

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

IN

HUMANITIES

March, 2015

Prepared by:

Dr. Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Chair
Iowa State University

Dr. Samantha Cantrell
Middle Tennessee State University

TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

HUMANITIES

FY 2014-15

Introduction

The Humanities Review Panel consisting of Dr. Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Iowa State University, chair; and Dr. Samantha Cantrell, Grant Development Specialist, Middle Tennessee State University, met via phone conference in March 2015 to evaluate seven (7) Humanities proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Traditional Enhancement Program component of the Boards of Regents Support Fund.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: (1) all proposals and appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of the proposals submitted listing titles, PIs, their institutions, and funds requested; (3) a copy of the most recent Humanities report (FY 2011-12); and (4) the FY 2014-15 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals containing criteria for evaluation. After studying all proposals, the panel met via teleconference to review and evaluate them. During the review each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria detailed in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for those deemed worthy of support.

The seven (7) Humanities proposals requested a total of \$373,592 in first-year funds. Two (2) proposals were highly recommended for funding, one (1) of them at a reduced level.

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

TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	94	07HUM-15	UNO	\$56,299	\$56,299		
2	92	02HUM-15	LSU-BR	\$120,029	\$111,941		
TOTALS:				\$176,328	\$168,240	\$0	\$0

TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
3	90	03HUM-15	LSU-BR	\$37,638	\$37,638	\$44,748	\$44,748
TOTALS:				\$37,638	\$37,638	\$44,748	\$44,748

TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
4	85	04HUM-15	LOY	\$67,297	\$0		
5	75.5	05HUM-15	NIC	\$48,209	\$0		
6	64	06HUM-15	UL-L	\$11,095	\$0		
7	58.5	01HUM-15	CEN	\$33,025	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$159,626	\$0	\$0	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01HUM-15

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Enhancement to the Centenary Curriculum via an
Interdisciplinary Middle Eastern Studies Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Spencer Dew

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 2.5 (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 1 (of 2 points)
D.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
D.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

58.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTS: Requested Amount: \$33,025
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 PIs seek to develop an interdisciplinary Middle Eastern studies program to address an important and timely topic. However, the proposal itself does not offer much of a foundation on which to build this program. Middle Eastern studies are outside the fields of specialty of the current faculty. Though the work plan contains components of program development, it lacks a cohesive description and sufficient context. It is not clear what the program will consist of, how many credits it will offer, or which other departments are involved. It is not specified what the process and timeline for program development and approval are, if there is institutional support for such a program, or when it will be approved and available to students. The goals and objectives are a list of independent, somewhat disconnected activities. A residence hall "base" is mentioned but not explained. Equipment is mentioned for connecting with scholars and students internationally, but the need is not explained. The PI requests funds for language software, but does not mention any collaboration or consultation with Centenary's language departments. The request for library resources does not include a list of books, journals, or other items. Funds are requested to support the Model Arab League Program but no description of what this involves is provided. Modest funds are requested for external speakers, but their impact on student learning is not described. The professional development support for three faculty is for conference attendance, but no details are provided for which conferences will be selected or the anticipated impact on teaching strategies. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02HUM-15

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: HopKins Black Box Performance Research Laboratory
Equipment Upgrade to Meet Industry Standards

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Terry

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 9 (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 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 _____ 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: \$120,029
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$111,941

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 renovate LSU's black box performance research laboratory in order to meet industry standards and allow students to train in the use of state-of-the-art lighting and sound technology, something they are unable to do with the current aging facilities. This is an important upgrade for an impressive program. Film production, live performance production, sound recording and digital media are increasingly vital to the Louisiana economy. The project will enhance ongoing multidisciplinary projects with the potential for external support. The energy savings from the new equipment will help the laboratory become more self sustaining. The PIs have extensive experience in performance production. The need for upgrading the incandescent lighting fixtures and the cumbersome sound system is clearly described. The upgrade will facilitate expanded practicum training in modern lighting and sound for undergraduates in the Performance Studies curriculum. The work plan timeline is clear and includes training on the new equipment for faculty and graduate students. The PIs have pursued creative collaborations with campus and community research partners. The budget justification does not explain why this particular equipment is chosen over other options. The University should provide the required electrical upgrade. Partial funding of \$111,941 is recommended. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03HUM-15

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Critical English Initiative

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Susan Weinstein

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
 B.2 16 (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 4 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

