

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

**REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

March 2016

Prepared by:

Mike Daniels (Chair)
University of Arkansas

2015-16 Board of Regents Support Fund Traditional Enhancement

Agricultural Sciences

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Mike Daniels, University of Arkansas, completed in March 2016 the evaluation of eight (8) Agricultural Sciences proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

Dr. Daniels received the following materials prior to the review: eight (8) Agricultural Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2015-16 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2012-13 Traditional Enhancement Final Report in Agricultural Sciences.

During the review process, the reviewer ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional monies become available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the reviewer did not recommend any projects with scores of 80 or lower. 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	88	04AG-16	LSUAG	\$124,979	\$124,979		
2	81	05AG-16	LSUAG	\$139,252	\$78,362		
TOTALS:				\$264,231	\$203,341	\$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	80	06AG-16	LaTech	\$68,850	\$48,306		
TOTALS:				\$68,850	\$48,306	\$0	\$0

TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
4	79	01AG-16	LSUAG	\$30,056	\$0		
4	79	03AG-16	LSUAG	\$63,153	\$0		
6	75	02AG-16	LSUAG	\$112,064	\$0		
6	75	07AG-16	UHC	\$161,590	\$0	\$0	\$0
8	73	08AG-16	ULL	\$26,969	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$393,832	\$0	\$0	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01AG-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Cold Pasteurization Equipment Needed to Enhance Its
Teaching and Research at Louisiana State University
Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kayanush Aryana

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

79

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$30,056</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to acquire cold pasteurization equipment to be utilized in research and both graduate and undergraduate education. While the specific objectives are well defined, clear measurables for obtaining the stated goals are not conveyed. Details are lacking on the personnel to be trained as well as the lab exercises that would be developed. The case for achieving eminence is not compelling. A statement or support letter from the industry that utilizes or is considering this technology could have strengthened this argument. On project evaluation, a survey of regional industry could demonstrate the importance of this project for supporting the technology through research and hiring students with related experience and skills. This survey could also provide better insight on economic potential. The requested amount is moderate and the benefit to cost ratio could be high. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02AG-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Laser-Diffraction Particle Size Analyzer

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Franz Ehrenhauser

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

G. Total Score:

75

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$112,064</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 the acquisition of a laser diffraction particle size analyzer to replace damaged and outdated equipment. The goals are clearly stated, but no measurable objectives are given. The description of the impact on curriculum is underdeveloped and only addresses graduate students and research. No attempt is made to incorporate the equipment into a graduate course. The overall impact of the proposal could have been broadened by working with faculty to incorporate the equipment into lab courses for undergraduates, which might inspire them to consider graduate work. A convincing case was not made for enhancing industry relationships or demonstrating how particle-size research provides economic benefit. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03AG-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Macromolecule Molecular Analysis Capabilities

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joan King

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$63,153</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 the acquisition of high-tech food analysis equipment to enhance education and research. The objectives are straightforward but don't provide performance measures. The project evaluation is weak. The proposal could be enhanced by demonstrating stronger collaborations with industry and attempting to better quantify the economic impacts. The requested amount is reasonable and the project likely offers a high cost-benefit ratio, though more analysis is needed. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04AG-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Nanocellulose Manufacturing Facility for Advanced
Material Research and Development

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Qinglin Wu

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$124,979</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$124,979</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 develop a lab to study manufacturing processes of cellulosic feedstock for energy and materials. An excellent case is made for how the project could positively impact Louisiana economic development. The objectives are effectively tied to the long-term research goals of the AgCenter. The proposed technology transfer and educational outreach opportunities are very compelling. A convincing case is made for the project's relevance to and relationship with industry. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05AG-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening Analytical Capability for Research and
Teaching in Watershed and Natural Resources

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yi Jun Xu

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 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 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$139,252</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$78,362</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 the acquisition of a three-dimensional terrestrial laser scanner to be used in assessing watershed hydrology and characterization. The proposal is well written and makes a convincing argument for the value of this equipment to protecting Louisiana water resources. The objectives are measurable. However, the described project evaluation is very generic and did not suggest any quantifiable performance outcomes, such as the number of watersheds characterized with the laser scanner. While the proposal addresses the potential for international eminence in research, it fails to address how the project might increase eminence in teaching. The proposal also overlooks the potential for serving State environmental and conservation agencies or stakeholder groups such as the timber industry in enhancing efforts to protect water resources. While this technology is cutting edge, other viable, less expensive options still exist, thus the cost to benefit ratio is not compelling. Partial funding of \$78,362 is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06AG-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Nutrition and Physiology Teaching
Laboratory Providing Kinesthetic Learning Opportunities for
Undergraduates in Agricultural Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Gentry

