

2005-06 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT

Biological Sciences

INTRODUCTION

A review panel in the Biological Sciences consisting of Professors Jerry Davenport, Chair, Ohio State University; Susan Ernst, Tufts University; and Kenneth Pruitt, University of Alabama-Birmingham, met in Baton Rouge on March 9-10, 2006, for the purpose of evaluating thirty-nine (39) Biological 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 the visit: a) thirty-nine (39) Biological Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2005-06 Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2003 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Biological Sciences.

Prior to the review, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the thirty-nine proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the three reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and the reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. 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 funding for any projects with scores lower than 80. 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.

For many proposals in Table I, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations; however, the partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling \$3,683,166 were submitted to the Biological Sciences review panel. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$1,299,909.

TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	95	012BS-06	LSUHSC-NO	\$99,875	\$90,000		
2	92	030BS-06	TUHSC	\$98,800	\$75,000		
3	91	031BS-06	TUHSC	\$84,530	\$77,500	\$10,640	\$0
4	89	037BS-06	ULM	\$24,000	\$24,000		
5	87	010BS-06	LSU-BR	\$112,258	\$70,000		
5	87	014BS-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$22,097	\$22,097		
7	86	003BS-06	CENTENARY	\$47,803	\$47,803		
7	86	016BS-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$45,000	\$33,000		
9	85	032BS-06	ULL	\$168,000	\$28,000		
10	84	019BS-06	LA TECH	\$16,800	\$16,000		
10	84	033BS-06	ULL	\$136,006	\$66,000		
10	84	034BS-06	ULM	\$258,049	\$200,000		
13	83	013BS-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$14,288	\$10,000		
13	83	026BS-06	SLU	\$47,999	\$38,973		
13	83	029BS-06	TULANE & TUHSC	\$144,480	\$56,240		
16	82	001BS-06	BPCC	\$61,187	\$50,000		
16	82	020BS-06	LA TECH	\$39,270	\$30,000		
16	82	022BS-06	NICHOLLS	\$114,829	\$31,296		
19	81	008BS-06	LSU-AG	\$185,656	\$45,000		
19	81	011BS-06	LSU-EUNICE	\$162,996	\$50,000		
19	81	023BS-06	NICHOLLS	\$86,770	\$79,000		
19	81	036BS-06	ULM	\$78,000	\$47,000		
23	80	007BS-06	LSU-AG	\$108,217	\$14,000		
23	80	024BS-06	NUNEZ	\$140,127	\$60,000		
23	80	025BS-06	SLU	\$143,550	\$39,000	\$0	\$0
TOTALS:				\$2,440,587	\$1,299,909	\$10,640	\$0

TABLE II
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
26	78	018BS-06	LA TECH	\$121,281	\$0		
27	76	038BS-06	ULM	\$80,719	\$0		
28	75	005BS-06	LSU-AG	\$107,512	\$0		
28	75	035BS-06	ULM	\$63,730	\$0		
30	73	004BS-06	LSU-AG	\$46,474	\$0		
30	73	017BS-06	LA TECH	\$26,597	\$0		
32	72	002BS-06	BPCC	\$82,044	\$0		
32	72	039BS-06	ULM	\$352,551	\$0		
34	68	015BS-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$30,400	\$0		
35	67	021BS-06	NICHOLLS	\$152,275	\$0		
36	53	027BS-06	SUBR	\$51,944	\$0		
37	52	009BS-06	LSU-AG	\$11,138	\$0		
38	49	006BS-06	LSU-AG	\$15,914	\$0		
39	39	028BS-06	TULANE & TUHSC	\$100,000	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$1,242,579	\$0	\$0	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001BS-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Student Success in Human Anatomy

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$61,187
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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 is a well-written and focused proposal to increase the success of students in human anatomy classes in the Science and Allied Health Division of Bossier Parish Community College. Only 42% of the students taking the lecture courses and 61% of those taking laboratory courses earn a C or higher. The PIs propose to increase success by developing video archives of images of anatomy models, bones, slides and other material; making the video archives available to students on DVD and in storage on a server; increasing the quantity of anatomy models; and providing faculty with training on this material and technology. Consideration is given of how these instructional techniques will meet diverse learning styles of students and help the students retain this foundational material for the allied health training. Timetables are well-designed and realistic. The PIs are qualified and innovative. The panel recognizes that a well-trained work force in the allied health area is vital to this area of Louisiana, and is particularly interested in learning how this project improves student performance as measured by student pass rates in the course and overall retention of students in the program. The panel recommends partial funding of \$50,000, provided the institutional match is maintained in full. Funds may be expended at the discretion of the PIs.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002BS-06

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Cell Culture Make-Over

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$82,044
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 requests funds for equipment and renovation of a cell culture lab. It appears that this request is for one course. Because we have no information regarding class size (although "six students" are mentioned), or how often the course is taught, it is difficult to assess the impact of this proposal. Though dual use of equipment among faculty is inconvenient, it does not appear to be incapacitating. The panel did not consider the budget well justified, and would not advise acquiring a tabletop centrifuge, the UV/visible spectrophotometer, or unspecified supplies. Finally, the panel felt that benches and electrical outlets should be provided by the institution as a matter of normal maintenance (in-kind). The panel cannot recommend funding at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003BS-06

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Proteomics in the Undergraduate Curriculum

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$47,803

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$47,803

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 for the purchase of equipment to allow proteomic analysis of complex protein mixtures as part of an effort to build more "hands-on" proteomics instruction in biology classes at the undergraduate level. The primary benefit would be to approximately seventy students in the Cell Biology course. The requested equipment would nicely complement a previously purchased LC/MS mass spectrometer, allowing students to use proteomics to analyze the MS data from complex mixtures of proteins. Training in such methods would better prepare students for jobs in the biomedical research field, such as are available in the Shreveport area. The panel was concerned about the lack of assessment of the students' performance and understanding of proteomics, once the requested programs are in place. It was not clear if there will be a measurable improvement in their understanding of proteomics once they have had a "hands-on" experience, or if there will be an increased retention over the long-term for students in the biomedical research field. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Imaging of Ants in Louisiana

