

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN HEALTH AND
MEDICAL SCIENCES

February 2016

Prepared by:

Thomas C. Robinson (Chair)
University of Kentucky

Wilsie S. Bishop
East Tennessee State University

2015-16 Board of Regents Support Fund Traditional Enhancement

Health and Medical Sciences

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. Thomas C. Robinson, University of Kentucky, chair; and Dr. Wilsie S. Bishop, East Tennessee State University, communicated via e-mail and phone in January 2016, for the purpose of evaluating thirty (30) Health and Medical Sciences 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: thirty (30) Health and Medical 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; d) a copy of the 2012-2013 Traditional Enhancement Final Report in the Health and Medical Sciences.

Prior to the review, each panel member independently evaluated and annotated each of the thirty 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 93 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	98	29HM-16	ULM	\$115,200	\$115,200	\$0	\$0
2	96.5	20HM-16	OLOLC	\$103,845	\$84,700		
3	96	27HM-16	ULM	\$73,706	\$73,706		
4	95.5	09HM-16	LSUHSCN	\$277,888	\$131,104		
5	95	30HM-16	UNO	\$81,645	\$75,495		
6	94.5	16HM-16	MCN	\$81,963	\$79,299		
7	94	17HM-16	NSU	\$167,256	\$124,069		
8	93.5	24HM-16	ULL	\$53,408	\$53,408		
9	93.25	14HM-16	LaTech	\$32,176	\$32,176	\$50,000	\$35,000
10	93	04HM-16	LSUA&M	\$150,000	\$100,000		
TOTALS:				\$1,137,087	\$869,157	\$50,000	\$35,000

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
11	92.5	02HM-16	FTCC	\$71,020	\$71,020		
11	92.5	22HM-16	TUHSC	\$493,980	\$492,480		
13	92	03HM-16	FTCC	\$82,583	\$73,614		
13	92	26HM-16	ULM	\$172,204	\$166,784		
15	90	11HM-16	LaTech	\$90,034	\$89,266		
15	90	21HM-16	SLU	\$98,651	\$84,036		
17	89	06HM-16	LSUA&M	\$59,840	\$59,840		
18	88	05HM-16	LSUA&M	\$61,264	\$58,764		
19	87.5	28HM-16	ULM	\$142,281	\$131,671		
20	87	13HM-16	LaTech	\$101,455	\$99,195		
21	86	07HM-16	LSUHSCN	\$119,804	\$109,194		
21	86	10HM-16	LSUHSCN	\$107,755	\$81,697		
23	84	15HM-16	LaTech	\$37,607	\$37,607		
24	80	08HM-16	LSUHSCN	\$34,529	\$34,529		
25	79.5	12HM-16	LaTech	\$112,498	\$107,400		
26	75	01HM-16	Dillard	\$101,285	\$83,285		
TOTALS:				\$1,886,790	\$1,780,382	\$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
27	70	23HM-16	ULL	\$92,605	\$0		
27	70	25HM-16	ULM	\$260,165	\$0		
	NR	18HM-16	Nunez	\$125,464	\$0		
	NR	19HM-16	Nunez	\$120,117	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$598,351	\$0	\$0	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01HM-16

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Health Sciences Curriculum Using Smart Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wodajo Welldaregay

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

75

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$101,285

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$83,285

(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 project seeks to upgrade classroom technology resources and revise curricula to enhance the campus' ability to meet accreditation and job market standards. The goals and objectives are well written and clear. The work plan is well organized and thorough. The faculty appears competent and able to carry out the project. However, the rationale is not strongly stated. No evidence is presented as to how the grant would propel the department to eminence. The argument for increasing enrollment and graduation through improved facilities is not persuasive. It is not clear how the project will specifically enhance the quality of faculty instruction or which pedagogical practices could be incorporated. The equipment request is not strongly justified or linked to goals and objectives. The argument for economic development is weak. Partial funding of \$83,285 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match consists only of indirect costs and may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02HM-16

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Breathing New Life into Cardiopulmonary Care Science Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Errol Champagne

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 21 (of 21 points)
B.3 4.5 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score:

92.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$71,020</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$71,020</u>

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal seeks to purchase a high fidelity simulation system to enhance the program's current patient care lab resources and support instruction in ventilation management for respiratory science students. The plan of work and methods of assessment are clearly presented with measurable outcomes. Justification is provided that supports use of this technology to provide better prepared graduates for the healthcare workforce. The proposal indicates a health system partner that speaks to the need for this level of training, but no matching funds are offered. Maintenance and care of the RespiSim System will be provided by the requesting institution. Student tech and lab fees will maintain supplies and equipment for extended use. Including a Co-PI with expertise in developing clinical scenarios would have improved the proposal. Full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03HM-16

