

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN
ARTS

March 2016

Prepared by:

Dr. Gregory Blakey (Chair)
University of Central Arkansas

Ms. Virginia Rougon Chavis
University of Mississippi

Dr. Robert Thompson
Georgia State University

2015-16 Board of Regents Support Fund Traditional Enhancement

Arts

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. Gregory Blakey, University of Central Arkansas, chair; Ms. Virginia Rougon Chavis, University of Mississippi; and Dr. Robert Thompson, Georgia State University, communicated via e-mail and phone in March 2016, for the purpose of evaluating twenty-four (24) Arts proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to their review: twenty-four (24) Arts 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 Arts.

Prior to the review, each panel member independently evaluated and annotated each of the twenty-four proposals. During the review process, all proposals were fully discussed by the reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and the reviewers ensured that the 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 panel did not recommend any projects with scores of 86 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	96	14ARTS-16	NIC	\$64,100	\$64,100		
2	95.5	19ARTS-16	ULL	\$16,956	\$16,956		
3	95	03ARTS-16	LSUAM	\$134,309	\$75,000		
4	94	16ARTS-16	NSU	\$167,582	\$125,000		
5	93.5	24ARTS-16	UNO	\$94,728	\$94,728		
6	93	17ARTS-16	Tulane	\$274,510	\$220,000		
7	92	22ARTS-16	ULL	\$35,283	\$35,283		
8	91	13ARTS-16	NIC	\$39,632	\$39,632		
9	90	10ARTS-16	LaTech	\$53,673	\$26,342		
TOTALS:				\$880,773	\$697,041	\$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
10	89.5	08ARTS-16	LaTech	\$82,200	\$75,000		
11	88	02ARTS-16	LSUAM	\$81,134	\$58,000		
12	87	05ARTS-16	LaTech	\$93,774	\$70,000		
TOTALS:				\$257,108	\$203,000	\$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
13	86	21ARTS-16	ULL	\$80,000	\$0		
14	85	18ARTS-16	ULL	\$92,604	\$0		
15	83	20ARTS-16	ULL	\$208,878	\$0		
16	80.5	04ARTS-16	LaTech	\$91,092	\$0		
17	80	15ARTS-16	NSU	\$153,202	\$0		
18	73	01ARTS-16	Dillard	\$232,720	\$0		
19	71	06ARTS-16	LaTech	\$168,549	\$0		
20	69	11ARTS-16	LaTech	\$194,925	\$0		
21	68	12ARTS-16	Loyola	\$237,369	\$0		
22	67	23ARTS-16	ULL	\$41,827	\$0		
23	66	09ARTS-16	LaTech	\$65,061	\$0	\$750	\$0
24	57	07ARTS-16	LaTech	\$190,153	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$1,756,380	\$0	\$750	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Additive Materials Orthographic Studio [AMOS]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Barnes

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 15 (of 21 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

G. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$232,720
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 equip a 3D-design lab with a 3D printer, computers, software and related accessories. The timeline provided does not give dates, so it is not clear how the project will realistically fit within the academic calendar. The proposal states workshops are planned for November, which seems early for a studio that has yet to be built. It is noted that the program is SACS accredited, but it is not clear if it has been accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design as well. It appears that there are currently no intermediate or advanced courses in 3D design. The proposal states that there is a rapid national rise in students enrolling in 3D courses, but there is actually a national decline in visual arts enrollment. The computers can be acquired for much less than the prices listed. It is not clear why the additional keyboards and accessories are necessary. It is not evident how the equipment will be maintained or if the space needs infrastructure upgrades to accommodate the equipment. The supplies for the printers are very expensive. The request is high relative to the amount of funds available, especially given the small number of students and faculty impacted. There is no institutional match. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana Orchestra Of Things [LOOT]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edgar Berdahl

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 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 (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 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (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:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$81,134</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$58,000</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 laptops and related musical accessories to create individual stations for an experimental music ensemble. The objectives are wide ranging and numerous and perhaps should be structured to focus on those directly impacted by the requested technology. The work plan is well constructed. The plan for some equipment to be fabricated with the interaction of students is a positive feature that adds significantly to the academic programs and courses in place. It is not clear if the requested iPhones and Apple watches can only be purchased without a data plan or if the institution has provisions for this. Corporate sponsors for the program are listed but the type and level of support are not described. The description of impact on culture is interesting but the argument for economic impact could be stronger. Partial funding of \$58,000 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions 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: 03ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Melding the Physical and Virtual through Emerging
Technologies in the Arts