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 2 (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 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$46,474
 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 requests funds for an Auto-Montage digital imaging system for photographing ants. The system would be used for research, for producing the illustrations for a newly written book, *The Ants of Louisiana*, for teaching, for the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, and in conjunction with the Red Imported Fire Ant Laboratory. The Auto-Montage would be used with an existing Olympus compound microscope and would produce very high quality three-dimensional photographs of insects. Insects in general and ants in particular are of great agricultural and economic importance to the State of Louisiana. The PI has also recently co-authored a book on ants that would benefit from this dedicated imaging system. In addition, this equipment would, as the proposal states, "directly support most courses taught within the Department of Entomology." Although the time on the available LSAM system is limited and slows down this work, the panel felt that it is still possible, if not fast and convenient, to do this work. Therefore, with limited funds available, the panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment Enhancement for Teaching and Research in
Food Microbiology, Food Safety, and Industrial Microbiology

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 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 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

H. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$107,512
 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 requests funds to upgrade classes in food science and support research in the PIs' laboratories. The PIs report the need to update the technical quality of programs that require acquisition of the requested equipment as a first step. The panel was unclear regarding use of equipment to test samples from the food industry. If the programs doing so were reimbursed by that industry then the fate of those funds and their impact on improving the existing program should be made clear. Due to limited funds, the panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for Polymerase Chain Reaction Work With Pecan Bacterial Leaf Scorch Disease

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 2 (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 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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 2 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (of 2 points)
B.6 0 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score:

49

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$15,914
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 application from the LSU Pecan Research Station requests a PCR cyler and other basic microbiology equipment. The requested equipment will support development of detection methods for pecan bacterial leaf scorch disease. The applicant has no practical experience with PCR techniques and institutional support is not provided. There will be no impact on teaching or student training since the Pecan Research Station does not have a student teaching function. Due to the limited funds available, the panel does not recommend funding of this proposal at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Advanced Materials Processing Facilities
at the Louisiana Forest Products Development Center

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

H. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 1 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$108,217
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$14,000

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 application from the Louisiana Forest Products Development Center requests equipment to increase its capabilities to support advanced wood products research. The equipment will directly support development of products that take advantage of timber grown in Louisiana, providing substantial potential economic benefit. Improvements in teaching capabilities are more theoretical and less well documented. There is only a small institutional match. The panel recognizes the importance of these studies, but this request primarily benefits the PI and his research assistant. There is a reasonable justification for each of the pieces of equipment, but there is no clear distinction of which is the most important to move the research forward and why that particular piece or other pieces of equipment are essential. After discussing the proposal, the panel felt that the atomic absorption spectrophotometer was the most important piece of equipment. Because of the limited funds available, the panel recommends partial funding of \$14,000, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of a Biotechnology Teaching Laboratory for the
Biotechnology Education for Students and Teachers (BEST)
Program at the LSU AgCenter

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 0 (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 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$185,656</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$45,000</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 request is for funds to establish a molecular biology lab to teach a suite of techniques to high school teachers and their students during one six-week lecture lab and summer course. Some of the equipment will be lent to high schools. The list of materials to be lent includes 35 pipettes, 5 mini centrifuges, 5 electrophoresis power supplies, and 5 gel trays. No discussion of how these materials will be used is given and, as a consequence, it is not clear that the specified items represent a functional unit. No inventory of "equipment on hand" is given, though some equipment is present but not in a central location. The panel was concerned that the good intentions of this program would be derailed by practical considerations as discussed above. Other institutions have initiated similar programs. However, in the panel's experiences, these are more clearly structured. As a result, the panel can only recommend an award of \$45,000 to expand BEST.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Symposium on Agricultural Biotechnology

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)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

D. 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 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 20 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 0 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 1 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No Not Clear

G. Total Score: 52 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$11,138
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.)

Funds are requested to sponsor a symposium on Agricultural Biotechnology. The symposium might foster collaboration between scientists, but it is not clear why this meeting should be supported when other national and international meetings are available. The panel does not understand how new information would be expected at this local meeting that could not be obtained from competing meetings on this subject. Because of the limited funds available, the panel cannot recommend funding of this proposal at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010BS-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment Enhancement for Synchrotron X-ray Tomography
Beamline

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 0 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$112,258
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,000

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.)

LSU-Baton Rouge has one of eight synchrotron X-ray tomography beam lines. The equipment compares well with that of other facilities in the U.S. by several criteria, but the University would need the equipment upgrades proposed here to become equal to the top national facilities on signal to noise and sample throughput. The synchrotron is in the Center for Advanced Microstructure Devices (CAMD) and is used by researchers in four departments. The original tomography beam line was funded by a BoRSF grant in 1999 and built in 2000, with the first images from this equipment being produced in October 2000. Additional funding for upgrades was obtained from a NSF IMR grant in 2003. At the time of this application, 11 publications from four separate research groups have resulted from work on this equipment . Several graduate students are now working on projects that involve tomography and the productivity rate is likely to increase. Each of the PIs is productive and either well funded or has grants pending that would use tomography. Some of the equipment seems to be more essential than other pieces. A semi-automatic sample changer replaced by a fully automatic changer would be convenient but not essential and, therefore, is not recommended. No institutional or other match was provided. The panel recommends partial funding of \$70,000 on the condition that an additional \$21,815 be provided by institutional or other sources.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Eunice

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment to Enhance Biology Science Lecture and
Laboratory Courses at LSUE