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing and Expanding High-Fidelity Simulations in Nursing
and Allied Health

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sonia Clarke

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

92

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$82,583</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$73,614</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 project seeks to provide alternate clinical learning opportunities through enhancement and expansion of an existing clinical simulation patient care lab for nursing students. The project rationale is articulate and compelling and correctly notes that competition in the healthcare sector is rapidly growing with increasingly complex technology. The impact of the project on current nursing and allied health labs is clearly stated. The goals and objectives are well written and clear. The timetable presented is informative. The evaluation plan is organized and thoughtful. The requested equipment is clearly justified. The argument for achieving eminence cites potential papers and presentations but does not explain the impact they would make. Reduced funding for training and shipping is suggested. Partial funding of \$73,614 is recommended if 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 REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Institute for Healthcare Education and Careers [IHEC]: Developing a Pipeline to Healthcare Careers by Preparing Underrepresented Minority Undergraduate Students to Enter a Career in Healthcare through Mentorship

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Annie Daniel

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 7 (of 8 points)
B.4 6 (of 8 points)
B.5 8 (of 8 points)
B.6 8 (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: 93 (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>\$150,000</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$35,000</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 develop a pipeline to veterinary medicine careers for underrepresented minority undergraduate students by partnering with HBCUs to establish professional development for faculty and create a multi-level mentoring program. This interesting and well-developed proposal is similar to a program that the PI has instituted in a previous position. The proposal provides strong justification for partnering with HBCUs to create a mentorship program and providing experiences that link HBCU faculty to veterinary programs. The use of peer tutors is documented as a proven concept for influencing undergraduate students in specific career fields. This is such a comprehensive program that the goals are numerous. Use of benchmarks or expected measures of success would have strengthened and focused the proposal. In the budget, consultant costs seem high (\$40,000/year) when the PI's background demonstrates capability and expertise to implement the grant. The proposal contains typographical and formatting errors. Partial funding of \$100,000 in year one and \$35,000 in year two 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: 05HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Implementing Clinical Ultrasound in Kinesiology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dennis Landin

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$61,264
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$58,764

(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 project seeks to equip clinical anatomy and cardiovascular physiology laboratories in order to enhance instructional and research opportunities for students in the study of musculoskeletal and cardiovascular dynamics. The proposal does a good job of showing the need and impact the new equipment will have on the curricula. The goals and objectives are well written, clear and concise. A strong statement is made for achieving eminence. A convincing case is made for the impact on student research and the enhancement of the curriculum. A compelling argument is provided for the increase in the quality of future graduate and undergraduate students. The work plan lacks detail and description. The evaluation plan is weak. The schedule of activities lacks detail and appears to be out of order. Partial funding of \$58,764 is recommended if funding becomes 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: 06HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of Transportation & Monitoring Platform to
Support Multi-modal Multi-site Imaging for Biomedical Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kenneth Matthews II

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$59,840
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$59,840

(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 innovative grant proposal seeks to develop a transportation and monitoring platform to support multi-modal and multi-site imaging for biomedical research. It is well written and clearly focused on developing new technology to support a trending field, with collaboration among three institutions. The objectives and the costs of the project are clearly tied to development of the transportation system and testing its usefulness. Students will be involved in the process and in the related research endeavors. The grant is not heavily focused on student learning as a primary objective; thus, objectives as stated and proposed measurements are acceptable. Following development, this system may be patentable, as other institutions may find such a device useful for the transport of animals for various reasons related to biomedical research. No matching funds beyond indirect costs are being provided by any of the three participating institutions. Few details are provided on housing and maintenance of the equipment, perhaps in part because the object of the grant is to develop the equipment. Full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Nurse Anesthesia Education to Improve the Quality
of Anesthesia Care Provided in Rural Settings

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura Bonanno

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 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 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: \$119,804
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$109,194

(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 project seeks to provide graduate students clinical training in the advanced skills of ultrasound guided regional anesthesia and difficult airway management. A convincing case is made for need. The goals are not clearly stated. The stated objectives are actually the specific activities that need to be done to meet the goals and objectives of the project. However, these activities are well written and detailed, with measureable results. The argument for obtaining eminence essentially restates the need, and an opportunity is missed to cite the quest for accreditation and how this equipment could propel the team forward. An informative chart is provided relative to curriculum, but the text does not clearly describe the impact. How the project will help attract and retains students is not clearly stated. The impact on faculty is not discussed. No detailed formative and summative evaluation plan is provided. The equipment appears to be proper and necessary, but the equipment section also relies too heavily on charts rather than providing precise statements to justify the request. Partial funding of \$109,194 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match consists only of indirect costs and may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creating a Realistic Experience for Home Health Simulation for Undergraduate Nursing and Occupational Therapy Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katherine Carter

