

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS**

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

**March 2016**

**Prepared by:**

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

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS  
REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
FY 2015-16**

**Introduction**

Twenty-three (23) Multidisciplinary Enhancement proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents staff for review by the panel chair, Dr. Jeff Dean, Department Head of Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, Entomology, and Plant Pathology at Mississippi State University. The proposals were divided into the root disciplines eligible for this year's competition (Agricultural Sciences, Arts, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Engineering A, and Health and Medical Sciences) and distributed to seven (7) subject-area reviewers.

Dr. Dean received the following materials for review: (a) the twenty-three (23) proposals submitted along with the appropriately numbered rating forms; (b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators, submitting institutions, funds requested, etc.; (c) the FY 2015-16 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals (RFP); and a copy of the FY 2012-13 Multidisciplinary Enhancement Report.

The subject-area reviewers submitted their evaluations of individual proposals by February 26, 2016 electronically to Dr. Dean for further review. The reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP. After careful consideration and communication with subject-area reviewers, the proposals were ranked and funding recommendations were made.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table II contains a rank-order list of proposals not recommended for funding. 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 83 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.

**MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT, FY 2015-16**

**SUBJECT-AREA REVIEWERS**

Mike Daniels, Agricultural Sciences	University of Arkansas
Virginia Rougon-Chavis, Arts	University of Mississippi
P. Jonathan Patchett, Earth & Environmental Sciences	University of Arizona
Shaikh Ahmed, Computer and Electrical Engineering	Southern Illinois University
Chris Cherry, Civil Engineering	University of Tennessee
Brandon Weeks, Chemical Engineering	Texas Tech University
Steven Chesbro, Health and Medical Sciences	Alabama State University

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

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Discipline	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	97	16MUL-16	ULL	Earth	\$138,359	\$138,359		
2	96	12MUL-16	PBRC	Health	\$65,100	\$65,100		
3	94	23MUL-16	UNO	Eng A	\$141,000	\$136,000		
4	93	11MUL-16	Nicholls	Earth	\$10,000	\$10,000		
5	92	08MUL-16	McNeese	Eng A	\$101,220	\$101,220		
6	88	19MUL-16	ULL	Earth	\$29,973	\$29,973		
7	87	09MUL-16	Nicholls	Earth	\$30,722	\$30,722		
8	86	04MUL-16	LSUAM	Eng A	\$196,394	\$178,500		
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$712,768</b>	<b>\$689,874</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

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

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Discipline	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
9	85	14MUL-16	Tulane	Arts	\$216,250	\$216,250		
10	84.5	10MUL-16	Nicholls	Eng A	\$153,297	\$97,400		
11	84	20MUL-16	ULL	Eng A	\$58,890	\$47,000		
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$428,437</b>	<b>\$360,650</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

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

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	Discipline	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
12	83	22MUL-16	ULL	Ag	\$270,921	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	82	02MUL-16	LSUAM	Eng A	\$232,609	\$0		
14	81	13MUL-16	SUBR	Eng A	\$96,139	\$0		
14	81	15MUL-16	ULL	Health	\$88,704	\$0		
14	81	17MUL-16	ULL	Earth	\$63,122	\$0		
17	80	05MUL-16	LaTech	Eng A	\$100,000	\$0		
17	80	21MUL-16	ULL	Earth	\$99,918	\$0		
19	74	01MUL-16	LSUAM	Arts	\$293,399	\$0		
20	73	18MUL-16	ULL	Eng A	\$103,138	\$0		
21	66	03MUL-16	LSUAM	Eng A	\$150,000	\$0		
22	65	06MUL-16	LaTech	Health	\$181,985	\$0		
23	64	07MUL-16	McNeese	Eng A	\$130,891	\$0		
<b>TOTALS:</b>					<b>\$1,810,826</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

01MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Arts

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A & M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSU CoAD Fabrication Factory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jason Crow