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 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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$162,996</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$50,000</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 requests funding for an extensive list of equipment to upgrade existing biology laboratories. It was difficult for the panel to distinguish between needed and desired items but we do recognize the importance of enhancing this program. The panel recommends partial funding of \$50,000, provided the institutional match is maintained in full. The expenditure of these funds is left to the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Request a Capillary Liquid Chromatography for Off-Line
LC-MS in LSUHSC-NO Proteomics Core Facility

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 20 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$99,875
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$90,000

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 proteomics core facility at LSUHSC-New Orleans has an outstanding track record of accomplishment, providing services to more than 30 research groups. This proposal requests funds to add multidimensional liquid chromatography capabilities to this facility. The plans for operation and long-term support through users fees are quite sound and the panel has substantial confidence that this equipment will be effectively used and maintained. The potential of this equipment to improve this already outstanding facility is very high. The panel recommends partial funding of \$90,000, to be expended at the PI's discretion, provided the institutional match is maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Computational Analysis in Cell and Molecular Biology Laboratories

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$14,288
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 is a straightforward proposal from LSU-Shreveport that expresses a clearly identified need to update and improve the computer equipment in their Biological Sciences Department primarily, but not limited to, the teaching of Cell and Molecular Biology Laboratories. The investigators supply background information on the current state of the equipment in these laboratories used to teach students, many of whom aspire to go on to medical school or other health-related professional schools. The current computer equipment does not enable the students to connect to the campus network and the Internet. In addition to correcting this situation, equipment is requested to link each of the six computers to one of the newly acquired UV-visible spectrophotometers and to run computational and bioinformatics software. The faculty appear devoted to teaching, introducing new interdisciplinary concepts and technologies and introducing students to independent research. The PIs have demonstrated the ability to maintain productive research programs while maintaining heavy teaching loads. This project would greatly benefit teaching and learning in the department. The University has made a contribution to the project. The panel believes that the goals of the proposal can be met by using laptop rather than desktop computers, and also recommends that the faculty purchase one printer that can be networked to all the computers rather than six individual printers. Funding is recommended at \$10,000, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Physiology Instruction Through Computer
Interfaced Equipment at LSU

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$22,097
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$22,097

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 computer interfaced equipment to be used in plant and animal physiology labs. The requested equipment expands the set that was funded by an earlier BoRSF grant. The use of the equipment and the general involvement of the Biology faculty in the development of this proposal persuaded the panel of both the need and the appropriateness of this request. The panel recommends full funding provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collection and Improvement and Computerization of the
LSUS Herbarium

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**D. 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 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 20 points)
 B.3 15 (of 25 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$30,400
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 requests funds to put the entire LSU-Shreveport Herbarium online to promote the sharing of information about changes in biodiversity within the Red River watershed. The primary costs are for personnel for specimen identification and for data entry into standard databases, activities that would seem to be part of the normal duties of the applicant. Since the size of the collection will only increase with time, the panel feels that there is no conceivable end to the entry process. There will be some impact on curricula and there is a substantial service component that may result from the availability of this data online. Institutional match is very good and there may be limited grant funds available as well. This project will support collaborations with other institutions in Louisiana and within the Red River Watershed. While the panel supports the development of collections, it felt that this proposal was outside the purview of this Enhancement program because of its emphasis on data entry rather than collection enhancement. In the light of limited funds available, the panel cannot recommend funding of this proposal at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Applied Biotechnology Course at LSU

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

86

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$45,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$33,000

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 proposal from the Department of Biological Sciences at Louisiana State University at Shreveport is for enhancing the Applied Biotechnology Course. The dedicated group of faculty who submitted this proposal recognizes the needs of the students for a more current laboratory in biotechnology. Starting from their current situation, they have identified much of the essential equipment that would make that possible. This equipment would be used in several other teaching labs in the department and for faculty and student research. The lab will be designed to teach basic techniques including DNA extractions, dialysis, UV spectroscopy, bacterial transformation of cells, restriction enzyme digestion, SDS-PAGE electrophoresis, PCR and others. These techniques will be learned in the context of a specific reach project to test if the introduction and over express of a yeast casein kinase 1 gene into cotton will result in salt tolerant cotton. Nearly \$7,200 of the request is for consumable supplies to begin the lab. Tuition funds or lab fees should be used for these supplies. The panel recommends partial funding of \$33,000, excluding supplies. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Research Capability and Productivity Related to
the Epidemiology of Life-Style

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$26,597
 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 requests funds to purchase three laptop computers with appropriate software and 19 triaxial accelerators for use in a new course in "life-style Epidemiology" with a total cost of \$10,750. The remaining costs are for PI salary and student help to develop lectures, exam questions, Power-Point presentations, etc. While the PIs address a significant problem, the panel was less convinced that they provided viable a solution in the proposal. Due to limited funds, the panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Graduate and Undergraduate Education in
Biological Sciences and Nanotechnology Through Practical
Training

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 4 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$121,281
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 requests funds to purchase a Raman Spectrometer microscope for several research programs in the College of Engineering and Sciences at Louisiana Tech. The equipment requested will also be used for teaching several courses and to provide research experiences beyond mere lectures on Raman spectroscopy. However, only two of the five courses listed provide actual information on Raman spectroscopy (BIEN557; MSE506). Although the number of students who take these courses is not provided, the College intends to submit an application for funding from NSF for a Nanoscience Education and Outreach Program and this equipment is expected to strengthen this proposal. Another strength of this application is the continuing development of research and teaching collaborations between Louisiana Tech and Grambling State University. What weakens enthusiasm for this proposal is the management plan, which will rely on graduate students for operation; in the long term, the PI or one of the co-PIs need to provide oversight and be trained to operate the instrument. How the maintenance contracts will be funded in future years needs to be clarified; the letter of support from the Institute of Micromanufacturing does not commit funds for maintenance. The institutional commitment appears meager relative to the requested amount and the number of investigators who will benefit from this purchase. Although the panel felt that this proposal was meritorious in many ways, due to the limited funds available, it is not able to recommend funding at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Biochemistry Experiences for Life Science Majors

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 0 (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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$16,800
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$16,000

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.)