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 0 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ 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: \$34,529
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$34,529

(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 a simulated apartment to teach nursing and occupational therapy students techniques for managing patients and families in the home environment. The objectives readily match the budget request. The purpose and benefits of sending faculty to a development session for interprofessional education are not clearly linked to the proposal's objectives. Measurement of objectives would be stronger if focus was on showing how the simulation experiences in the proposed apartment will enhance learning. Use of a control group or outcomes data from previous students compared to students who have access to the simulated apartment would be helpful. The items requested to equip the simulated apartment are reasonable and basic. The proposal argues that interprofessional education is part of the Quality Enhancement Plan for the institution's accreditation. However, no institutional matching funds are identified beyond indirect costs. There is no discussion of the maintenance and care of the requested equipment and supplies. Full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Simulation for Gulf Coast Region Disasters to Facilitate
Critical Thinking and Leadership/Management Skills for
Pre-Licensure Nursing Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alison Davis

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 8.5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (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 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: 95.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$277,888</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$131,104</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 project seeks to provide realistic, multiple disaster simulation scenarios for pre-licensure nursing students. Students will be exposed to region-specific disasters while honing critical thinking and management/leadership skills imperative to the care of the unique populations affected. Strong citations help document the need for disaster prep nurses. The goals and objectives are clear, concise and measurable. The work plan is clearly described. A convincing case is made for eminence in that this would be the only such program in the State and would be a major community resource. The curriculum would clearly be enhanced and the skill sets of graduates would be impacted. The requested amount is high relative to the total available funds, but a scaled-back project would still be viable. Partial funding of \$131,104 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match consists only of indirect costs and may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preparing BSN Students with the Use of Automated Medication
Dispensing Devices to Enhance Clinical Simulation Experiences
Focusing on Enhanced Patient Safety and Fiscal Responsibility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rose Schaubhut

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 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 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 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: \$107,755
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$81,697

(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 help nursing students gain confidence in medicine administration, a discipline that is generally taught with the use of automated systems in health care facilities. Students do not have the opportunity to train on these devices before being placed in a position to administer medications. While the PI suggests that the goal is to help students gain confidence, it appears that the ultimate goal is a reduction of medication errors in practice. Carefully defined objectives and a plan for their measurement to demonstrate improved student learning outcomes would have made this a stronger grant request. This request has a good justification for need. The institution has a technology fee that will be used to provide supplies in the future, but not the initial supplies valued at \$12,000. The institution does have simulators for high-fidelity simulation. This piece of equipment represents more of an upgrade than an enhancement that would add major national recognition. Partial funding of \$81,697 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match, which consists only of indirect costs, may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Pediatric Audiology Program at
Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Matthew Bryan

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$90,034</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$89,266</u>

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal seeks to obtain essential equipment for the screening, assessment, and fitting of amplification on children with hearing loss. A good case is made for the enhancement of pediatric audiology capabilities, and the need for an enhanced program in this region. The acquisition of this equipment would also have positive implications for ASHA accreditation. The impact on existing resources is well described. The work plan is thorough. The equipment request is appropriate given the project's purpose. The program has adequate space to house this equipment. The proposal does not present true, measurable goals and objectives, but instead describes activities. The case for achieving eminence is not detailed or fully developed. The evaluation plan lacks details, and a convincing case is not made that the project will be effective. The proposal is, overall, a good submission addressing a defined need. Reduced funding for shipping and installation is suggested and partial funding of \$89,266 is recommended if 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: 12HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Gold-standard Equipment to Enhance the
Kinesiology and Nutrition Curricula at Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jordan Glenn

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 21 points)
B.3 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 1 (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: 79.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$112,498
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$107,400