F. Total Score: 90 (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>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested		
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Amount:	<u>\$37,638</u>	<u>\$44,748</u>
	Recommended		
	Amount:	<u>\$37,638</u>	<u>\$44,748</u>

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal seeks to strengthen a teacher education partnership with a local high school. A pilot program is already underway linking LSU's undergraduate English teacher prep program, an interdisciplinary graduate program, and an eleventh-grade English class. Under the direction of the PI, a doctoral student is teaching a class using an innovative approach to teaching literature and communication. Five undergraduates participating in the pre-service teacher practicum are doing on-site work. This compelling project is built on an existing foundation and includes passionate personnel who have forged a strong collaboration. The project will impact high school, undergraduate, and graduate students, as well as secondary school teachers. The budget includes hiring a PhD student to lead the high school class for a second year. An external evaluator will be hired to assess program impact. There is strong institutional cost share. The primary budget request is for a stipend to support the graduate student who teaches the Amped class at the high school, which is minimal to maintain the project beyond the initial pilot period. The project is weakened by the absence of sufficient detail in the work plan, which included no benchmark dates or assignments of tasks to project leaders. Nonetheless, the merit of the program is strong and full funding is recommended for two years if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04HUM-15

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing through Excellence and Innovation: Expanding the
Documentary and Oral History Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Justin Nystrom

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 17 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

85

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,297
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a well-written proposal to enhance Loyola's Documentary and Oral History Studio with video equipment, post-production computing power and data storage capacity. The Studio is a core resource for the digital filmmaking program. The workload of the Studio is nearly at capacity such that expansion to a larger undergraduate student audience is not possible. This project builds on existing resources provided through other funding sources. While the proposal makes compelling arguments for teaching students about filming historical documentaries and oral histories, it is not clear why industry-standard equipment is required to accomplish this. The PI will move the studio's physical presence to a larger available space to securely store equipment at no cost and with no necessary renovation. The objectives and goals are ambitious and clearly described. The work plan adequately describes the steps to install and set up the equipment. The specific digital projects that students will work on are directly related to the local culture and history, which signals ongoing relevance to and support from local and regional stakeholders. Of major concern is that there is a single PI with no evidence presented of collaboration or buy-in from the department and faculty. It is unclear who contributed the letters of support and why they were chosen to do so. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05HUM-15

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technical & Professional Communications Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Scott Banville

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6.5 (of 10 points)
B.2 11 (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 2 (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: 75.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$48,209
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 establish a multimedia professional and technical writing lab to train students entering industry in new writing formats such as web design, data visualization, and use of social media. The lab is appropriate and leverages existing resources. However, the proposal contains numerous errors. The work plan lacks sufficient detail on the specific tasks to be undertaken to mount the multimedia classroom. It is not clear who will carry out each task. No timeline or benchmarks are provided and, therefore, it is impossible to assess whether the goals and objectives can be addressed in the grant timeframe. The work plan references development of a Certificate in Petroleum Technical and Professional Writing by fall 2016 but does not lay out a process or plan. The work plan mentions pedagogical training for faculty in best practices of emergent digital writing but provides no details. The project evaluation appears reasonable but there is no indication of who will lead or assist with the collection of data. Though it is a 17-seat lab, 20 computers are requested. Given that this is an addition of one computer lab to a department that already has three, the impact on the quality of students might be overstated. The applicants note that iMacs were chosen to ensure consistency with existing labs, but it is unclear if iMacs are commonly used in the industries in which the students will seek employment. Finally, a letter of institutional support would strengthen this proposal. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06HUM-15

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ACTFL OPI Training

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nicholas Person

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (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 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
D.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 11 (of 20 points)
B.3 6 (of 8 points)
B.4 4 (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: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$11,095</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 seeks to train and certify ten foreign language faculty as Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) testers. This is a highly ambitious and laudable goal, as few departments nationally have more than one OPI-certified faculty member. The ACTFL OPI assessment of foreign language proficiency is the gold standard of proficiency certification in the U.S. However, the work plan does not provide enough detail on the process and seriously underestimates the timeline for full certification. The work plan section only addresses the timing for the on-campus OPI workshop and does not elaborate on what, if anything, will occur beyond that training week before the start of classes. No mention is made of follow-up workshops or faculty development training on how the ACTFL OPI approach to proficiency can be integrated into faculty pedagogy and transform the curriculum. Being trained in OPI testing alone does not translate into curricular reform, as the proposal suggests. Most importantly, the OPI training is just the first step in becoming an OPI-certified tester. The remaining requirements include carrying out multiple assessments of non-native speakers and having those assessments recorded and reviewed by the ACTFL. The proposal does not address or plan for the full certification process, which undermines the overall goal of having 10 faculty OPI certified within 30 days of the workshop. This proposal could be greatly strengthened by addressing how the curriculum and benchmarking of student learning will change as a result of the ACTFL-OPI training. It is also unclear why graduate students could not get their own OPI ratings independent of the faculty who instruct them. An independent OPI rating would seemingly be more objective than one conducted in-house. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07HUM-15