## 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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No                     

G. Total Score: 

74
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$293,399

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks to create an interdisciplinary design lab with three major pieces of equipment. It is interesting and eloquently written but the request is high relative to available funds. The argument for need is not strong. Such cutting-edge equipment should theoretically affect eminence, student quality and faculty development, but the proposal does not establish what specific voids in student learning, faculty research and recruiting are being addressed. No courses are listed where this equipment will be utilized and it is not evident how it will directly impact students. It is not clear if there will be safety training, if there is an HVAC system in the facility where the equipment will be housed, or if the project will affect accreditation. The lab would be a spectacular addition to the campus but it is not clear that the space for it is worked out. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

02MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A & M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Confocal Raman Spectroscopy and Microscopy System for  
Materials & Nano-Biotechnology Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Manas Ranjan Gartia

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 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 15 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (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 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

## SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$232,609

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

PIs from across multiple departments seek a confocal Raman spectroscopy and microscopy system for the shared instrumentation facility at LSU. It would undoubtedly be a very useful instrument on campus. An excellent description of Raman scattering is provided and the PI group is very strong. The section on research is well written and the activities are diverse. The authors state that they currently have to travel to UTA for these capabilities, though it is not clearly established why they do not work with the strong group of researchers at Tulane doing Raman spectroscopy or with the Raman system at the UNO materials center. It is also not evident why the Horiba Raman on campus is no longer useful or could not be upgraded. The educational component lacks details. The PIs propose to incorporate the system into a number of classes but it is difficult to apply in undergraduate study with such a steep learning curve. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

03MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A & M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Big Memory Computer Cluster for Efficient Big Data Analytics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lu Peng

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No                     

G. Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)

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

## SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$150,000

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks to build a high-performance computing (HPC) cluster to support Big Data research and education. The proposed research is interesting but the rationale for acquiring this infrastructure is unfocused and weak. The Center for Computation and Technology has multiple active HPCs, some of which are available through NSF's XSEDE cyber-platform and currently serving a national HPC community. The proposed research in the application domains could utilize these existing systems. The PIs could benefit from a local HPC for doing research in energy efficiency and related topics, which may require root access, but such research can be carried out using a reduced dimensionality HPC system. No quantitative analysis has been presented to justify the configuration of the system. Seven courses are listed that could benefit, but given the cluster size and the heavy use in research (which often requires reconfiguration at the software/hardware levels), opportunities for using the system in classroom activities will be limited. There is no plan for developing new courses. The proposal does not present a detailed plan for resource allocation, developing a shared body of knowledge, or long-term sustainability. The evaluation plan is vague. Discussion of the relationship with industries does not reflect expected new opportunities. Economic development contributions are not described. The proposal could benefit from a convincing rationale, a stronger interdisciplinary characteristic, and quantitative analysis of memory and scaling requirements to justify the cluster configuration. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

04MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A & M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Silicon Drift Detector for X-ray Absorption Spectroscopy

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amitava Roy

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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:

\$196,394

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$178,500

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

This proposal seeks a seven-element silicon drift detector system for research across several disciplines. LSU has one of the last, if not only, university synchrotrons. The team is well qualified with a good track record. The research ideas are interesting and well thought out. This proposal aims to upgrade the existing light source with the capability to do XAFS. The synchrotron is a fantastic facility which keeps Louisiana in the forefront of x-ray research. The cost of running this facility may be a long-term sustainability issue if it does not have capabilities that match or exceed other user facilities. Partial funding of \$178,500 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:

05MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Materials Core Lab Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Caldorera-Moore

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 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 17 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 3 (of 5 points)  
B.6 3 (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: 80 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$100,000

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks to enhance the undergraduate materials laboratory for engineering students. It did not follow formatting guidelines which made it difficult to read. The need is not strongly justified. It is not clearly established what barriers exist to offering the lab and lecture class concurrently. The number of seats in the lab is presented as a justification for the requested enhancement, though it is not evident that it is necessary for all students have access to equipment simultaneously, or that adding workstations would address the ability to teach techniques or knowledge of contemporary issues. The main challenge for this program may be with pedagogy and have less to do with equipment bottlenecks. It is unclear what new capabilities the added equipment will provide. The list of specific courses and the expected outcomes is helpful. The evaluation portion is also very well conceived. As written, it is not established that this program represents the strongest case for basic course-related equipment. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

06MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Health/Medical

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Lumbopelvic Rhythm During Anterior Load Lifting

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Braden Romer

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 10 (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 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 5 (of 5 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 0 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$181,985