(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 requests two pieces of equipment identified as the "gold standard" for Kinesiology and Nutrition curricula. The request notes that approximately 595 students per quarter on average would have access to the equipment. Specific courses are identified that would be enhanced by having this equipment, which does provide a case for student use rather than faculty research. However, the objectives fell short. While each goal is identified along with a description of how the proposed equipment purchase would help meet the goal, there are no identified measures or benchmarks to assess goal attainment. What are the anticipated student outcomes that will be measured as a result of having this equipment? Of the three team members, one has experience with DXA and the other two bring related experience. Secure housing of the equipment is discussed, with maintenance being provided by a laboratory coordinator. No information is provided on this individual's knowledge or ability to maintain the equipment. Maintenance contracts for the equipment are not described. Partial funding of \$107,400 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match consists only of indirect costs and may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Aligning Nursing Education with Current Practice: Clinical Skills Lab Enhancement Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tara Haskins

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)

E.2a 7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (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 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

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

RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$101,455
Recommended Amount: \$99,195

(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 equipment to improve an existing clinical skills laboratory. The current lab is clearly outdated and contains antiquated equipment. The need is evident. The goals and objectives are well written, clear and applicable. The requested equipment is proper and would address the stated needs. The proposal fails to label and differentiate the current situation from the section on rationale and impact on existing resources. The described evaluation plan is confusing and it is not clear that the results achieved would be substantive. No details are provided on potential for the project propelling the department to eminence. The case for impact on the curriculum is not clear or compelling. The description of the impact on quality of students cites good literature on the usefulness of simulation and its positive influence on students and their skills, but the section overall is not very developed. The description of the impact on faculty development is weak and lacks details. Reduced funding for training is suggested. Partial funding of \$99,195 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match consists only of indirect costs and may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading Food Sciences Research and Teaching Laboratory
to Improve Student Foodservice Management Experiences in
Nutrition and Dietetics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pei Liu

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 4.25 (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:

93.25

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$32,176</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$32,176</u>

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

The proposal seeks to renovate a nutrition and dietetics lab with upgraded equipment. Pictures of the current lab situation are provided. The lab facilities are in significant disrepair and out of date, which must significantly impact the institution's ability to recruit students or to adequately prepare them for the workforce. This upgrade will directly serve 100 students annually and six nutrition and dietetics faculty. The institution has committed funds to match equipment costs and for faculty-release time. The proposal identifies ways of assessing the effectiveness of upgrading the equipment. However, measurable benchmarks for student achievement or student satisfaction through exit surveys of students or employer surveys would provide definitive ways of measuring effectiveness of the requested upgrade. The upgrades being requested are critical for accreditation. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15HM-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Unique Patient Identification: A Simulation of Multiple
Biometric Modalities

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kim Theodos

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$37,607
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$37,607

(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 funding for two Biometric Learning Simulators (BLS) to be utilized in a newly created biometric classroom and one in a proposed biometrics laboratory. The rationale is strong. The requested equipment is appropriate and the faculty are qualified. The impact on curriculum is clearly described. The terms "goals" and "objectives" are used interchangeably, those identified are not measurable, and a number of them are actually activities. The evaluation plan lacks details and is not clear. Achieving eminence is not addressed. A plan is described to use the equipment at schools and career fairs but this is not linked to recruitment. Full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16HM-16

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Medical Laboratory Science Blood Banking Simulation Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sonya Hidalgo

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 21 (of 21 points)
B.3 4.5 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 94.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$81,963
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$79,299

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

The proposal seeks equipment for labs to enhance blood banking instruction. This is a well-written proposal. The objectives are clearly stated and measurable. The rationale is strong. The institution has established a relationship with area hospitals to receive supplies to support the use of this equipment. In addition, the department is offering a \$3,000 match for the equipment. This equipment will provide an important curricular component that is currently not available. While students are required to learn critical techniques related to blood banking during their internships, a critical project goal is to provide them with this knowledge beforehand. There are currently 61 majors in the Medical Laboratory Science program. The grant includes four letters of support both from administrators and from health care affiliates. The panel suggests that funding for shipping and supplies be reduced and that the institution attempt to cover these expenses. Partial funding of \$79,299 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match is to be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17HM-16

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Distance Education: Quality, Accessible Learning
Environments for Nursing and Allied Health Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Maxine Johnson

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score:

94

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$167,256</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$124,069</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 expand and upgrade three video conferencing classrooms, one each on the NSU campuses in Alexandria, Leesville-Ft. Polk, and Shreveport. The largest users of these facilities are the College of Nursing and the School of Allied Health. The rationale for upgrading and expanding long-distance education opportunities is clearly described. The goals and objectives, along with the work plan, are written simply and clearly, and are related to the need. The description of the impact on the curriculum is compact but precise and to the point. The impact on faculty development is also brief but exactly written. The evaluation plan is solid. The discussion of relationships with industrial sponsors is detailed and specific. The promotion of economic development is well written. The section on achieving eminence is not convincing or clearly worded. The request is high relative to the total available funds; a scaled-down version of the three simulation rooms, or equipping two fully with the institution subsidizing part of the third is suggested. Partial funding of \$124,069 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. There is no institutional match.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 18HM-16