In this proposal, funds to purchase six spectrophotometers, 36 pipettors and six pH meters are requested to provide a "biochemical component" to the Chemistry laboratory course for life science majors at Louisiana Tech. Current equipment is suitable only for teaching chemistry principles and is inappropriate for teaching about acid/base, Beer's law, and other basic biochemical principles to this group of 75 students. The institutional match for this request is poor, given the great need of the PI for this fundamental laboratory equipment and the size of these laboratory classes. The institutional match is primarily 10% release time for the PI, but it's not clear why that release time is required for learning how to operate such basic equipment. The addition of this equipment will expand the usefulness of this course, but still only at the most rudimentary level. Nevertheless, the panel recognizes the need for this essential equipment and recommends funding at the level of \$16,000, provided that the institutional match is maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020BS-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improved Computer-Based Data Acquisition Work Stations in Physiology Teaching Laboratories

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$39,270
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$30,000

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 is a request for six new mobile labs for teaching physiology and anatomy. They replace a set of 10-year old Mac Labs purchased previously with BoRSF funds. No institutional match was provided. The panel felt this proposal was both timely and appropriate and recommends partial funding of \$30,000 for five mobile labs .

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021BS-06

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Molecular Biology Experiences for Pre-Medical Students

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 1 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$152,275
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 application requests funds to purchase scientific and instructional equipment and library materials to improve education of biology and other pre-professional health career students. Much of the requested equipment is standard laboratory fare (microcentrifuges, gel electrophoresis boxes, computers, spectrophotometer, fluorimeter, and other small items). The major piece of equipment is a real-time PCR machine, but the application and maintenance of this sophisticated equipment is poorly described and it seems inappropriate for this group of students. In addition, funds for training in bioinformatics and for hosting an MCAT preparation course are requested. This part of the request also seems inappropriate; if there is sufficient interest in a Kaplan MCAT preparation seminar, the panel believes that the Kaplan staff could arrange for some on- or off-campus location themselves. The participants in this application believe that the addition of the equipment requested (particularly the real time PCR machine) will also increase their research productivity. The requested equipment and experiences provided may strengthen up to eight different courses taken by these students. Improving the educational experiences of these students is suggested to help increase the number of health practitioners who will return to this underserved region of Louisiana once they graduate from advanced studies. By offering practical experience in advanced molecular biology and bioinformatics strategies, the applicants believe that student performance and retention will be improved, thereby keeping the best students who otherwise might move to larger and better -equipped universities within Louisiana. The institutional match to this request represents less than 10% of the funds requested. Because of the limited funds available, the panel does not recommend funding of this proposal at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022BS-06

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding Marine Biology for the New Louisiana Coast

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 1 (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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$114,829</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$31,296</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 from a group of five active researchers at Nicholls State University requests funding to expand the equipment for teaching and basic research in Marine Biology. The Department has strengths in Marine and Environmental Biology, which are enhanced by its relationships with LUMCON and BTNEP. There are two loosely related objectives in the proposal: (1) to incorporate protein and DNA analysis into teaching and research to measure environmental effects on animals in marine and wetland environments; and (2) to purchase equipment to monitor water quality of marine environments in the field and in the lab. The requested equipment will improve the competitiveness of these investigators for extramural funding and will tangentially affect students doing research projects in these labs. In addition, the course in Marine Biology will also be strengthened by the availability of the requested equipment. Several of these investigators are implementing "inquiry-based" instructional methods, supported in part by an NSF grant to the University of Michigan. They would like to introduce research-quality instrumentation into the classroom setting, rather than use out-of-date tools with their students. The panel recommends partial funding of \$31,296 for the equipment to monitor water chemistry, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023BS-06

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Immunology Education for Biology Students

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 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$86,770
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$79,000

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 proposal requests funds to update and expand equipment used in teaching immunology, microbiology, molecular biology, and cell biology. While the costs are substantial, the breadth of use and current needs justify the expense. The panel also recognizes that this equipment can be shared among the other courses taught by the PIs and recommends partial funding of \$79,000, provided that the institutional match is maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024BS-06

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Biological Sciences in the Community College

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$140,127
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$60,000

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.)

In this application three faculty members request funds for equipment and supplies to improve the teaching of biological sciences lectures and laboratory courses. These materials will support instruction in Biology and Anatomy courses that have seen an increasing demand from students. Much of the supply budget is for standard chemicals and materials that would seem to be better supported from student tuition and fees. The instructional materials requested seem more appropriate, but would hardly be called "state-of-the-art", and their use will require faculty training. The institutional match for this proposal is very poor, given that these funds will be used to improve teaching in the biological sciences. The request for Qwizdom equipment was not justified and the panel does not recommend funding of this specific purchase. Nevertheless, the panel recognized the need for some of this listed items and recommends partial funding of \$60,000 for the requested equipment, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025BS-06

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of a Unified Microscopy Laboratory Network

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 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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ Not Clear _____

H. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	Requested Amount:
	<u>\$143,550</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	Recommended Amount:
	<u>\$39,000</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 application requests funds to replace an outdated Optiphot fluorescence microscope and to purchase a Nikon 3 laser confocal microscope system. The equipment will enhance the funded research of a number of faculty members in the Department of Biological Science. The requested equipment will be housed as part of a larger unified microscopy laboratory and will serve a broad community of faculty, staff, graduate students and undergraduate students. Impact on teaching is less clear, except that the microscope will be connected to a computer network that will allow projection of images to nearby classrooms. Clear examples of how teaching will be improved are not provided. What is most troublesome is the plan for maintenance of the requested instrument. The applicants want the microscope to be available to all; in the panel's experience, similar microscopy equipment needs a dedicated staff supervisor. It seems naive to assert that everyone can be appropriately trained to operate the microscope without it suffering substantial and frequent damage. The most important equipment would seem to be the replacement Nikon E600 microscope and imaging system to replace the existing and outdated Optiphot microscope. For this reason, the panel recommends partial funding of \$39,000, provided that the institutional commitment is maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026BS-06

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instruction and Research in the Biological
Sciences Through Acquisition of a Workgroup Cluster

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$47,999
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$38,973

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 requests funding to purchase a computer cluster for research and teaching. The PIs make it clear that this purchase will have broad implications for both teaching and research for students and faculty. The panel recommends partial funding of \$38,973 to be expended at the PI's discretion, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027BS-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Health Promotion and Disease
Prevention Infrastructure

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 0 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 53 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$51,944
 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.)

Funds are requested to purchase several pieces of exercise equipment for use in the Division of Family and Consumer Sciences at Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge campus. The stated goal is to enhance infrastructure relative to nutrition, health promotion and disease prevention, focused on studies of the treatment of obesity by improved nutrition and exercise. The applicants will use the equipment to focus attention on exercise, but the target population for these studies is not described. The panel is not clear whether they will involve clients of the center who have enrolled in obesity studies supported by external entities. The institutional match is not strong, although several of the investigators do have extramural funding. However, it's unclear whether these funds are focused on studies of obesity and human health. Because of the limited funds available, the panel cannot recommend funding of this proposal at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028BS-06

INSTITUTION: Tulane University and Tulane University Health Sciences Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Stabilizing the Tulane Museum of Natural History Internet Node with a Hybrid Solar Back-up Power System

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 5 (of 15 points)
 B.3 0 (of 20 points)
 B.4 1 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

H. Total Score: 39 (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 requests funds for purchase of a solar powered generator system to provide power for Internet access to the Tulane University Museum of Natural History. The museum serves as a "National Center of Ichthyology Resource Collection" and there has been a major effort to provide Internet access to these research collections. During Hurricane Katrina power was disrupted, blocking Internet access to these collections. As important as these resources are, it seems a low priority to provide the requested backup power system, since most power disruptions in the New Orleans area would likely be substantially less severe and of a shorter duration than those caused by Hurricane Katrina. Because of the limited funds available, the panel does not recommend funding of this proposal at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029BS-06

INSTITUTION: Tulane University and Tulane University Health Sciences Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Health Professions Distant Learning Network (HPDLN)

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

D. 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 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 20 points)
 B.3 20 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$144,480</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$56,240</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 seems to represent a tangible partnership between an academic institution and industry in order to establish a "large fiber optic cable route." The costs are substantial, as are the matching funds. However, there are budgeted items that were cause for concern. Of the \$75,400 requested for the Poydras link, \$52,700 are annual costs. An additional annual cost of \$6,600 is also listed for future years. Likewise the LCRP includes \$6,840 in annual costs. The panel is reluctant to lay the groundwork for future funding. Other sources must be used to pay the initial and future annual costs, and requested release time. The panel recommends partial funding at \$56,240, with the institutional matches to be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030BS-06

INSTITUTION: Tulane University Health Sciences Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Purchase of EYESI Ophthalmosurgical Simulator

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 20 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$98,800
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$75,000

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 proposal requests funds for purchase of an EYESI Ophthalmosurgical Simulator for the Department of Ophthalmology at Tulane University School of Medicine. This simulator would be the first in the United States, making this department the national leader in the use of this equipment. It would allow students to practice some surgical procedures using a head model and a computer screen. It would also allow faculty to prepare lessons to be mastered on the simulator, instead of using pig eye models which do not completely simulate human eye structure and disease. What weakens the proposal is the poor level of institutional commitment and information about the long-term maintenance of the simulator. The panel recommends funding this proposal at a level of \$75,000, with the expectation that the remaining funds will be provided by the institution or other sources. The minimal institutional match should be maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031BS-06

INSTITUTION: Tulane University Health Sciences Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: DNA and Protein Chemistry Instrumentation

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 20 (of 20 points)
 B.4 0 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	Requested Amount:
	<u>\$84,530</u>	<u>\$10,640</u>
	Recommended Amount:	Recommended Amount:
	<u>\$77,500</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 requests funding for an automated Caliper Lab-Chip 90 instrument for the chemical analysis of RNA, DNA, and protein. This equipment will complement a major investment in equipment for genomics from previous grants. The success of this core facility is outstanding, with utilization by over 40 investigators and numerous other outside entities. Maintenance, utilization, and supervision of the instrument have also been well thought out. However, with the funds to be generated from hourly charges, it seems inappropriate to charge maintenance costs for this instrument to this application. Similarly, the request for chips should also be borne by the institution or by the core facility. The institutional match is very poor, since it uses salary that would be paid from the VA as the match. In the panel's view, the institution should provide the funds for the initial chips and the maintenance contracts. The panel recommends partial funding of \$77,500 for year one, provided that the above-referenced conditions are met and the first-year institutional match is maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Throughput Environmental Genomics Capabilities at UL Lafayette

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$168,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$28,000

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 for an automated workstation to facilitate meta-genome analysis is aimed at enhancing the research programs and potential of the PIs. There was no compelling evidence that there would be a measurable impact on the curriculum or student quality. Of the requested equipment, the DNA Shearing Machine and Micro Array Hybridization Station seemed of most use to the PIs. The panel recommends partial funding of \$28,000 for their purchase, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Equipment to Enhance Molecular Evolution Research and Teaching

