. Economic and/or Cultural

### Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

83
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$106,730

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$106,730

(if additional funds become available)

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

A multidisciplinary group at UNO seeks to acquire a helium recovery system. The proposal is laudable, and the equipment will make a significant impact on research activities for many years. While the objectives of the proposal are simple, the measurables are not thoroughly articulated. As a result, the work plan of this proposal suffers. It does not sufficiently describe how the research projects will help achieve the goals of the proposal. While the impact on research of this proposal is clear, the impact on curricula and instruction is limited. With the increasing shortage of He, the proposed helium recovery system is both economically and scientifically warranted. Funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

# **Appendix A**

## **Summary List of Proposals**

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary  
for the FY 2016-17 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	Project Title	Amount Requested		
						Year 1	Year 2	Total
001MUL-17	Prof. Ye-Sho Chen	Louisiana State University and A & M College	2 Years	E	Enhancing and Expanding Entrepreneurship in Creative Industries Using the Fully Automated Knitting Production System	\$219,800.00	\$23,000.00	\$242,800.00
002MUL-17	Dr. Manas Ranjan Gartia	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	High-Resolution Raman System for Multidisciplinary Research at LSU	\$166,395.00	\$0.00	\$166,395.00
003MUL-17	Dr. Fengyuan Lu	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	Acquisition of a Spark Plasma Sintering System for Multidisciplinary Research and Education	\$88,270.00	\$0.00	\$88,270.00
004MUL-17	Prof. Kevin McPeak	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	Acquisition of an Atomic Force Microscope to Enhance the Nanosciences at Louisiana State University	\$152,091.00	\$0.00	\$152,091.00
005MUL-17	Mr. Michael Scanlan	Louisiana State University at Eunice	1 Year	E	Department of Physical Science Upgrade for the Educational Enhancement and Recruitment of STEM Scholars	\$167,029.00	\$0.00	\$167,029.00
006MUL-17	Dr. Darcey Wayment	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	Enhancing Chemical Analysis through the Acquisition of a Liquid Chromatograph Mass Spectrometer [LC-MS]	\$140,000.00	\$0.00	\$140,000.00
007MUL-17	Dr. Marcia Hardy	Northwestern State University	1 Year	E	LIFT: Leadership and Innovation Foundation Training	\$78,926.00	\$0.00	\$78,926.00
008MUL-17	Dr. Colleen Klein-Ezell	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	E	SOLUTIONS Virtual Reality Hub: A Collaborative Approach to Educating the Whole Child	\$69,782.00	\$0.00	\$69,782.00
009MUL-17	Dr. Shizhong Yang	Southern University and A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	Raman Equipment to Enhance Undergraduate Student Training	\$200,588.00	\$0.00	\$200,588.00
010MUL-17	Dr. Igwe Udeh	Southern University at New Orleans	2 Years	E	Enhancement Plan to Provide Student Learning Tools to Retain New Freshmen and Continuing Sophomore CBA Students	\$85,100.00	\$64,056.00	\$149,156.00
011MUL-17	Dr. Dilip Depan	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	Acquisition of Chemical Imaging Microscopy System Consist of FTIR / Raman Spectro-microscope for Advancement in Chemical, Biological, and Materials Science Research and Teaching	\$258,425.00	\$0.00	\$258,425.00
012MUL-17	Dr. Michelle Haj-Broussard	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	LA-CUE: Language and Content for University Enhancement	\$50,429.00	\$0.00	\$50,429.00
013MUL-17	Dr. Lulin Jiang	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	Acquisition of a Time-Resolved Planar Laser Induced Fluorescence [PLIF] to Foster Energy Frontier Research Rooted in Chemistry	\$201,890.00	\$0.00	\$201,890.00
014MUL-17	Dr. Heather Stone	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	Empowering through Knowledge: Exploring Social, Economic, and Environmental Sustainability in Louisiana through Oral History and Virtual Reality	\$127,320.00	\$0.00	\$127,320.00
015MUL-17	Prof. Wu Xu	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	2 Years	E	Acquisition of a mass spectrometer to enhance undergraduate research and teaching through a platform of interdisciplinary, multilevel and collaborative efforts	\$199,816.00	\$0.00	\$199,816.00
016MUL-17	Dr. John Wiley	University of New Orleans	1 Year	E	Cost Effective Helium Recovery System for Low Temperature Magnetic, Electronic and Thermal Measurements	\$106,730.00	\$0.00	\$106,730.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	16
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,312,591.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$87,056.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,399,647.00

# **Appendix B**

## **Rating Forms**

## BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

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 \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      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 2015)

## BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2016-17

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 2015)