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

The Department of Kinesiology and Center for Biomedical Engineering & Rehabilitation Science seeks equipment for education and research. Adding video motion capture equipment to the research infrastructure would be a clear benefit. The opportunities for federally funded grant opportunities would significantly increase. The project is interdisciplinary in that it targets students from multiple academic programs. The proposal did not follow the format provided in the RFP. Details are lacking on the rationale for selecting this specific equipment or what other options might also be appropriate. The objectives are not measurable and the work plan is vague. The citations are dated: most are prior to 2010. Evaluation is not clearly addressed for each goal. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

07MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of EECS Computer Laboratory at McNeese  
State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Bender

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)  
C.2 0.5 (of 1 point)  
C.3 1.5 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$130,891  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to create a 45-seat computer laboratory in the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS). A strong case is made for enhancing the quality of undergraduate education, but the proposal lacks a true multidisciplinary characteristic. The issue of an expected increase in the number of students requiring access to the lab after certain courses are eliminated or merged could be addressed by using the currently available lab stations in multiple sessions. Given that the total number of students in the consolidated EECS Department remains the same, it is not evident why such a merger would require more lab stations. The PIs claim that the existing computers are outdated, but do not provide specifics. The configurations (memory, architecture, availability of GPUs) of the requested PCs lack appropriate justification and the proposal could benefit from a quantitative analysis of the size and nature of data to be handled. The research aspect of the proposal is weak. Strong ties with industry partners are a plus. However, a lack of detailed plans and specifics on how the proposed enhancement of the lab could contribute to the economic growth of the region and the State as a whole makes the project outcomes unclear. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

08MUL-15

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instrumentation and Control Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zhuang Li

## 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 10 (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 3 (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 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:

\$101,220

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$101,220

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 Instrument and Control Laboratory seeks transmitters, communicators, calibrators, digital controllers, and an ultrasonic flowmeter, which will be integrated within the existing lab stations. The enhanced infrastructure will help the PIs update the instrumentation track and offer three regular lecture courses and one laboratory course in engineering measurements, which will be open to students from electrical, mechanical, and chemical engineering disciplines. The proposal is well written and the rationale is compelling with a crisp underlying vision. The team is solid and has a good track record. The program objectives and associated tasks are clearly stated and realistic. The plan to couple the new toolsets with an adjacent chemical plant for real-time monitoring and control is commendable. Strong collaboration with industry partners is a plus, and efforts in seeking inputs from the IAB in defining the curricular needs as well as assessing the outcomes fit extremely well into the program goals. The evaluation plan is well rounded, well organized, and effective. While the proposal is mute on plans for conducting cutting-edge research, efforts in recruiting international students are expected to increase visibility of the institution. There is considerable technical opportunity for the students and participants associated with this program to access the resources and environment needed to become competitive and creative innovators in a global economy. There is a sizeable institutional match. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

09MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Earth/Environmental

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Computing Technology for General and  
Specialized Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Doucet

## 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 9 (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 16 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 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 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

87
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$30,722</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$30,722</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 update computer workstations in an undergraduate teaching laboratory where existing equipment dates from 2008. The equipment will mainly be used in computing classes, but also by biology students. The project is interdisciplinary because of the combined computing/biology usage, and the strong environmental science component of biology instruction and student projects.

Instructional use of the new equipment is strong. While the need for an up-to-date laboratory is self-evident, the proposal would benefit from additional information. Installation and maintenance will not be performed by the PIs and details on the responsible personnel are lacking. Further information is needed on what applications and activities are disadvantaged or impossible with existing hardware. It is not evident what operating system the existing computers use, which might add to the argument for the upgrade. The request, overall, is modest, efficient and will have high impact. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

10MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Geospatial Technology for the Next  
Generation of Louisiana's Coastal Scientists

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Balaji Ramachandran

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 8 (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 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4.5 (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: 84.5 (of 100 points)

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

## SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$153,297

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$97,400

(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 seeks various pieces of geospatial technology for conducting multidisciplinary research on coastal ecosystems. This is a strong proposal that presents well-defined research plans. Some hardware is new to the program and some will replace outdated equipment. Each item is thoughtfully justified, though some seem more critical than others. For example, it appears that the upgraded sensor systems could be integrated into their existing airframes and increase their capabilities. Upgrading the UX5 and even adding the ZX5 seem to be discretionary and will help the team maintain existing capabilities. The need for the remaining items is not established as strongly. Partial funding of \$97,400 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:

11MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Earth/Environmental

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Longevity of the Newly Acquired Metal-Analysis  
Equipment at Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Enmin Zou

## 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 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 19 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 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 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

93
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$10,000  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$10,000

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

This request is for two power conditioners to back new analysis equipment funded by the BoRSF in 2014. Ground-to-neutral voltage variations have been found to be about 4V, eight times more than specified for the instruments. The lifespan and reliability of the new equipment will be threatened without power stabilization. The Pls' laboratories provide metal analysis for classes and student projects in environmental studies of the Delta region. The project is interdisciplinary in that it involves both biology and chemistry units, and the majority of the work is environmental geochemistry. The work includes several areas of importance related to marshland degradation, contaminant spills, and fisheries, which Nicholls State is ideally placed to study. A statement and price quote from Perkin-Elmer would have lent weight to the proposal. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

12MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Health/Medical

INSTITUTION: Pennington Biomedical Research Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Calibrated Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging of the Brain

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Owen Carmichael

## 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 9.5 (of 10 points)  
B.2 20 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4.5 (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: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$65,100

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$65,100

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 Biomedical Imaging Center requests equipment that will improve research on functional magnetic resonance (fMRI) data by addressing signal calibration. The goals are well defined and the objectives are measurable. The work plan is clearly stated and the evaluation plan is described effectively. The value to the academic and clinical programs involved is significant. The equipment will enhance the relationship between Pennington and LSU A&M. It will make faculty more competitive for funding and enable new research across several departments. Full funding is recommended.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE: Engineering A

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment Enhancement for Research and Education on  
Carbon Nanomaterials

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Guang-Lin Zhao

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 21 points)  
B.3 5 (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: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$96,139

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal seeks equipment for use in the synthesis and characterization of carbon nanotubes (CNTs). Specific research projects that would benefit include development of an energy efficient synthesis method for large-scale production of CNTs, electromechanical characterization of functionalized carbon nanomaterials, and fabrication of chemical sensors. The PI has a recently funded grant in a related area, completion and success of which depends on the availability of the proposed infrastructure. The current equipment available is seven years old and has been out of order since September 2015. No specifics are provided on repair or reconstruction plans. The proposal states that the new equipment would allow the team to investigate CNT properties synthesized above 1200°C but there are no details on the nature, need and novelty of studies incorporating this. Education and outreach plans are organized and well rounded. Local high school teachers will have an opportunity to become familiar with the equipment. The PIs have a good track record in interdisciplinary collaboration. Discussions of student and faculty development lack specifics. The evaluation plan focuses on reporting routes and is mute on tangible and effective assessment strategies. A convincing argument for economic development impacts is missing. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

14MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Arts

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Waterjet Cutter: A Cornerstone Maker Tool for Maker Row

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kevin Jones

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 17 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$216,250

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$216,250

(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 an OMAX 5555 waterjet cutter for a Maker Space in a fabrication facility. It would enhance the equipment already in place for a proven multidisciplinary endeavor. The faculty and departments involved have a good track record of working together. There is also community and K-12 outreach. The argument for need is strong. A specific list of classes that will utilize the equipment is provided. It would offer a competitive edge for a program that recruits against Georgia Tech and MIT. The facility is part of a larger national movement towards advanced manufacturing and, last summer, Tulane was one of 134 universities that wrote the President about their commitment to this cultural shift. The only drawback is the expense of the request relative to the available funds. Full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

15MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Health/Medical

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving National Certification Test Scores Via Improved  
Anatomical Interaction

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Randy Aldret

## 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 1 (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 6 (of 10 points)  
B.2 11 (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 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: 

81
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$88,704

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks a virtual anatomical dissection table for anatomy and physiology education in order to enhance laboratory experiences. The goals lack specific details. The work plan does not clearly indicate which personnel would perform activities beyond those assigned to the PI. Benchmarks are not identified. The availability of the equipment and scheduling across programs are not clearly presented. One of the goals is to improve certification scores, but no student performance data are provided as a baseline, and the education gap targeted is not clearly stated. Release time for the PI to perform maintenance is not clearly justified given that the manufacturer covers maintenance for three years. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

16MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Earth/Environmental

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of an X-ray Diffractometer for Research and  
Training in Oil and Gas Exploration and Materials Evaluation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Borrok

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

97
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$138,359  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$138,359

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 replace a 30-year-old X-Ray Diffraction (XRD) unit with a modern benchtop XRD. The old instrument is no longer functional and is not supported with spare parts. The new instrument will be installed in the same laboratory as the defunct one, so all utilities and safety protections are already in place. Use of the new XRD will be interdisciplinary, impacting geoscience and engineering faculty and students, linked under ULL's strong specialization in oil- and gas-field geology and technology. Development of shale oil and gas plays over the past ten years has accentuated the need to characterize source and reservoir rocks, as well as materials used in the extraction process. Use of the equipment in courses and for master's-level research projects is well described. All the PIs have active research, and most have external funding. Full quotes from the supplier are provided, and while there is no breakout of shipping, warranty and the one-year service contract, all the items seem essential. The proposal mentions the possibility of user fees, and the panel strongly recommends that very modest fees, levied on all users who have a source of funds, be utilized to allow laboratory costs to be continuously covered. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17MUL-16  
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Earth/Environmental

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Special Multidisciplinary: Acquisition of a River Table and  
Flume for Research, Training, and Education in Water  
Resources at UL Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katie Costigan

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 17 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 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 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

81
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$63,122  
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$0

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

This proposal seeks a river table and a flume. The project is interdisciplinary between Geoscience and Engineering. The Geoscience Department currently has a much smaller and older river table setup, with very limited capability. The proposed new equipment has a research function, but is primarily an educational tool. The potential applications within courses of both departments are extensive, and are well described in the proposal. There is also considerable potential for outreach activities. While the flume will be a valuable addition to the project, most of the classroom and outreach applications described primarily involve the river table. It requires a significant space, and even though the technical requirements are minimal, the proposal could have better defined where the equipment will be housed and whether or not the area will be under the PI's control. The evaluation plan is vague. The explicit shipping costs on the manufacturer's quotes amount to \$1,430, with the stated possibility of additional shipping for accessories. The estimate of \$2,500 for shipping seems imprecise in relation to explicit numbers given in the quotes, and is also likely excessive. There may be a more efficient, cost-effective way to acquire or build a river table than the project as presented. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

18MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Educational and Research Resources in  
the Area of Food, Energy and Water

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Emad Habib

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 5.5 (of 10 points)  
B.2 14 (of 20 points)  
B.3 6 (of 8 points)  
B.4 6 (of 8 points)  
B.5 6 (of 8 points)  
B.6 4.5 (of 8 points)  
B.7 2 (of 4 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No                     

F. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

## SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$103,138

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks to develop new educational opportunities in food, water and energy systems. This is an important area and the PIs appear to have the relevant experience to make this effort possible. The project idea is interesting but the PIs do not effectively communicate how it will enhance the infrastructure of ULL. The funding request level appears to be unnecessarily high. There are three faculty members who are requesting summer salary for this effort, though all three appear to hold the position of director or department head, and curriculum development should be a basic duty. Such costs are discouraged by the RFP except in unusual circumstances. This effort is also not an efficient use of graduate students. The job of the University is to train them in research. There are no research activities tied to these students and their assigned duties. If PIs plan to employ students from Education, that would seem like a much better fit. The programmer seems to be the most important participant for accomplishing project goals. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

19MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Earth/Environmental

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading Particle-Induced X-Ray Emission Spectrometry at  
the Louisiana Accelerator Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Karl Hasenstein

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 16 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 5 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4.5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 4.5 (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 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:

\$29,973

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$29,973

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 modernize an existing PIXE analysis setup at the Louisiana Accelerator Center of ULL. A beamline is available for PIXE work, but the existing setup is outdated. The proposal seeks to upgrade the beam control from the original supplier and modernize the computing and vacuum pumping as well as the PIXE interpretation software. The upgrades are very carefully targeted from different suppliers to achieve a state-of-the-art system. Full quotes are documented from all suppliers, and a letter from Louisiana Tech shows some external support. The PIXE setup finds use in senior and graduate classes in both Physics and Earth Science. A fully upgraded system will certainly benefit ULL and all external collaborators. The proposal would be substantially improved with concrete data on the enrollments in the courses that are listed, and the number of ULL students currently impacted by PIXE analysis. It is also not established what projects are inhibited by the older system and what new projects would become possible. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

20MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Novel Materials Characterization Using the Advanced Rheometer System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mohammad Khattak

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 21 points)  
B.3 4 (of 5 points)  
B.4 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 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No                     

G. Total Score: 

84
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount:

\$58,890

Recommended Amount:

\$47,000

(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 a rheometer system for an infrastructure and materials testing lab to enhance education and research. On its website, the Department of Civil Engineering lists a rheometer in its transport and materials lab. The PIs do not establish whether this system is unavailable or inadequate for the proposed project. The requested equipment would be a nice addition to the capabilities at ULL. A less expensive rheometer may be adequate for the stated purposes. More discussion on specific research projects would have benefitted the proposal. The education section is well constructed. Partial funding of \$47,000 is recommended if additional funds become available, 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:

21MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Earth/Environmental

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Metal Analysis by Inductively Coupled Plasma  
Optical Emission Spectrometry in Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Febee Louka

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 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 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 18 (of 21 points)  
B.3 3 (of 5 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 4 (of 5 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

80
----

 (of 100 points)

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

## SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$99,918

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$0

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

This proposal seeks to acquire a new ICP-OES machine for the ULL Chemistry Department, to be used also by biology and environmental science faculty and students. This machine is needed, and the use will certainly be both interdisciplinary and intense. It is a workhorse for major and trace element analysis, with very wide applications. Graduates in Chemistry should certainly be trained in its use, or at least be aware of the method, as stated in the proposal. The problem is that the proposal has been submitted as grounded in Earth and Environmental Sciences. Of the five PIs, only one is in Environmental Science. Of the seven courses described which could receive benefit from the equipment, only one 400-level course is in Environmental Science. Certainly, the emphasis of some of the Biology courses is environmental, but the courses with both higher student numbers and frequent offerings are more in the domain of Chemistry than any other subject area. Environmental Science is by far the smallest of the three academic units: four faculty versus 32 and 17 in Biology and Chemistry respectively. This equipment acquisition should be submitted either as a Chemistry proposal, or a Multidisciplinary proposal grounded in Chemistry. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 22MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE: Agricultural

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Wu Xu

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No                     

G. Total Score: 

83
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
		<u>\$270,921</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks a mass spectrometer to enhance both undergraduate and graduate education across several departments. The objectives need to be written in a way that allows for performance measures. The evaluation parameters focused more on outputs and not outcomes, which would provide a greater indicator of impact. The number of faculty listed as Co-PIs is impressive. Discussion of economic development is generic and lacks specific examples. The summer workshop greatly enhances this proposal. The match is laudable but the request is high relative to available funds. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:

23MUL-16

ROOT DISCIPLINE:

Engineering A

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Micro-Writer to Advance Multidisciplinary  
Research and Education in Materials Science at the  
University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leszek Malkinski

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)  
B.2 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 11 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No                     

G. Total Score: 

94
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$141,000  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$136,000