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 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 1 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$136,006
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$66,000

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 proposal is for the purchase of equipment for enhancing studies of molecular evolution. The major items of equipment include a quantitative PCR machine, a molecular imager, electroporator, large shaker, and refrigerated microcentrifuge (the last two items replace existing equipment that is beyond repair). The equipment will increase the competitiveness of four UL Lafayette investigators. The quantitative PCR machine is said to enhance teaching activities in several existing courses, but the discussion of specific enhancements is very general and not well justified. The need for the imager is more compelling, since faculty are already using X-ray film for exposures of radioactive samples. Contributions from the Department consist solely of a \$20,000 match and a small amount of faculty release time. The panel recommends partial funding of \$66,014 for the imager, provided that the institutional match is maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of an Electron Microscopic Imaging and
Chemical Analysis Facility at ULM

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 1 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$258,049
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$200,000

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 proposal requests funds to acquire a custom-configured Environmental Scanning Electron Microscope. There is currently no functional scanning electron microscope at UL-M. The capabilities of this equipment seem to complement existing capabilities and should allow this group of investigators to continue its excellence in pharmaceutical research. The institutional match is good and the extramural funding of these investigators should also support the maintenance of the equipment. The impact on teaching is less apparent. The PI will introduce activities that utilize this instrument in several courses, but how such additional exercises will make students more competent than their peers at other institutions is less clear. The panel recommends funding at a level of \$200,000, provided that the institutional match is maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Cap/NMR Flow Microprobe Enhancement of ULM College of Pharmacy NMR Spectrometer

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 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 5 (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 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

75

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$63,730
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 request is for an upgrade of an existing NMR spectrophotometer. In principle the upgrade will enhance sensitivity and significantly reduce the size of the sample being analyzed. BoRSF funds have played an important role in establishing and expanding this facility. The PIs have capitalized on that investment, yielding increases in productivity and diversity of their research programs. Although the panel recognizes that the upgrade is important, we do not feel that it is essential, especially in light of the limited funds available. The panel does not recommend funding at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Incorporation of Genomics and Discovery-Based Learning into the Biology Laboratory Curriculum

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

H. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$78,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$47,000

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.)

Funds are requested to allow introduction of discovery-based genomics teaching modules into two existing courses in Genetics and Developmental Biology. These additions to the curricula will enhance an existing HHMI grant in Biological Sciences Education. The equipment request seems well thought out and integrates nicely with the proposed curriculum changes. It was not clear what the applicants meant by "RNA synthesis for RNAi experiments"; presumably they are not really going to have the students chemically synthesize RNA, but rather use RNA transcription from plasmids of cloned genes to make double-stranded RNA transcripts to feed to the worms or feed bacteria making the dsRNA to the worms. The panel wonders why the applicants have requested desktop computers (and the associated need for secure installation) rather than laptops that could be checked out to the students during the laboratory exercises and kept secure at other times. Since they intend to connect the computers to the Internet using wireless technology, it would seem to make no difference whether desktops or laptops are purchased. There is also no mention of purchasing antivirus software for the computers. The request for the microscopes for ultrastructure study seems more solid, but the number of cameras seems excessive. The panel wonders why these cameras have been used successfully in other classes, yet cannot be shared with this course as well, or why the instructor needs an additional camera. It also seems more reasonable to acquire supplies through tuition and course funds rather than through this mechanism. The panel recommends partial funding of \$47,000, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Cell Sorter Upgrade to Flow Cytometer to Enhance Cell Toxicology and Pharmacology Research at ULM

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$24,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$24,000

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 proposal requests funds to upgrade an existing flow cytometer with equipment to allow sorting of cells and subcellular organelles. Expanding the capabilities of the existing equipment seems reasonable. A current student will undertake training in the use of the new equipment and will then train others. The panel would be more comfortable if the PI or some faculty member also undertook the training, to assure proper operation of the instrument on a long-term basis, rather than passing the knowledge from student to student. The impact on course content is more indirect, but the instrument will be available to a growing pool of graduate students in Pharmacology and Toxicology. The institutional match for the requested funding is good. The panel recommends full funding of this proposal, provided that the institutional match is maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Dispersive Raman Spectrometer for Enhancement of
Pharmaceutical and Biological Science at ULM

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

H. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$80,719
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a request for purchase of a Raman spectrometer. The PIs argue that acquisition of this piece of equipment would enhance their existing research as well as allow them to undertake additional projects. While there may be some impact on teaching and students, the panel feels that this is secondary to the immediate goals of the PIs. While personnel involved in maintenance of the equipment are named, the sources of funds are not identified. Under other circumstances the panel would be favorably disposed to this proposal, but in light of limitations on available funds, the panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039BS-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of Intravital Microscopy Facility at ULM

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 13 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 0 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ Not Clear _____

H. Total Score:

72

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$352,551
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 applicant and six other funded investigators from the University of Louisiana at Monroe School of Pharmacy are requesting funds to establish an Intravital Microscopy Facility. The equipment requested enables qualitative and quantitative analysis of angiogenesis, microcirculation, and growth behavior of benign and invasive tissues, and will aid studies in cancer progression, chemoprevention and identification of potential new therapeutics. This equipment may strengthen the competitiveness of these investigators and may help with the recruitment, training and retention of graduate students in these laboratories. The impact on teaching is much more tenuous. It's also not clear how this equipment is going to increase the number of pharmacists in Louisiana. Institutional funds will provide 25.8% of the cost of this very expensive equipment. Given the many requests for equipment by this Department and looking at the range of interests of these investigators, this specific proposal seems less central to their mission. Due to limited funds, the panel cannot recommend funding of this proposal at the present time.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Biological Sciences
for the FY 2005-2006 Review Cycle**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001BS-06 BS	Improving Student Success in Human Anatomy	Bossier Parish Community College (Science);	Judith Coston; Rick Jones;	1	\$ 61,187
				Total	\$ 61,187
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
002BS-06 BS	Cell Culture Make-Over	Bossier Parish Community College (Science and Allied Health);	Elaine Cox;	1	\$ 82,044
				Total	\$ 82,044
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