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Meeting the Challenges of the New History: Instructional
Improvement and Workforce Development

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Dupont

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 17 (of 20 points)
B.3 8 (of 8 points)
B.4 8 (of 8 points)
B.5 8 (of 8 points)
B.6 8 (of 8 points)
B.7 4 (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 10 (For NS/NE)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

F. Total Score:

94

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$56,299</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$56,299</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 Department of History seeks to strengthen its public history program by expanding digital teaching capacity and conducting three year-long activities that will have long-term impact. This is a well-written proposal for a meticulously planned project that builds on existing departmental strengths. The project is an appropriate priority for a high-caliber program in an urban research university. The Department is well equipped to parlay this grant support into greater visibility and prominence for its programs, faculty and students. New Orleans is a unique subject of public history. Many history departments steer clear of building capacity in public history because it is viewed as a field that is either too applied or not scholarly enough for the very traditional history discipline. UNO's proposal is strong because project goals link faculty training in pedagogy with student learning that is both scholarly and project based. The work plan provides a reasonable timeline but would be stronger with more description of the various project benchmarks. A mid-project evaluation will allow the PIs to assess their work to date and adjust for maximum outcomes. The impact of this project on curriculum, student learning, and faculty development is clearly articulated. The proposal makes a compelling case for partnership with and relevance to the local economy which is grounded in cultural tourism. The project is bolstered by its potential for wide impact and a solid evaluation plan. The applicants offer a convincing sustainability plan that ensures that the project can continue to grow and succeed. Full funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Humanities
for the FY 2014-15 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/No n Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001HUM-15	Dr. Spencer Dew	Centenary College	1 Year	NE	New Request	An Enhancement to the Centenary Curriculum via an Interdisciplinary Middle Eastern Studies Program	\$33,025.00	\$0.00	\$33,025.00
002HUM-15	Dr. David Terry	Louisiana State University and A & M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	New Request	HopKins Black Box Performance Research Laboratory Equipment Upgrade to Meet Industry Standards	\$120,029.00	\$0.00	\$120,029.00
003HUM-15	Dr. Susan Weinstein	Louisiana State University and A & M College - Baton Rouge	2 Years	NE	New Request	Critical English Initiative	\$37,638.00	\$44,748.00	\$82,386.00
004HUM-15	Dr. Justin Nystrom	Loyola University New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing through Excellence and Innovation: Expanding the Documentary and Oral History Studio	\$67,297.00	\$0.00	\$67,297.00
005HUM-15	Dr. Scott Banville	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Technical & Professional Communications Laboratory	\$48,209.00	\$0.00	\$48,209.00
006HUM-15	Mr. Nicholas Person	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	New Request	ACTFL OPI Training	\$11,095.00	\$0.00	\$11,095.00
007HUM-15	Dr. Robert Dupont	University of New Orleans	1 Year	NE	New Request	Meeting the Challenges of the New History: Instructional Improvement and Workforce Development	\$56,299.00	\$0.00	\$56,299.00

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

Total Number of Proposals submitted	7
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$373,592.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$44,748.00
Total Money Requested	\$418,340.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 1 of 3

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

YES _____ NO _____

_____ of 5 pts.

_____ of 5 pts.

A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?

A.2 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?

A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 66 points

_____ of 5 pts.

_____ of 23 pts.

_____ of 25 pts.

_____ of 5 pts.

_____ of 2 pts.

_____ of 6 pts.

B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?

B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?

B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?

B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?

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?

B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?

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

_____ of 12 pts

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 2 of 3

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

_____ of 10 pts. D.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?

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

COMMENTS:

E. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 3 of 3

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____ Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Form 6.12, rev.2010)

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 1 of 3

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 56 points

- ____ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- ____ of 18 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- ____ of 20 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- ____ of 2 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- ____ of 6 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 2 of 3

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 3 of 3

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Form 6.11, rev 2010)