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

The Advanced Materials Research Institute (AMRI) seeks a photoresist writer to enhance capabilities in microfabrication. AMRI is a very well equipped characterization and fabrication lab. Previous funding by the BoRSF has significantly enhanced the research endeavor of this standout facility. The proposal is well written with clear, precise goals and objectives. The research ideas are very well presented with a diverse array of activities across several departments. This resource will introduce a capability not currently available in Louisiana, strengthening the campus. The lack of matching funds or an academic discount is surprising. Partial funding of \$136,000 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 - Multidisciplinary  
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
001MUL-16	Dr. Jason Crow	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	LSU CoAD Fabrication Factory	\$293,399.00	\$0.00	\$293,399.00
002MUL-16	Dr. Manas Ranjan Gartia	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	Confocal Raman Spectroscopy and Microscopy System for Materials & Nano-Biotechnology Research and Education	\$232,609.00	\$0.00	\$232,609.00
003MUL-16	Prof. Lu Peng	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	A Big Memory Computer Cluster for Efficient Big Data Analytics	\$150,000.00	\$0.00	\$150,000.00
004MUL-16	Dr. Amitava Roy	Louisiana State University and A & M College	1 Year	E	New Request	Silicon Drift Detector for X-ray Absorption Spectroscopy	\$196,394.00	\$0.00	\$196,394.00
005MUL-16	Dr. Mary Caldorera-Moore	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Undergraduate Materials Core Lab Enhancement	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$100,000.00
006MUL-16	Dr. Braden Romer	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	New Request	Lumbopelvic Rhythm During Anterior Load Lifting	\$181,985.00	\$0.00	\$181,985.00
007MUL-16	Dr. Paul Bender	McNeese State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of EECS Computer Laboratory at McNeese State University	\$130,891.00	\$0.00	\$130,891.00
008MUL-16	Dr. Zhuang Li	McNeese State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Instrumentation and Control Laboratory	\$101,220.00	\$0.00	\$101,220.00
009MUL-16	Dr. John Doucet	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Improving Computing Technology for General and Specialized Education	\$30,722.00	\$0.00	\$30,722.00
010MUL-16	Dr. Balaji Ramachandran	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Geospatial Technology for the next generation of Louisiana's Coastal Scientists	\$153,297.00	\$0.00	\$153,297.00
011MUL-16	Dr. Enmin Zou	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	Continuation	Enhancing the longevity of the newly acquired metal-analysis equipment at Nicholls State University	\$10,000.00	\$0.00	\$10,000.00
012MUL-16	Prof. Owen Carmichael	Pennington Biomedical Research Center	1 Year	E	New Request	Calibrated functional magnetic resonance imaging of the brain	\$65,100.00	\$0.00	\$65,100.00
013MUL-16	Prof. Guang-Lin Zhao	Southern University and A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	New Request	Equipment Enhancement for Research and Education on Carbon Nanomaterials	\$96,139.00	\$0.00	\$96,139.00
014MUL-16	Prof. Kevin Jones	Tulane University	1 Year	E	New Request	Waterjet Cutter: A cornerstone maker tool for Maker Row	\$216,250.00	\$0.00	\$216,250.00
015MUL-16	Prof. Randy Aldret	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Improving National Certification Test Scores Via Improved Anatomical Interaction	\$88,704.00	\$0.00	\$88,704.00
016MUL-16	Prof. David Borrok	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Acquisition of an X-ray Diffractometer for Research and Training in Oil and Gas Exploration and Materials Evaluation	\$138,359.00	\$0.00	\$138,359.00
017MUL-16	Prof. Katie Costigan	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Special multidisciplinary: Acquisition of a river table and flume for research, training, and education in water resources at UL Lafayette	\$63,122.00	\$0.00	\$63,122.00
018MUL-16	Dr. Emad Habib	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	New Request	Enhancement of Educational and Research Resources in the Area of Food, Energy and Water	\$103,138.00	\$0.00	\$103,138.00
019MUL-16	Dr. Karl Hasenstein	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Upgrading particle-induced X-ray emission spectrometry at the Louisiana Accelerator Center	\$29,973.00	\$0.00	\$29,973.00
020MUL-16	Dr. Mohammad Khattak	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Novel Materials Characterization using the Advanced Rheometer System	\$58,890.00	\$0.00	\$58,890.00

**Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary  
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
021MUL-16	Dr. Febee Louka	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Metal Analysis by Inductively Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometry in Research and Education	\$99,918.00	\$0.00	\$99,918.00
022MUL-16	Prof. Wu Xu	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	2 Years	E	New Request	Acquisition of a mass spectrometer to enhance student research and teaching through a platform of interdisciplinary, multilevel and collaborative efforts	\$270,921.00	\$0.00	\$270,921.00
023MUL-16	Prof. Leszek Malkinski	University of New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Acquisition of a Micro-Writer to Advance Multidisciplinary Research and Education in Materials Science at the University of New Orleans	\$141,000.00	\$0.00	\$141,000.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	23
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,952,031.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$0.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,952,031.00

# **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)