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Derick Ostrenko

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

95

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$134,309</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$75,000</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 School of Art requests equipment to create a new digital design studio and lab, and renovate an existing studio and lab. The goals are clearly and simply stated. The reuse of existing equipment shows commendable conservation of resources. There is a very clear and articulate plan for successful implementation. The crowning element of the proposal is the number of students served and the role the project will play in the technology transformation of arts education on campus. Outcomes and evaluation are addressed but could use more elaboration. It is not evident how the Adobe Creative Cloud will be funded after the first year. The enhancement of four major spaces represents an ambitious range of activity; a prioritized project could still provide valuable impact. Partial funding of \$75,000 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: 04ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advancements in the Arts at Louisiana Tech

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jerry Berg

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 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 16.5 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (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 6 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score:

80.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$91,092</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.)

The School of Design seeks to modernize classroom instruction with new image making tools. The arguments that the equipment will increase student engagement and attract new students need substantiation. For some equipment choices, the advantages of the requested purchases over the existing resources is not made evident. The proposal states that the University is a regional leader in design education but no supporting details are provided. It is not clear if the affected courses are existing or in development. The listed objectives are not measurable. The work plan cites benchmarks but it is not apparent what is being measured and how. It is not evident what skills the faculty will develop or if they are currently trained on this equipment. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Arthur W. Stone Theatre Stage Manager Console

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Crook

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 8 (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 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 No x

G. Total Score:

87

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$93,774</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$70,000</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.)

The School of the Performing Arts seeks to upgrade facilities with a theatre console and related equipment. The enhancement is an appropriate step forward and will allow the campus to maintain the current level of instruction via industry-standard equipment. Several separate systems are being enhanced or upgraded and, while all the improvements are desirable, not all of them are vital to stage management. The goals are appropriate but need to be stated in a way that lead to measurable objectives. The equipment will be utilized by a range of stage management courses, but more specific examples of curriculum impact would have improved the proposal. The institutional match is a benefit and demonstrates support. Partial funding of \$70,000 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: DIGR Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Adam Forrester

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 11 (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 4 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score:

71

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$168,549</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.)

The School of Design seeks to equip the Digital Incubation Gallery and Research Laboratory, a multipurpose facility that includes an indoor gallery, an outdoor projection theatre and a computer design lab. The project goals are not clearly stated in the appropriate section, though they are articulated better in the evaluation plan. A compelling argument is made for the innovation and uniqueness of the project. A measurable objective aligned with the goal of pursuing partnerships would have benefited the proposal. It is not clear if the requested studio furniture is for specific technical use or just seating. The equipment, overall, is not carefully described. The need for the outdoor space is not justified. The community outreach and the potential for arts collaborations and visiting artists are positive components. The PIs have a good track record and the efforts to create industry connections are impressive. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Howard Auditorium Smart Classroom Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Guinn

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score:

57

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$190,153</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 a state-of-the-art audio-visual projection system for the major theatre space on campus. The rationale is not compelling and need is not established. Measurable objectives and outcomes such as retention and recruitment are not described. The number of students who would use the projector is not indicated. It is not clearly established what each piece of equipment is for. It is not evident who will be running the equipment and how they will be trained. The project appears to be set up as a large-format smart classroom but the pedagogical impact is not articulated. The proposal is, overall, too brief and lacks details. The additional funding sources are laudable. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana Tech University School of Design Photography
Enhancements and Upgrades

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Hamrick

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7.5 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

89.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$82,200</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$75,000</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.)

The School of Design seeks to enhance its photography facilities. Though the goals are clear, they are numerous and repetitive and should be consolidated. A strong argument is made for acquiring industry-standard equipment to prepare students. The curricular impact and educational outcomes are evident. The work plan lacks detail. The evaluation plan is relatively weak. The effort to develop collaborations with industry is compelling. The pledged institutional support is laudable. Partial funding of \$75,000 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 REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Glimpse of Cultural Art Through Historic Fashion: The
Development of a Virtual Museum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

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 6 (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 7 (of 10 points)
B.2 14 (of 20 points)
B.3 5 (of 8 points)
B.4 5 (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 x No _____

F. Total Score:

66

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$65,061</u>	<u>\$750</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to provide virtual access to the Museum of Fashion and Textiles. The project is interesting but need is not clearly established. It is not evident why the project is necessary in order to create a website. The historical significance of the collection is not made clear. Specific details are missing about the kind of equipment needed. It is not indicated what kind of computers are requested, why five are needed, and what kinds of camera and scanner are requested. This could be an excellent student project and there is potential for interdisciplinary collaboration. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Department of Music Choir Library Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Petzet