E=Primarily an Equipment Request
N=Not Primarily an Equipment Request

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003BS-06 BS	Proteomics in the Undergraduate Curriculum	Centenary College (Biology);	Cynthia J. Brame;	1	\$ 47,803
				Total	\$ 47,803
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
004BS-06 BS	Digital Imaging of Ants in Louisiana	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Entomology);	Linda M. Hooper-Bui;	1	\$ 46,474
				Total	\$ 46,474
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
005BS-06 BS	Equipment Enhancement for Teaching and Research in Food Microbiology, Food Safety and Industrial Microbiology	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Food Science);	Marlene E. Janes; Beilei Ge;	1	\$ 107,512
				Total	\$ 107,512
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006BS-06 BS	Equipment for Polymerase Chain Reaction Work With Pecan Bacterial Leaf Scorch Disease	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Pecan Research Station);	R. S. Sanderlin;	1	\$ 15,914
				Total	\$ 15,914
E	Proposal is a New Request				
007BS-06 BS	Enhancement of Advanced Materials Processing Facilities at the Louisiana Forest Products Development Center	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Renewable Natural Resources);	Todd Shupe; Sangyeob Lee;	1	\$ 108,217
				Total	\$ 108,217
E	Proposal is a New Request				
008BS-06 BS	Establishment of a Biotechnology Teaching Laboratory for the Biotechnology Education for Students and Teachers (BEST) Program at the LSU AgCenter	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Agricultural Experiment Station);	Richard Tulley;	1	\$ 185,656
				Total	\$ 185,656
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009BS-06	Symposium on Agricultural Biotechnology	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Plant Pathology and Crop Physiology);	Rodrigo A. Valverde;	1	\$ 11,138
BS				Total	\$ 11,138
N Proposal is a New Request					
010BS-06	Equipment Enhancement for Synchrotron X-ray Tomography Beamline	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices);	Kyungmin Ham; Brygg Ullmer; Clint Willson; Dominique Homberger; Les Butler;	1	\$ 112,258
BS				Total	\$ 112,258
E Proposal is a New Request					
011BS-06	Equipment to Enhance Biology Science Lecture and Laboratory Courses at LSUE	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Biology);	S. Renee Hazelton-Robichaux; Jameel S. AL-Dujaili;	1	\$ 162,996
BS				Total	\$ 162,996
E Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012BS-06	Request a Capillary Liquid Chromatography for Off-Line LC-MS in LSUHSC-NO Proteomics Core Facility	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans (Physiology);	Chau-Wen Chou; William M. Chilian;	1	\$ 99,875
BS				Total	\$ 99,875
E	Proposal is a New Request				
013BS-06	Enhancement of Computational Analysis in Cell and Molecular Biology Laboratories	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	M. Cran Lucas; Stephen Banks; Tara Williams-Hart;	1	\$ 14,288
BS				Total	\$ 14,288
E	Proposal is a New Request				
014BS-06	Enhancing Physiology Instruction Through Computer Interfaced Equipment at LSUS	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Stephen W. Banks; Dalton R. Gossett; Nathan R. Hutchings;	1	\$ 22,097
BS				Total	\$ 22,097
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015BS-06 BS	Collection Improvement and Computerization of the LSUS Herbarium	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Michael H. MacRoberts; Gary M. Hanson; M. Cran Lucas; Nathan R. Hutchings;	1	\$ 30,400
				Total	\$ 30,400
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
016BS-06 BS	Enhancement of the Applied Biotechnology Course at LSUS	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Tara Williams-Hart; M. Cran Lucas; Nathan R. Hutchings; Stephanie Aamodt; Stephen Banks;	1	\$ 45,000
				Total	\$ 45,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
017BS-06 BS	Enhancing Research Capability and Productivity Related to the Epidemiology of Life-Style	Louisiana Tech University (Health and Exercise Sciences);	Charles F. Ciciarella;	1	\$ 26,597
				Total	\$ 26,597
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018BS-06	Enhancement of Graduate and Undergraduate Education in Biological Sciences and Nanotechnology Through Practical Training	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing, Chemistry, and Biological Sciences);	David Mills; Alfred Gunasekaran; Debasish Kuila; Michael McShane; Sidney Sit; Tabbetha Dobbins;	1	\$ 121,281
BS				Total	\$ 121,281
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
019BS-06	Biochemistry Experiences for Life Science Majors	Louisiana Tech University (Chemistry);	L. Dale Snow;	1	\$ 16,800
BS				Total	\$ 16,800
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
020BS-06	Improved Computer-Based Data Acquisition Work Stations in Physiology Teaching Laboratories	Louisiana Tech University (Biological Sciences);	John M. Wakeman;	1	\$ 39,270
BS				Total	\$ 39,270
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021BS-06 BS	Enhancing Molecular Biology Experiences for Pre-Medical Students	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	John P. Doucet; Enmin Zou; Gary J. LaFleur, Jr.; Rajkumar Nathaniel; Ramaraj Boopathy;	1	\$ 152,275
				Total	\$ 152,275
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
022BS-06 BS	Expanding Marine Biology for the New Louisiana Coast	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Gary J. LaFleur, Jr.; Enmin Zou; John P. Doucet; Rajkumar Nathaniel; Ramaraj Boopathy;	1	\$ 114,829
				Total	\$ 114,829
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
023BS-06 BS	Enhancing Immunology Education for Biology Students	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Rajkumar Nathaniel; Enmin Zou; Gary J. LaFleur, Jr.; John Doucet; Ramaraj Boopathy;	1	\$ 86,770
				Total	\$ 86,770
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
024BS-06 BS	Enhancing Biological Sciences in the Community College	Nunez Community College (Allied Health and Natural Science);	Stephen Waddell; Klaus Heyer; Tina Tinney;	1	\$ 140,127
				Total	\$ 140,127
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
025BS-06 BS	Establishment of an Unified Microscopy Laboratory Network	Southeastern Louisiana University (Biological Sciences);	Gary W. Childers; David Sever; Deborah Dardis; Gary T. Howard;	1 2	\$ 143,550 \$
				Total	\$ 143,550
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
026BS-06 BS	Enhancement of Instruction and Research in the Biological Sciences Through Acquisition of a Workgroup Cluster	Southeastern Louisiana University (Biological Sciences);	Kyle Piller; Brian I. Crother; Mary E. White;	1	\$ 47,999
				Total	\$ 47,999
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
027BS-06 BS	Enhancement of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Infrastructure	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Family and Consumer Sciences);	Glenda Stein Johnson; Bernestine B. McGee; Cheryl Atkinson; Crystal Johnson; Louis Hightower;	1	\$ 51,944
				Total	\$ 51,944