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Building a Bridge

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score: NR (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$125,464</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 proposal was not scored because it was essentially a duplicate of proposal 19HM-16, with entire sections repeated verbatim including the budgets and with occasional lapses where the focus academic group identified in 18HM-16 was not even substituted in 19HM-16. The RFP clearly indicates that duplicate grants will not be accepted (Page 3: "ELIGIBILITY OF DUPLICATE PROPOSALS"); therefore this grant proposal is disqualified from consideration. For the benefit of the submitting team, the panel made the following observations applicable to both proposals. The proposal seeks various equipment, software and supplies to enhance health and medical sciences education. It lacks a coherent description of the purpose of the request. The writing is imprecise and would benefit from following a good outline with the purpose clearly stated at the beginning and expected outcomes better identified. While there appears to be a need for adequate equipment to support the teaching needs of the department and the expected increase of students who will participate in the LPN to RN program, the equipment requested is not linked to specific courses or learning objectives. Objectives are identified, but it was difficult to see how the equipment request supports them. Benchmarks for improvement are not evident in the performance measures. The work plan is not clear and specific requests are not linked to specific courses. While it is obvious there is a need at this institution for basic teaching materials for Anatomy and Physiology courses, this proposal needs more focus to let the reviewers know how the equipment requested will be used to enhance the curriculum.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 19HM-16

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Certified Nursing Assistants [CNA]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score:

NR

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$120,117</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</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 proposal was not scored because it was essentially a duplicate of proposal 18HM-16, with entire sections repeated verbatim including the budgets and with occasional lapses where the focus academic group identified in 19HM-16 was not even substituted in 18HM-16. The RFP clearly indicates that duplicate grants will not be accepted (Page 3: "ELIGIBILITY OF DUPLICATE PROPOSALS"); therefore this grant proposal is disqualified from consideration. For the benefit of the submitting team, the panel made observations applicable to both proposals that are provided on the rating form in this report for proposal 18HM-16.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

20HM-16

INSTITUTION: Our Lady of the Lake College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: EMERGE: Enhancing Medical SuRgical CRitical ThinkinG
among BaccalaureatE Nursing Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carla Harmon

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 21 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 4.5 (of 5 points)
B.5 4.5 (of 5 points)
B.6 4.5 (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: 96.5 (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
		Recommended Amount:	
		<u>\$103,845</u>	<u>\$0</u>
		<u>\$84,700</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 project seeks to enhance the curriculum for pre-licensure baccalaureate degree students to increase their clinical reasoning capacity to manage complex health needs of patients. This is a well-written proposal that identifies courses which are linked to the requested equipment. It provides a justification for the request based on improving critical thinking and standardizing experiences of students. Objectives are clearly identified with appropriate measurements. The instruments that will be used to measure progress are clearly described. Benchmarks are identified to recognize achievement of objectives. An outstanding description is provided of the evaluation plan. The described economic and cultural development is based on workforce development. This requested equipment is appropriate for what is currently considered competitive, state-of-the-art nursing education. The proposal does an effective job of describing the planned use of existing equipment and how it will complement the equipment being provided as institutional match. Four letters of support speak to the institution's support of this grant request. The equipment costs appear high, and the panel suggests reduced funding for training, supplies and software. Partial funding of \$84,700 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: 21HM-16

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Nursing Competency and Patient Safety through
High-Fidelity Simulation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kristie Riddle

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ 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: \$98,651
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$84,036

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal seeks to acquire upgraded simulators focused on improving medication administration for nursing students. The rationale clearly and concisely addresses the process and need to improve the safety and effectiveness of simulation labs. The section concerning impact on existing resources is well written. The objectives are nearly perfect but are not linked to measurable outcomes. A model work plan is provided. The impact on curriculum is clearly stated. The impact on the quality of students is well addressed by the hands-on simulation approach. The project evaluation is minimal and should have included a specific formative and summative evaluation protocol. How this project could enhance the program's relationship with clinical facilities was not addressed in the economic and cultural impact section, though a relationship with North Oaks Hospital was mentioned elsewhere in the narrative. Reduced funding for training, shipping and installation is suggested. Partial funding of \$84,036 is recommended if additional funds become available. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 22HM-16

INSTITUTION: Tulane University Health Sciences Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ImageStream Mark II Imaging Flow Cytometer