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (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 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:

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$53,673</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$26,342</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 Music seeks to enhance organization and storage of the choral library. It is a straightforward request that will create space and improve instruction. The library is an asset with a long-term legacy. The current situation is also a safety hazard. The work plan would be stronger if the activities were grouped under the stated objectives. The repurposing of the existing space, after project completion, is a nice byproduct of the proposal. The listed equipment prices do not add up to the requested total and an effective project could be undertaken with less funding. Partial funding of \$26,342 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: 11ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Fabrication Enhancement via Robotic Milling Cell

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kyle Triplett

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 14 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 No x

G. Total Score:

69

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$194,925</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.)

The School of Design seeks a 7-axis Robotic Milling Cell to enhance its digital fabrication and prototyping facilities. The objectives are not clearly articulated. This is a fabrication tool that removes the student from the equation and appears to have minimal impact on the curriculum. The size of the request is excessive relative to available funds. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Filmmaking Production Infrastructure Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Snyder

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 12 (of 21 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score:

68

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$237,369

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The Department of Film & Music Industry Studies seeks to enhance the digital filmmaking program with 4K technology. The focus of the proposal often strays. A wide variety of equipment is requested, and it is not clear how the sound equipment or enhancements boost the 4K agenda. The use of metrics for evaluation is helpful. A list of courses is provided but it is not made evident how the enhancement will impact them. The request is large relative to available funds. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology for High-Impact Educational Experiences in
General Education, the Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree
Program in Art, and the Concentration in Art Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Deborah Cibelli

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

91

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$39,632</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$39,632</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 computing, audiovisual and conferencing equipment to upgrade lecture classrooms for arts education. It is well written, straightforward and logical. The potential for impact is high, with over 1,600 using the rooms to be upgraded. A strong argument for need is made that incorporates pedagogy and accreditation. The equipment is of good quality and efficiently chosen. The enhancement for education is clearly laid out. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Wood Shop Project Completion-Safety and Health
Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Williams

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (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>\$64,100</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$64,100</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 Art seeks to upgrade its wood shop facility. The rationale for the project is strong, incorporating NASAD and OSHA safety requirements. It is a straightforward proposal with clear goals, measurable objectives and a detailed work plan. The faulty equipment is clearly outdated and the upgrade is appropriate. It would be helpful to know how much additional instructional space will be generated and how it will be utilized. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Diversification and Renewal of Ceramic and Sculptural
Equipment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Matthew DeFord

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 16 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

G. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$153,202</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.)

The Art Department seeks to upgrade three labs to increase safety. The application is not thorough or detailed. More attention needs to be given the rationale, which might incorporate such things as safety concerns, past accidents, or recommendations from an accrediting agency. The objectives are not clear or measurable and do not provide data such as statistics related to preventable injuries to measure against. It is not clear what curricular changes will be caused by this enhancement. The rationale for keeping the crafts area is underdeveloped. Specific examples of student activities that the upgraded labs will make possible are not provided. The potential impact of this equipment is huge, yet no measurable objectives are provided for evaluation. The additional, advanced technology itself creates instructional and safety concerns that need to be addressed. The number of students in the program is relatively small and an incremental approach might have been better. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Recording Capabilities through the Upgrade
of Magale Recital Hall and the Development of a Recording
Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: J. Mark Thompson

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

94

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$167,582</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$125,000</u>

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

This proposal seeks to upgrade the audio and visual recording capabilities of the primary concert space on campus. The argument for need is clearly established. The importance of the enhancement to accreditation is compelling, and it would impact the campus beyond the broad spectrum of arts courses affected. The maintenance plan is sound. The institutional support is laudable and significant. Much of the equipment could be acquired at a lower cost than listed. Partial funding of \$125,000 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: 17ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Learning the Language of Color in the Digital Film Process

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Blue

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

93

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$274,510</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$220,000</u>

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

This proposal seeks equipment to enhance film production education. It is a very well written, needs-based request for a growing program. The focus of the proposal on the means to develop a pedagogy of raw video is compelling. The objectives are articulately outlined. A clear discussion of new courses that will be created through this project is provided. The argument for attaining eminence is convincing. The request is high relative to available funds, but a prioritized project with reduced funding will still have a significant impact. Partial funding of \$220,000 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: 18ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Digital Cinema Technologies for New Media and
Digital Art, Visual Arts

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jamie Baldrige

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 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 16 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (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 10 (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:	<u>\$92,604</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.)