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

028BS-06 BS	Stabilizing the Tulane Museum of Natural History Internet Node with a Hybrid Solar Back-up Power System	Tulane University (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology); Tulane University Health Sciences Center;	Henry L. Bart, Jr.; Nelson E. Rios;	1	\$ 100,000
				Total	\$ 100,000

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

Note: The title of this proposals was changed slightly from the original submission.

029BS-06 BS	The Health Professions Distant Learning Network (HPDLN)	Tulane University (Clinical Effectiveness and Prevention); Tulane University Health Sciences Center;	William C. Steinmann; Bruce E. Bowdiish;	1	\$ 144,480
				Total	\$ 144,480

N

Proposal is a **New Request**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
030BS-06 BS	Purchase of EYESI Ophthalmosurgical Simulator	Tulane University Health Sciences Center (Ophthalmology);	Delmar R. Caldwell; Gholam A. Peyman; Mandi D. Conway; Peter R. Kastl; Ramesh S. Ayyala; Robert A. Gordon;	1 Total	\$ 98,800 \$ 98,800
E Proposal is a New Request					
031BS-06 BS	DNA and Protein Chemistry Instrumentation	Tulane University Health Sciences Center (Internal Medicine);	Timothy Grant Hammond;	1 2 Total	\$ 84,530 \$ 10,640 \$ 95,170
E Proposal is a New Request					
032BS-06 BS	High Throughput Environmental Genomics Capabilities at UL Lafayette	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Biology);	Andrei Chistoserdov; Johannes Rick; Joseph Neigel; Karl Hasenstein; Paul Klerks; Suzanne Fredericq;	1 Total	\$ 168,000 \$ 168,000
E Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
033BS-06	Acquisition of Equipment to Enhance Molecular Evolution Research and Teaching	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Biology);	Caryl A. Chlan; James S. Albert; Joseph E. Neigel; Scott C. France;	1	\$ 136,006
BS				Total	\$ 136,006

E
 Proposal is a **New Request**

034BS-06	Establishment of an Electron Microscopic Imaging and Chemical Analysis Facility at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Karen P. Briski;	1	\$ 258,049
BS				Total	\$ 258,049

E
 Proposal is a **New Request**

035BS-06	Cap/NMR Flow Microprobe Enhancement of ULM College of Pharmacy NMR Spectrometer	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Pharmacy);	Khalid A. El Sayed; Ronald A. Hill; Seetharama D. S. Jois;	1	\$ 63,730
BS				Total	\$ 63,730

E
 Proposal is a **New Request**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
036BS-06	Incorporation of Genomics and Discovery-Based Learning Into the Biology Laboratory Curriculum	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Biology);	Chris R. Gissendanner; Ann Findley;	1	\$ 78,000
				Total	\$ 78,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
037BS-06	Cell Sorter Upgrade to Flow Cytometer to Enhance Cell Toxicology and Pharmacology Research at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Toxicology);	Sharon A. Meyer; Benny L. Blaylock; David S. Roane; Garish Shah; Harihara M. Mehendale; Khalid El Sayed; Paul W. Sylvester; Sami Nazzal;	1	\$ 24,000
				Total	\$ 24,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
038BS-06	Dispersive Raman Spectrometer for Enhancement of Pharmaceutical and Biological Sciences at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Sami Nazzal; David S. Roane; Joseph A. Watkins; Karen P. Briski; Khalid El Sayed; Ronald A. Hill;	1	\$ 80,719
				Total	\$ 80,719
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
039BS-06 BS	Establishment of Intravital Microscopy Facility at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Girish Shah;	1	\$ 352,551
				Total	\$ 352,551

E
Proposal is a **New Request**

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Biological Sciences for the FY 2005-2006 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
39	\$ 3,683,166	\$ 3,693,806	\$1,532,270

Appendix B

Rating Forms

- A. For Equipment Proposals
- B. For Non-Equipment Proposals

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2005-06**

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

- _____ of 20 pts. B.1 Are the objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.2 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- _____ of 2 pts. B.4 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.5 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts.

F.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES ___ NO ___

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

=====

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2005-06**

**RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

- _____ of 25 pts. B.1 Are the objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 25 pts. B.2 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- _____ of 2 pts. B.4 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.5 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 12 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 2 pts.

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

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

_____ of 10 pts.

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts.

E.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

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?

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount: \$ _____

Recommended Amount: \$ _____

COMMENTS:

=====

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Date: _____
(Form 6.12, rev.2004)