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yan Dong

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. 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 8.5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 92.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$493,980
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$492,480

(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 requests a sophisticated Imaging Flow Cytometer that will be used by researchers from multiple institutions and facilities. This is an excellent proposal and well written. A clear description is provided of the benefits of this particular piece of equipment. Plans for the cytometer's housing and maintenance are well described. Tulane Cancer Center will cover service contracts for maintenance. The matching commitments are impressive. The availability of this equipment would enhance the research and educational environment for four institutions in the New Orleans vicinity, and provide significant potential for increases in federal funds and perhaps improved patent incomes. It is not clear, however, that a large number of students would be impacted. This would be an excellent research tool and it appears teaching would be adjunct to research. While this proposal is ranked high, the reviewers are very concerned that the budget cannot be reduced and highly recommending it for funding would severely limit funding available for other excellent grant requests. Reduced funding for shipping is suggested. Partial funding of \$492,480 is recommended if additional funds become available. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 23HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Undergraduate and Graduate Student Learning
in the Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Greggory Davis

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

70

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$92,605</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 enhance ULL's Human Performance Laboratory for education and research. While the request is for equipment upgrades, the stated purpose of the grant is faculty and student development, which creates a confusing and disjointed narrative. Discussions of the requested equipment and its impact on existing equipment, along with the faculty involved, are adequate. However, the need is never clearly stated and linked to curriculum development. Some of the goals and objectives are actually activities, and this proposal section is not well organized. The work plan is poorly presented and does not address to whom the responsibility for each task is assigned. The proposal does not contain an evaluation protocol and it does not make a case for achieving eminence. The case for economic impact is poorly written and lacks substance. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 24HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Health Informatics Lab for Population Health
Data Analytics and Decision Support to Facilitate Learning and
Curriculum Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Scott Sittig

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 7.5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (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 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 _____ No X

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: \$53,408
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$53,408

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

This proposal requests funds to establish a Health Informatics Lab for Population Health and Data Analytics. The lab would support more than 300 students per year. A significant institutional match is provided. In addition, a local company is willing to provide \$29,040 in software licensing for the lab. This demonstrates significant institutional and community support. While detailed discussion is included on the importance of the lab to curriculum development, further discussion of how the lab would be used and evaluated for effectiveness in supporting student learning in the five courses identified to be taught in the lab would have strengthened the proposal. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 25HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laser Scanning Confocal Microscope for ULM
Pharmaceutical Sciences Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Karen Briski

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

70

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$260,165</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 project requests funds to replace the ULM School of Pharmacy's obsolete confocal system with a Zeiss LSM 800 microscope with Airyscan detection. This would expand the capabilities of the PI to conduct her research and the equipment is appropriate for what the team is doing. This proposal is less compelling than competing proposals from the same team and institution. The need is not evident. The work plan is limited and not convincing. The evaluation plan lacks substance. The impact on both research and education appears limited as presented. The description of impact on curriculum, students and faculty lacks details. The section on economic development is poorly written and insubstantial. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 26HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ULM Nursing Simulation Center Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Glaze

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 8 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (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 3.5 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 3.5 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

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: \$172,204
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$166,784

(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 requests funding for three high-fidelity simulators and accessories to support them. While the institution currently has a simulation lab for its nursing students, some of the simulators are out of date and will no longer be serviced by the manufacturer. At the same time, the institution has been requested to admit more students. A case is made for more cost-effective teaching of larger numbers of students as well as better preparation for the workforce with the use of simulation. An impressive institutional match is included. The proposal clearly links the learner outcomes to the funding of this project as well as having measurable goals for completing the project. Simulation will be added to existing clinical courses and better performance on summative evaluation instruments is expected. The equipment costs appear to be high and reduced funding for installation and shipping is suggested. Partial funding of \$166,784 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: 27HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of Peptide and Protein Facility at ULM

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Seetharama Jois

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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 RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$73,706</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$73,706</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 enhance protein biochemistry and interfacing areas of drug-discovery research in the School of Pharmacy at ULM by establishing a protein/peptide research instrumentation facility with three new instruments. The case for need is convincing. A strong rationale is provided for the research equipment. The goals and objectives are clearly written, concise and persuasive. The work plan is solid and a summary of impacted projects is provided. A clear and concise statement is provided describing how the project will propel the program to eminence. The description of impact on the curriculum is compelling. The evaluation plan includes legitimate benchmarks. The section on economic development is creatively argued. The description of impact on the quality of students is a generalized statement. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 28HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Bench-top Twin Screw Extruder to Enhance
Industrial Pharmacy Curriculum, Training, and Research at ULM