The Department of Visual Arts seeks equipment to enhance instruction in digital film production. This is an interesting proposal and generally well written but the argument for need is not strong. The relationship between the proposed technology and the training necessary to make students competitive in the workforce is not clearly established. The impact on curriculum is not made evident. There is no institutional match. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 19ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Proposed Improvements and Updates to Equipment in the Art
Education Classroom and Research Lab at the University of
Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Patricia Chambers

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 8.5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

95.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$16,956</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$16,956</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 create a state-of-the-art classroom for art education students that will simulate a teaching environment for pre-service teacher candidates. The request is modest and the proposal is brief but effective. The rationale is strongly justified. The goals are clearly written, the objectives are measurable and the work plan is detailed but efficient. It is sharply written overall. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 20ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Kiln Room Enhancement for Visual Arts, Art Education &
Industrial Design

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Gargano

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (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:	<u>\$208,878</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.)

The Department of Visual Arts seeks to upgrade the ceramics kiln room. Safety is mentioned as a concern but not developed into an argument. More details are necessary to understand what will be measured for each goal. The work plan does not establish if any building upgrades will be necessary to handle the technology. There is clear impact on a reasonably large number of courses, but it is not clear that totally automating the firing process better prepares students in firing practices. Because these expensive kilns run themselves, there is no student involvement. A long list of outcomes is provided with little detail of how they will be evaluated; examples would strengthen this section. A number of the requested costs, such as installation and training, should be covered by the institution. The request is excessive and could be formulated at much lower cost. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 21ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Scenic Projection System for Performing Arts

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shannon Miller

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No _____
A.2 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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 3.5 (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 _____ No x

G. Total Score:

86

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$80,000</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.)

The Department of Performing Arts seeks to acquire a high-lumen digital projector with multiple lenses for each performance venue. The rationale argues that upgraded projection will overcome increasing scenic budgets but does not mention the need to teach various scenic techniques. The educational outcomes need to be clearly stated in measurable terms. It is not clear if an LED curtain was considered. The impact on the curriculum is not made evident; it is not clear how this projector will replace current equipment for classroom purposes. Development of cross-curricular aspects of the project are important and need inclusion. A maintenance plan is not clearly established. The PI has experience in technical direction and also production management, though external partnerships are currently limited to one collaborator. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 22ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Post-Production Facility Enhancement for Music Media and
Music Business Programs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Chris Munson

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

G. Total Score:

92

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$35,283</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$35,283</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 upgrade an audio post-production studio and classroom. It is a well-written, modest request from a program accredited by NASM. Details are lacking for the evaluation of educational outcomes. The description of the requested equipment items is wordy and unfocused. While a more straightforward list would have been helpful, it is clear that the PIs have carefully chosen each item and justified the need. The enhancement will impact a relatively high number of students and faculty across a variety of music media and music business courses. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 23ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Organizing and Cataloging the University of Louisiana at Lafayette Costume Shop Clothing Collection

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kendra Weeks

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

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

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

F. Total Score:

67

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$41,827</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.)

The Department of Performing Arts seeks to fund student labor for organizing and cataloging its costume collection. The proposal is well written but it lacks a curricular basis. It is not clear what the educational impact is or how it would be measured. It may be possible to tie a project like this to courses for costume history or costume design, but this is not attempted. The argument for need is not compelling. The amount requested is not strongly justified. Beyond the requested equipment and supplies, which appear to be adequate, work plan and budget details are lacking for why the funds are necessary and exactly how they will be expended. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 24ARTS-16

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creation of a Digital Animation Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jeffrey Rinehart

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>9</u>	(of 10 points)
B.2	<u>17</u>	(of 21 points)
B.3	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>4.5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.6	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	<u>4</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:

93.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$94,728</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$94,728</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 Fine Arts Department seeks to build a degree program along with a specialized lab for digital media arts. The main strengths of the request are the collaborative nature of the program and the relative lack of similar regional programs. A strong collaboration already in place on campus between fine arts and computer science is a compelling asset. One flaw is that existing courses slated to help build this degree are listed by number without supporting details. The requested equipment list is straightforward, reasonable and efficient and will be effectively combined with existing supporting equipment. The eleven-station media center for digital animation appears to be appropriate. Cultural and economic impact could be elaborated, especially in light of recent State efforts to develop a film production industry. Full funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Arts
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
001ARTS-16	Mr. John Barnes	Dillard University	1 Year	E	New Request	Additive Materials Orthographic Studio [AMOS]	\$232,720.00	\$0.00	\$232,720.00
002ARTS-16	Prof. Edgar Berdahl	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	Louisiana Orchestra Of Things [LOOT]	\$81,134.00	\$0.00	\$81,134.00
003ARTS-16	Mr. Derick Ostrenko	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	Melding the Physical and Virtual through Emerging Technologies in the Arts	\$134,309.00	\$0.00	\$134,309.00
004ARTS-16	Prof. Jerry Berg	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Advancements in the Arts at Louisiana Tech	\$91,092.00	\$0.00	\$91,092.00
005ARTS-16	Mr. Paul Crook	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Arthur W. Stone Theatre Stage Manager Console	\$93,774.00	\$0.00	\$93,774.00
006ARTS-16	Mr. Adam Forrester	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	DIGR Lab	\$168,549.00	\$0.00	\$168,549.00
007ARTS-16	Prof. Mark Guinn	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Howard Auditorium Smart Classroom Enhancement	\$190,153.00	\$0.00	\$190,153.00
008ARTS-16	Mr. Frank Hamrick	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Louisiana Tech University School of Design Photography Enhancements and Upgrades	\$82,200.00	\$0.00	\$82,200.00
009ARTS-16	Dr. Kathleen Heiden	Louisiana Tech University	2 Years	NE	New Request	A Glimpse of Cultural Art Through Historic Fashion: The Development of a Virtual Museum	\$65,061.00	\$750.00	\$65,811.00
010ARTS-16	Dr. John Petzet	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Department of Music Choir Library Enhancement	\$53,673.00	\$0.00	\$53,673.00
011ARTS-16	Prof. Kyle Triplett	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Digital Fabrication Enhancement via Robotic Milling Cell	\$194,925.00	\$0.00	\$194,925.00
012ARTS-16	Prof. John Snyder	Loyola University New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Digital Filmmaking Production Infrastructure Enhancement	\$237,369.00	\$0.00	\$237,369.00
013ARTS-16	Dr. Deborah Cibelli	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Technology for High-Impact Educational Experiences in General Education, the Bachelor of Fine Arts Degree Program in Art, and the Concentration in Art Education	\$39,632.00	\$0.00	\$39,632.00
014ARTS-16	Mr. Michael Williams	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Wood Shop Project Completion - Safety and Health Enhancement	\$64,100.00	\$0.00	\$64,100.00
015ARTS-16	Mr. Matthew DeFord	Northwestern State University	1 Year	E	New Request	The Diversification and Renewal of Ceramic and Sculptural Equipment	\$153,202.00	\$0.00	\$153,202.00
016ARTS-16	Dr. J. Thompson	Northwestern State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Recording Capabilities through the Upgrade of Magale Recital Hall and the Development of a Recording Studio	\$167,582.00	\$0.00	\$167,582.00
017ARTS-16	Dr. MARY BLUE	Tulane University	1 Year	E	New Request	Learning the Language of Color in the Digital Film Process	\$274,510.00	\$0.00	\$274,510.00
018ARTS-16	Prof. Jamie Baldrige	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Advanced Digital Cinema Technologies for New Media and Digital Art, Visual Arts	\$92,604.00	\$0.00	\$92,604.00
019ARTS-16	Dr. Patricia Chambers	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Proposed Improvements and Updates to Equipment in the Art Education Classroom and Research Lab at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette	\$16,956.00	\$0.00	\$16,956.00
020ARTS-16	Prof. JOHN GARGANO	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Kiln Room Enhancement for Visual Arts, Art Education & Industrial Design	\$208,878.00	\$0.00	\$208,878.00

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Arts
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
021ARTS-16	Mr. Shannon Miller	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Digital Scenic Projection System for Performing Arts	\$80,000.00	\$0.00	\$80,000.00
022ARTS-16	Mr. Chris Munson	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Post-Production Facility Enhancement for Music Media and Music Business Programs	\$35,283.00	\$0.00	\$35,283.00
023ARTS-16	Mrs. Kendra Weeks	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	New Request	Organizing and Cataloging the University of Louisiana at Lafayette Costume Shop Clothing Collection	\$41,827.00	\$0.00	\$41,827.00
024ARTS-16	Mr. jeffrey rinehart	University of New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Creation of a Digital Animation Studio	\$94,728.00	\$0.00	\$94,728.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	24
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,894,261.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$750.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,895,011.00

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)