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$68,850
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$48,306

(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 establish an analytical lab to support animal nutrition and physiology as well as soil fertility testing. The proposal is well written. The objectives are clear and include quantifiable performance measures. The service learning approach for students is an innovative way to develop regional eminence with local stakeholders. While the strength of the team is in animal science, a considerable portion of the proposal addresses soils and plant relationships. The institution is in a strong position to serve agricultural producers and related industry in North Louisiana. However, more evidence of relationships with stakeholder groups such as producer organizations would strengthen the project. The request is very reasonable and the cost-benefit ratio of the proposal is high. The project may be more effective with its focus narrowed to animal sciences. Partial funding of \$48,306 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07AG-16

INSTITUTION: University of Holy Cross

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Food Science Education and Outreach Infrastructure Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Darryl Holliday

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

G. Total Score: 75 (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>\$161,590</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.)

This proposal seeks the acquisition of new technology and equipment to enhance student learning experiences in food science and to support outreach to the food industry. The Pls wants to provide students with "real world" experience through service learning, as well as increase the faculty's consulting opportunities. The goals and objectives are clearly described and performance measures are included. The submitting institution is well positioned geographically to gain eminence with the local food industry in New Orleans, though the proposal only presents a vision for the future, with little insight into the current standing. The potential exists for the proposal to impact the local economy based on the relationship with the New Orleans Food and Farm network, however no examples of student service learning projects or other ongoing projects are mentioned. It is not clear how many students are enrolled in food science, which makes it difficult to assess the potential impact. While the project is conceptually sound, concrete evidence that the outreach network is currently functioning is lacking. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08AG-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Genetic Engineering Teaching and Research
Infrastructure at UL Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yi-Hong Wang

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5 (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

73

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$26,969</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks the acquisition of equipment to enhance teaching and research in genetic engineering. The objectives, as written, make it difficult to establish a quality project evaluation in terms of measurable performance indicators. The description of equipment maintenance lacks important details such as a schedule of work or names of individuals responsible for each aspect. The expertise of the PI is clear, though the project would be enhanced by having Co-PIs. The lack of relationship with industry is a concern, and the case for economic development is not compelling. Funding is not recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Agricultural Sciences
for the FY 2015-16 Review Cycle**

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001AG-16	Dr. Kayanush Aryana	Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	1 Year	E	New Request	Cold Pasteurization equipment needed to enhance its teaching and research at Louisiana State University Agricultural Center.	\$30,056.00	\$0.00	\$30,056.00
002AG-16	Dr. Franz Ehrenhauser	Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	1 Year	E	New Request	Acquisition of a laser-diffraction particle size analyzer	\$112,064.00	\$0.00	\$112,064.00
003AG-16	Dr. Joan King	Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	1 Year	E	New Request	Increasing Macromolecule Molecular Analysis Capabilities	\$63,153.00	\$0.00	\$63,153.00
004AG-16	Prof. Qinglin Wu	Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Nanocellulose Manufacturing Facility for Advanced Material Research and Development	\$124,979.00	\$0.00	\$124,979.00
005AG-16	Prof. Yi Jun Xu	Louisiana State University Agricultural Center	1 Year	E	New Request	Strengthening Analytical Capability for Research and Teaching in Watershed and Natural Resources	\$139,252.00	\$0.00	\$139,252.00
006AG-16	Dr. Laura Gentry	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Development of a nutrition and physiology teaching laboratory providing kinesthetic learning opportunities for undergraduates in agricultural sciences	\$68,850.00	\$0.00	\$68,850.00
007AG-16	Dr. Darryl Holliday	University of Holy Cross	2 Years	E	New Request	Food Science Education and Outreach Infrastructure Project	\$161,590.00	\$0.00	\$161,590.00
008AG-16	Dr. Yi-Hong Wang	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Genetic Engineering Teaching and Research Infrastructure at UL Lafayette	\$26,969.00	\$0.00	\$26,969.00

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

Total Number of Proposals submitted	8
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$726,913.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$0.00
Total Money Requested	\$726,913.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2015-16

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

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

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

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—56 points

- _____ of 10 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 21 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity and a schedule of// activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/ unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and/or quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.7 To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

C. EQUIPMENT—10 points

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

D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points

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

E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—12 points

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

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

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned

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

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$_____ Recommended Amount \$_____

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution:_____

Reviewer's Signature:_____ Date:_____

(Form 6.11, rev 2015)

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2015-16

**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)