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sami Nazzal

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 3.5 (of 5 points)
B.4 3.5 (of 5 points)
B.5 3.5 (of 5 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 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:

87.5

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$142,281</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$131,671</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 requests funding to obtain a piece of cutting-edge equipment (Bench-top Twin Screw Extruder) that will allow students interested in industrial pharmacy to develop unique skills. A legitimate case is made for attracting potential graduate students with the equipment; however, broad-base application to the majority of pharmacy students, both graduate and undergraduate, is not demonstrated. The proposal could have more effectively linked use of the equipment to goals of the curriculum and/or specific classes. The Dean's letter of support indicated a match but did not speak to the need for this piece of equipment. This extruder will be used for teaching and research and will also offer opportunities for ULM to provide a contract service in the region. The equipment costs appear high, and reduced funding is suggested for supplies and installation. Partial funding of \$131,671 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: 29HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Low-volume Microfluidizer and Mini Spray Dryer for the
Fabrication of Nano and Micro-particles to Enhance Basic
Research in Drug Delivery

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sami Nazzal

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 21 (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:

98

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$115,200</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$115,200</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 an LV1 low volume benchtop high shear homogenizer to support research in cell and molecular biology. The need is clearly stated and supportable. The project will enhance the ongoing research because current BORSF-funded equipment has limits on sample size and the requested item does not. The goals and objectives are clear, concise, and convincing. The work plan is solid and appropriate. The authors do a great job of demonstrating the project's potential to propel the department to a higher level of eminence. Impact on the curriculum is amply addressed. The description of the impact on faculty is believable and clearly written. The evaluation plan is adequate. Specific examples of existing industrial partnerships are provided. The case for economic development is compelling. A substantial institutional match is provided. The case for impact on the quality of students is less convincing. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 30HM-16

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: BoR Enhancement Proposal to Complete Equiping Health
Science Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marc Bonis

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 4.5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 4.5 (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:

95

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$81,645</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$75,495</u>

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

This proposal requests minimal equipment and supplies to reinstate the human performance lab that was dismantled after Hurricane Katrina in 2005. The objectives of the request focus on returning this necessary teaching lab to full operational status and providing a place for hands-on instruction for eleven courses. There is also a plan to identify needs of stakeholders to assure that the lab has the right focus. Measurement of success with student learning expectations would have strengthened the proposal. The equipment being requested is described as essential to delivery of this revived educational program in a way that is based on needs of the community. There is no institutional match. Reduced funding is suggested for supplies, shipping and software. Partial funding of \$75,495 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Health and Medical 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
001HM-16	Dr. Wodajo Welldaregay	Dillard University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Health Sciences Curriculum Using Smart Classroom	\$101,285.00	\$0.00	\$101,285.00
002HM-16	Mr. Errol Champagne	Fletcher Technical Community College	1 Year	E	New Request	Breathing New Life into Cardiopulmonary Care Science Program	\$71,020.00	\$0.00	\$71,020.00
003HM-16	Dr. Sonia Clarke	Fletcher Technical Community College	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing and Expanding High-Fidelity Simulations in Nursing and Allied Health	\$82,583.00	\$0.00	\$82,583.00
004HM-16	Dr. Annie Daniel	Louisiana State University and A & M College	2 Years	NE	New Request	The Institute for Healthcare Education and Careers [IHEC]: Developing a Pipeline to Healthcare Careers by Preparing Underrepresented Minority Undergraduate Students to Enter a Career in Healthcare through Mentorship	\$150,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$200,000.00
005HM-16	Prof. Dennis Landin	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	Implementing Clinical Ultrasound in Kinesiology.	\$61,264.00	\$0.00	\$61,264.00
006HM-16	Dr. Kenneth Matthews II	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	Development of Transportation & Monitoring Platform to support multi-modal multi-site imaging for biomedical research	\$59,840.00	\$0.00	\$59,840.00
007HM-16	Dr. Laura Bonanno	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Nurse Anesthesia Education to Improve the Quality of Anesthesia Care Provided in Rural Settings	\$119,804.00	\$0.00	\$119,804.00
008HM-16	Dr. Katherine Carter	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Creating a Realistic Experience for Home Health Simulation for Undergraduate Nursing and Occupational Therapy Students	\$34,529.00	\$0.00	\$34,529.00
009HM-16	Dr. Alison Davis	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Simulation for Gulf Coast Region Disasters to Facilitate Critical Thinking and Leadership/Management Skills for Pre-Licensure Nursing Students	\$277,888.00	\$0.00	\$277,888.00
010HM-16	Dr. Rose Schaubhut	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Preparing BSN Students with the Use of Automated Medication Dispensing Devices to Enhance Clinical Simulation Experiences Focusing on Enhanced Patient Safety and Fiscal Responsibility	\$107,755.00	\$0.00	\$107,755.00
011HM-16	Dr. Matthew Bryan	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of the Pediatric Audiology Program at Louisiana Tech University	\$90,034.00	\$0.00	\$90,034.00
012HM-16	Dr. Jordan Glenn	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Acquisition of gold-standard equipment to enhance the Kinesiology and Nutrition curricula at Louisiana Tech University	\$112,498.00	\$0.00	\$112,498.00
013HM-16	Dr. Tara Haskins	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Aligning nursing education with current practice: Clinical skills lab enhancement project	\$101,455.00	\$0.00	\$101,455.00
014HM-16	Dr. Pei Liu	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Upgrading food sciences research and teaching laboratory to improve student foodservice management experiences in Nutrition and Dietetics	\$32,176.00	\$0.00	\$32,176.00

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Health and Medical 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
015HM-16	Prof. Kim Theodos	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Unique Patient Identification: A simulation of multiple biometric modalities	\$37,607.00	\$0.00	\$37,607.00
016HM-16	Ms. Sonya Hidalgo	McNeese State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Medical Laboratory Science Blood Banking Simulation Lab	\$81,963.00	\$0.00	\$81,963.00
017HM-16	Ms. Maxine Johnson	Northwestern State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Distance Education: Quality, Accessible Learning Environments for Nursing and Allied Health Students	\$167,256.00	\$0.00	\$167,256.00
018HM-16	Mr. Stephen Waddell	Nunez Community College	1 Year	E	New Request	Building a Bridge	\$125,464.00	\$0.00	\$125,464.00
019HM-16	Mr. Stephen Waddell	Nunez Community College	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Certified Nursing Assistants [CNA]	\$120,117.00	\$0.00	\$120,117.00
020HM-16	Dr. Carla Harmon	Our Lady of the Lake College	2 Years	E	New Request	EMERGE: Enhancing MEDical SuRgical CRITICAL ThinkinG among BaccalaureatE Nursing Students	\$103,845.00	\$0.00	\$103,845.00
021HM-16	Dr. Kristie Riddle	Southeastern Louisiana University	1 Year	E	New Request	Increasing Nursing Competency and Patient Safety through High-Fidelity Simulation	\$98,651.00	\$0.00	\$98,651.00
022HM-16	Dr. Yan Dong	Tulane University Health Sciences Center	1 Year	E	New Request	ImageStream Mark II Imaging Flow Cytometer	\$493,980.00	\$0.00	\$493,980.00
023HM-16	Dr. Gregory Davis	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing Undergraduate and Graduate Student Learning in the Laboratory	\$92,605.00	\$0.00	\$92,605.00
024HM-16	Mr. Scott Sittig	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Development of a Health Informatics Lab for Population Health Data Analytics and Decision Support to Facilitate Learning and Curriculum Enhancement	\$53,408.00	\$0.00	\$53,408.00
025HM-16	Dr. Karen B	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1 Year	E	New Request	Laser Scanning Confocal Microscope for ULM Pharmaceutical Sciences Research	\$260,165.00	\$0.00	\$260,165.00
026HM-16	Ms. Donna Glaze	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1 Year	E	New Request	ULM Nursing Simulation Center Enhancement	\$172,204.00	\$0.00	\$172,204.00
027HM-16	Dr. Seetharama Jois	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1 Year	E	New Request	Establishment of peptide and protein facility at ULM	\$73,706.00	\$0.00	\$73,706.00
028HM-16	Dr. sami nazzal	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1 Year	E	New Request	Acquisition of a bench-top twin screw extruder to enhance industrial pharmacy curriculum, training, and research at ULM	\$142,281.00	\$0.00	\$142,281.00
029HM-16	Dr. sami nazzal	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1 Year	E	New Request	Low-volume microfluidizer and mini spray dryer for the fabrication of nano and micro-particles to enhance basic research in drug delivery	\$115,200.00	\$0.00	\$115,200.00
030HM-16	Dr. Marc Bonis	University of New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	BoR Enhancement Proposal to Complete Equipping Health Science Lab	\$81,645.00	\$0.00	\$81,645.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	24
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$3,622,228.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$50,000.00
Total Money Requested	\$3,672,228.00

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)